OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

SECOND SESSION—TENTH PARLIAMENT

---

6 EDWARD VII., 1906

VOL. LXXIV

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE EIGHTH DAY OF MARCH TO THE TWENTY-FOURTH DAY OF APRIL, INCLUSIVE



OTTAWA

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

1906

MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

OF THE

RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR WILFRID LAURIER

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

AT THE OPENING OF THE

SECOND SESSION OF THE TENTH PARLIAMENT

1906

CABINET FORMED JULY 13, 1896

President of the Privy Council (Premier)	Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER, P.C., G.C.M.G., K.C., D.C.L. *(Oxon.)*
Minister of Trade and Commerce	Rt. Hon. Sir RICHARD J. CARTWRIGHT, G.C.M.G.
Secretary of State	Hon. R. W. SCOTT, K.C., LL.D.
Minister of Militia and Defence	Hon. Sir F. W. BORDEN, K.C.M.G., B.A., M.D.
Minister of Agriculture	Hon. SYDNEY A. FISHER, B.A.
Minister of Finance	Hon. W. S. FIELDING.
Minister of Customs	Hon. WM. PATERSON.
Minister of Marine and Fisheries	Hon. L. P. BRODEUR.
Minister of Railways and Canals	Hon. H. R. EMMERSON.
Minister of Inland Revenue	Hon. W. TEMPLEMAN.
Minister of Public Works	Hon. C. S. HYMAN.
Minister of the Interior	Hon. F. OLIVER.
Minister of Justice	Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH, K.C.
Postmaster General	Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX, K.C., LL.B.

Clerk of the Privy Council ..... JOHN J. MCGEE.

OFFICERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

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

OFFICIAL REPORTERS.

ALBERT HORTON ..... Chief Reporter.

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

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

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

SECOND SESSION, TENTH PARLIAMENT

1906

ADAMSON, A. J.—Humboldt.
ALCORN, GEORGE OSCAR—Prince Edward.
AMES, HERBERT B.—Montreal, St. Antoine.
ARCHAMBAULT, JOSEPH ELOI—Berthier.
ARMSTRONG, Joseph E.—Lambton, E.R.
AVERY, MELZAR—Frontenac.
AYLESWORTH, HON. ALLEN B.—York, Ont., N.R.

BARKER, SAMUEL—Hamilton, East.
BARR, JOHN—Dufferin.
BEAUPARLANT, AIMÉ M.—St. Hyacinthe.
BÉLAND, HENRI SÉVÉRIN—Beauce.
BELCOURT, HON. NAPOLÉON ANTOINE—Ottawa.
BENNETT, WILLIAM H.—Simcoe, E.R.
BERGERON, JOSEPH G. H.—Beauharnois.
BICKERDIKE, ROBERT—Montreal, St. Lawrence.
BLACK, JUDSON BURPEE—Hants.
BLAIN, RICHARD—Peel.
BLAND, LEONARD T.—Bruce, N.R.
BOLE, DAVID WESLEY—Winnipeg.
BORDEN, HON. SIR FREDERICK W., K.C.M.G.—King's, N.S.
BORDEN, ROBERT LAIRD—Carleton, Ont.
BOURASSA, HENRI—Labelle.
BOURBONNAIS, AUGUSTIN—Soulanges.
BOYCE, ARTHUR CYRIL—Algoma West.
BOYER, GUSTAVE—Vaudreuil.
BRABAZON, Gerald H.—Pontiac.
BRISTOL, EDMUND—Toronto, Centre.
BRODER, ANDREW—Dundas.
BRODEUR, HON. LOUIS PHILIPPE—Rouville.
BROWN, JAMES P.—Chateauguay.
BRUNEAU, ARTHUR AIMÉ—Richelieu.
BUREAU, JACQUES—Three Rivers and St. Maurice.
BURROWS, THEODORE ARTHUR—Dauphin.

CALDWELL. THOMAS BOYD—Lanark, N.R.
CALVERT, WILLIAM SAMUEL—Middlesex, W.R.
CAMPBELL, ARCHIBALD—York, Ont., C.R.
CARNEY, MICHAEL—Halifax.
CARRIERE, LOUIS A.—Lévis.
CARVELL, FRANK BROADSTREET—Carleton, N.B.
CASH, E. L.—Mackenzie.
CHISHOLM, THOMAS—Huron, E.R.
CHISHOLM, WILLIAM—Antigonish.
CHRISTIE, PETER—Ontario, S.R.
CLARE, GEORGE A.—Waterloo, S.R.
CLARKE, ALFRED H.—Essex, S.R.
CLEMENTS, HERBERT S.—Kent, W.R.
COCHRANE, EDWARD—Northumberland, Ont., E.R.
COCKSHUTT, WILLIAM F.—Brantford.
CONMEE, JAMES—Thunder Bay and Rainy River.
COPP, ALBERT J. S.—Digby.
COSTIGAN, HON. JOHN—Victoria, N.B.
CRAWFORD, JOHN—Portage la Prairie.
CROCKET, OSWALD S.—York, N.B.
CYR, JOSEPH ERNEST—Provencher.

DANIEL, JOHN WATERHOUSE—St. John (City).
DELISLE, MICHEL SIMÉON—Portneuf.
DEMERS, L. PHILIPPE—St. John and Iberville.
DERBYSHIRE, DANIEL—Brockville.
DESJARDINS, SAMUEL—Terrebonne.
DEVLIN, EMMANUEL B.—Wright.
DUBEAU, JOSEPH ADELARD—Joliette.
DUGAS, FRANÇOIS O.—Montcalm.
DYMENT, ALBERT EDWARD—Algoma East.

ELSON, PETER—Middlesex, E.R.
EMMERSON, HON. HENRY R.—Westmoreland.
ETHIER, JOSEPH ARTHUR C.—Two Mountains.

FIELDING, HON. WILLIAM STEVENS—Shelburne and Queen's, N.S.
FINLAY, JOHN—Peterborough, E.R.
FINLAYSON, DUNCAN—Richmond, N.S.
FISHER, HON. SYDNEY ARTHUR—Brome.
FITZPATRICK, HON. CHARLES—Quebec County.
FORGET, RODOLPHE—Charlevoix.
FORTIER, EDMOND—Lotbinière.
FOSTER, HON. GEORGE EULAS—Toronto, North
FOWLER, GEORGE W.—King's and Albert, N.B.

GALLIHER, WILLIAM ALFRED—Kootenay.
GANONG, GILBERT W.—Charlotte.
GAUVREAU, CHARLES ARTHUR—Témiscouata.
GEOFFRION, VICTOR—Chambly and Verchères.
GERMAN, WILLIAM MANLY—Welland.
GERVAIS, HONORÉ—Montreal, St. James.
GIRARD, JOSEPH—Chicoutimi and Saguenay.
GLADU, JOSEPH E. O.—Yamaska.
GORDON, DAVID ALEXANDER—Kent. E.R.

GRANT, GEORGE D.—Ontario, N.R.
GREENWAY, THOMAS—Lisgar.
GUNN, BENJAMIN B.—Huron, S.R.
GUTHRIE, HUGH—Wellington, S.R.

HAGGART, HON. JOHN GRAHAM—Lanark, S.R.
HALL, R. R.—Peterborough, W.R.
HARTY, WILLIAM—Kingston.
HENDERSON, DAVID—Halton.
HERRON, JOHN—Alberta.
HUGHES, JAMES J.—King's, P.E.I.
HUGHES, SAMUEL—Victoria and Haliburton.
HUNT, AYLMER BYRON—Compton.
HYMAN, HON. CHARLES S.—London.

INGRAM, ANDREW B.—Elgin, E.R.

JACKSON, SAMUEL JACOB—Selkirk.
JACKSON, WILLIAM—Elgin, W.R.
JOHNSTON, ALEXANDER—Cape Breton, South.

KEMP, ALBERT E.—Toronto, East.
KENNEDY, JAMES BUCKHAM—New Westminster.
KNOWLES, WILLIAM ERSKINE—Assiniboia, West.

LACHANCE, ARTHUR—Quebec Centre.
LAKE, RICHARD STUART—Qu'Appelle.
LALOR, FRANCIS RAMSAY—Haldimand.
LANCASTER, EDWARD A.—Lincoln and Niagara.
LANCTÔT, ROCH—Laprairie-Napierville.
LAPOINTE, ERNEST—Kamouraska.
LAURENCE, FREDERICK A.—Colchester.
LAURIER, R. CHARLEMAGNE—L'Assomption.
LAURIER, RT. HON. SIR WILFRID, G.C.M.G.—Quebec, East.
LAVERGNE, ARMAND—Montmagny.
LAVERGNE, LOUIS—Drummond and Arthabaska.
LAW, BOWMAN BROWN—Yarmouth, N.S.
LEBLANC, OLIVER J.—Kent, N.B.
LEFURGEY, ALFRED A.—Prince, P.E.I.
LEMIEUX, HON. RODOLPHE—{Gaspé. / Nicolet.}
LENNOX, HAUGHTON—Simcoe, S.R.
LEONARD, J. E. EMILE—Laval.
LEWIS, EDWARD NORMAN—Huron, W.R.
LOGAN, HANCE J.—Cumberland.
LOGGIE, WILLIAM STEWART—Northumberland, N.B.
LOVELL, HENRY—Stanstead.

MACDONALD, EDWARD M.—Pictou.
MACDONELL, ANGUS CLAUDE—Toronto, South.
MACLAREN, ALEXANDER F.—Perth, N.R.
MACLEAN, ALEXANDER K.—Lunenburg.
MACLEAN, WILLIAM F.—York, Ont., S.R.
MACPHERSON, ROBERT GEORGE—Vancouver City.
MCCARTHY, LEIGHTON GOLDIE—Simcoe, N.R.
MCCARTHY, MAITLAND STEWART—Calgary.
MCCOLL, JOHN B.—Northumberland, Ont., W.R.
MCCOOL, CHARLES ARTHUR—Nipissing.
MCCRANEY, GEORGE EWAN—Saskatchewan.
MCINTYRE, GILBERT H.—Perth, S.R.
MCINTYRE, WILBERT—Strathcona.
MCKENZIE, PETER H.—Bruce, S.R.
MCLEAN, ANGUS A.—Queen's, P.E.I.
MCLENNAN, ANGUS—Inverness.
MARCIL, CHARLES—Bonaventure.
MARCILE, JOSEPH EDMOND—Bagot.
MARTIN, ALEXANDER—Queen's, P.E.I.
MARTIN, THOMAS—Wellington, N.R.
MAYRAND, HORMISDAS—Maskinongé.
MEIGS, DANIEL BISHOP—Missisquoi.
MILLER, HENRY HORTON—Grey, S.R.
MONK, FREDERICK D.—Jacques Cartier.
MORIN, JEAN BAPTISTE—Dorchester.

NORTHRUP, WILLIAM BARTON—Hastings, E.R

OLIVER, HON. FRANK—Edmonton.
OSLER, EDMUND BOYD—Toronto, West.

PAQUET, EUGÈNE—L'Islet.
PARDEE, FRED. F.—Lambton, W.R.
PARENT, GEORGE—Montmorency.
PARMELEE, CHARLES H.—Shefford.
PATERSON, HON. WILLIAM—Brant.
PERLEY, GEORGE H.—Argenteuil.
PICHÉ, CAMILLE—Montreal, St. Mary's.
PICKUP, SAMUEL W. W.—Annapolis.
PORTER, EDWARD GUSS—Hastings, W.R.
POWER, WILLIAM—Quebec, West.
PRINGLE, ROBERT A.—Stormont.
PROULX, EDMOND—Prescott.

RATZ, VALENTINE—Middlesex, N.R.
REID, JAMES—Restigouche.
REID, JOHN D.—Grenville.
RIVET, LOUIS ALFRED ADHÉMAR—Hochelaga.
ROCHE, WILLIAM—Halifax.
ROCHE, WILLIAM J.—Marquette.
ROSS, A. C.—N. C. Breton and Victoria.
ROSS, DUNCAN—Yale-Cariboo.
ROSS, JEAN AUGUSTE—Rimouski.
ROUSSEAU, JEFFREY ALEXANDRE—Champlain.

SAVOIE, FRANÇOIS THÉODORE—Mégantic.
SCHAFFNER, FREDERICK LAURENCE—Souris.
SCHELL, JACOB T.—Glengarry.
SCHELL, MALCOLM S.—Oxford, S.R.
SEAGRAM, JOSEPH E.—Waterloo, N.R.
SIFTON, HON. CLIFFORD—Brandon.
SINCLAIR, JOHN H.—Guysborough.
SLOAN, WILLIAM—Comox-Atlin.
SMITH, ERNEST D.—Wentworth.
SMITH, GEORGE—Oxford, N.R.
SMITH, RALPH—Nanaimo.
SPROULE, THOMAS S.—Grey, E.R.
STAPLES, WILLIAM D.—Macdonald.
STEWART, ROBERT—Ottawa.
STOCKTON, ALFRED AUGUSTUS—St. John City and County.
SUTHERLAND, HON. ROBT. FRANKLIN—Essex, N.R.

TALBOT, ONÉSIPHORE ERNEST—Bellechasse.

TAYLOR, GEORGE—Leeds.
TELFORD, WILLIAM PATTESON—Grey, N.R.
TEMPLEMAN, HON. WILLIAM—Victoria City, B.C.
THOMPSON, ALFRED—Yukon Territory.
TISDALE, HON. DAVID—Norfolk.
TOBIN, EDMUND WILLIAM—Richmond and Wolfe.
TURGEON, ONÉSIPHORE—Gloucester.
TURRIFF, JOHN G.—Assiniboia, East

VERVILLE, A.—Maisonneuve.

WALSH, ROBERT NELSON—Huntingdon.
WARD, HENRY ALFRED—Durham.
WATSON, ROBERT JAMES—Parry Sound.
WHITE, HON. PETER, Renfrew. N.R.
WILMOT, ROBERT D.—Sunbury and Queen's.
WILSON, NORMAN FRANK—Russell.
WILSON, URIAH—Lennox and Addington.
WORTHINGTON, ARTHUR NORREYS—Sherbrooke.
WRIGHT, AARON ABEL—Renfrew, S.R.
WRIGHT, WILLIAM—Muskoka.

ZIMMERMAN, ADAM—Hamilton, West.

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

CONSTITUENCIES OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

SECOND SESSION, TENTH PARLIAMENT

1906

ALBERTA—John Herron.
ALGOMA, EAST—Albert Edward Dyment.
ALGOMA, WEST—Arthur Cyril Boyce.
ANNAPOLIS—Samuel W. W. Pickup.
ANTIGONISH—William Chisholm.
ARGENTEUIL—George H. Perley.
ASSINIBOIA, EAST—John G. Turriff.
ASSINIBOIA, WEST—William E. Knowles.

BAGOT—Joseph Edmond Marcile.
BEAUCE—Henri Sévérin Béland.
BEAUHARNOIS—Joseph Gédéon Horace Bergeron.
BELLECHASSE—Onésiphore Ernest Talbot.
BERTHIER—Joseph Eloi Archambault.
BONAVENTURE—Charles Marcil.
BRANDON—Hon. Clifford Sifton.
BRANT—Hon. William Paterson.
BRANTFORD—William F. Cockshutt.
BROCKVILLE—Daniel Derbyshire.
BROME—Hon. Sydney Arthur Fisher.
BRUCE, N. RIDING—Leonard T. Bland.
BRUCE, S. RIDING—Peter H. McKenzie.

CALGARY—Maitland Stewart McCarthy.
CAPE BRETON NORTH AND VICTORIA—A. C. Ross.
CAPE BRETON, SOUTH—Alexander Johnston.
CARLETON (N.B.)—Frank Broadstreet Carvell.
CARLETON (O.)—Robert Laird Borden.
CHAMBLY AND VERCHÈRES—Victor Geoffrion.
CHAMPLAIN—Jeffrey Alexandre Rousseau.
CHARLEVOIX—Rodolphe Forget.
CHARLOTTE—Gilbert W. Ganong.
CHATEAUGUAY—James P. Brown.
CHICOUTIMI AND SAGUENAY—Joseph Girard.
COLCHESTER—Frederick A. Laurence.
COMOX-ATLIN—William Sloan.
COMPTON—Aylmer Byron Hunt.
CUMBERLAND—Hance J. Logan.

DAUPHIN—Theodore Arthur Burrows.
DIGBY—Albert J. S. Copp.
DORCHESTER—Jean Baptiste Morin.
DRUMMOND AND ARTHABASKA—Louis Lavergne.
DUFFERIN—John Barr.
DUNDAS—Andrew Broder.
DURHAM—Henry Alfred Ward.

EDMONTON—Hon. Frank Oliver.
ELGIN, E. RIDING—Andrew B. Ingram.
ELGIN, W. RIDING—William Jackson.
ESSEX, N. RIDING—Hon. Robert Franklin Sutherland
ESSEX, S. RIDING—Alfred H. Clarke.

FRONTENAC—Melzar Avery.

GASPÉ—Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux.
GLENGARRY—Jacob T. Schell.
GLOUCESTER—Onésiphore Turgeon.
GRENVILLE—John Dowsley Reid.
GREY, E. RIDING—Thomas S. Sproule.
GREY, N. RIDING—William Patteson Telford.
GREY, S. RIDING—Henry Horton Miller.
GUYSBOROUGH—J. H. Sinclair.

HALDIMAND—Francis Ramsay Lalor.
HALIFAX—William Roche. Michael Carney.
HALTON—David Henderson.
HAMILTON, EAST—Samuel Barker.
HAMILTON, WEST—Adam Zimmerman.
HANTS—Judson Burpee Black.
HASTINGS, E. RIDING—William B. Northrup.
HASTINGS, W. RIDING—Edward Guss Porter.
HOCHELAGA—Louis Alfred Adhémar Rivet.
HUMBOLT—A. J. Adamson.
HUNTINGDON—Robert Nelson Walsh.
HURON, E. RIDING—Thomas Chisholm.
HURON, S. RIDING—Benjamin B. Gunn.
HURON, W. RIDING—Edward Norman Lewis.

INVERNESS—Angus McLennan.

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

KAMOURASKA—Ernest Lapointe.
KENT (N.B.)—Oliver J. LeBlanc.
KENT (O.), E. RIDING—David Alexander Gordon.
KENT (O.), W. RIDING—Herbert S. Clements.
KING'S AND ALBERT (N.B.)—George W. Fowler.
KING'S (N.S.)—Hon. Sir Frederick W. Borden K.C.M.G.

KING'S (P.E.I.)—James J. Hughes.
KINGSTON—William Harty.
KOOTENAY—William Alfred Galliher.

LABELLE—Henri Bourassa.
LAMBTON, E. RIDING—Joseph E. Armstrong.
LAMBTON, W. RIDING—Fred. F. Pardee.
LANARK, N. RIDING—Thomas Boyd Caldwell.
LANARK, S. RIDING—Hon. John Graham Haggart.
LAPRAIRIE-NAPIERVILLE—Roch Lanctôt.
L'ASSOMPTION—R. Charlemagne Laurier.
LAVAL—J. E. Emile Leonard.
LEEDS—George Taylor.
LENNOX AND ADDINGTON—Uriah Wilson.
LÉVIS—Louis A. Carrier.
LINCOLN—Edward A. Lancaster.
LISGAR—Thomas Greenway.
L'ISLET—Eugène Paquet.
LONDON—Hon. Charles S. Hyman.
LOTBINIÈRE—Edmond Fortier.
LUNENBURG—Alexander Kenneth Maclean.

MACDONALD—William D. Staples.
MACKENZIE—E. L. Cash.
MAISONNEUVE—A. Verville.
MARQUETTE—William J. Roche.
MASKINONGÉ—Hormisdas Mayrand.
MEGANTIC—François Théodore Savoie.
MIDDLESEX, E. RIDING—Peter Elson.
MIDDLESEX, N. RIDING—Valentine Ratz.
MIDDLESEX, W. RIDING—William Samuel Calvert.
MISSISQUOI—Daniel B. Meigs.
MONTCALM—François Octave Dugas.
MONTMAGNY—Armand Lavergne.
MONTMORENCY—George Parent.
MONTREAL, ST. ANTOINE—Herbert B. Ames.
MONTREAL, ST. JAMES—Honoré Gervais.
MONTREAL, ST. LAWRENCE—Robert Bickerdike.
MONTREAL, St. MARY—Camille Piché.
MUSKOKA—William Wright.

Nanaimo—Ralph Smith.
NEW WESTMINSTER—James B. Kennedy.
NICOLET—Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux.
NIPISSING—Charles Arthur McCool.
NORFOLK—Hon. David Tisdale.
NORTHUMBERLAND (N.B.)—William Stewart Loggie.
NORTHUMBERLAND (O.) E.R.—Edward Cochrane.
NORTHUMBERLAND (O.) W.R.—John B. McColl.

ONTARIO, N. RIDING—George D. Grant.
ONTARIO, S. RIDING—Peter Christie.
OTTAWA CITY { Hon. Napoléon Antoine Belcourt. / Robert Stewart.
OXFORD, N. RIDING—George Smith.
OXFORD, S. RIDING—Malcolm S. Schell.

PARRY SOUND—Robert James Watson.
PEEL—Richard Blain.
PERTH, N. RIDING—Alexander Ferguson MacLaren.
PERTH, S. RIDING—Gilbert H. McIntyre.
PETERBOROUGH, E. RIDING—John Finlay.
PETERBOROUGH, W. RIDING—R. R. Hall.
PICTOU—Edward M. Macdonald.
PONTIAC—Gerald H. Brabazon.
PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE—John Crawford.
PORTNEUF—Michel Siméon Delisle.
PRESCOTT—Edmond Proulx.
PRINCE, (P.E.I.)—Alfred A. Lefurgey.
PRINCE EDWARD—George Oscar Alcorn.
PROVENCHER—Joseph Ernest Cyr.

QU'APPELLE—Richard Stuart Lake.
QUEBEC, CENTRE—Arthur Lachance.
QUEBEC, EAST—Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, G.C.M.G.
QUEBEC, WEST—William Power.
QUEBEC (County)—Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick.
QUEEN'S, (P.E.I.)— { Alexander Martin. / Angus A. McLean.

RENFREW, N. RIDING—Hon. Peter White.
RENFREW, S. RIDING—Aaron Abel Wright.
RESTIGOUCHE—James Reid.
RICHELIEU—Arthur Aimé Bruneau.
RICHMOND (N.S.)—Duncan Finlayson.
RICHMOND AND WOLFE (Q.)—Edmund William Tobin
RIMOUSKI—Jean Auguste Ross.
ROUVILLE—Hon. Louis Philippe Brodeur.
RUSSELL—Norman Frank Wilson.

ST. HYACINTHE—Aimé M. Beauparlant.
ST. JOHN (N.B.), City—John Waterhouse Daniel.
ST. JOHN (N.B.), City and Co.—Alfred Augustus Stockton.
ST. JOHN AND IBERVILLE—L. Philippe Demers.
SASKATCHEWAN—George E. McCraney.
SELKIRK—Samuel Jacob Jackson.
SHEFFORD—Charles H. Parmelee.
SHELBURNE AND QUEEN'S, N.S.—Hon. William Stevens Fielding.
SHERBROOKE—Arthur Norreys Worthington.
SIMCOE, E. RIDING—William H. Bennett.
SIMCOE, N. RIDING—Leighton Goldie McCarthy.
SIMCOE, S. RIDING—Haughton Lennox.
SOULANGES—Augustin Bourbonnais.
SOURIS—Frederick Laurence Schaffner.
STANSTEAD—Henry Lovell.
STORMONT—Robert A. Pringle.
STRATHCONA—Wilbert McIntyre.
SUNBURY AND QUEEN'S (N.B.)—Robert D. Wilmot.

TEMISCOUATA—Charles Arthur Gauvreau.
TERREBONNE—Samuel Desjardins.
THREE RIVERS AND ST. MAURICE—Jacques Bureau.
THUNDER BAY AND RAINY RIVER—James Conmee.
TORONTO, CENTRE—Edmund Bristol.
TORONTO, EAST—Albert E. Kemp.
TORONTO, NORTH—Hon. George Eulas Foster.
TORONTO, SOUTH—Angus Claude Macdonell.
TORONTO, WEST—Edmund Boyd Osler.
TWO MOUNTAINS—Joseph Arthur C. Ethier.

VANCOUVER (City)—Robert George Macpherson.
VAUDREUIL—Gustave Boyer

VICTORIA (B.C.)—Hon. William Templeman.
VICTORIA (N.B.)—Hon. John Costigan.
VICTORIA AND HALIBURTON, (O.)—Samuel Hughes.

WATERLOO, N. RIDING—Joseph E. Seagram.
WATERLOO, S. RIDING—George A. Clare.
WELLAND—William Manly German.
WELLINGTON, N. RIDING—Thomas Martin.
WELLINGTON, S. RIDING—Hugh Guthrie.
WENTWORTH—Ernest D. Smith.
WESTMORELAND—Hon. Henry R. Emmerson.
WINNIPEG—David Wesley Bole.
WRIGHT—Emmanuel B. Devlin.
YALE-CARIBOO—Duncan Ross.
YAMASKA—Joseph E. O. Gladu.
YARMOUTH—Bowman Brown Law.
YORK (N.B.)—Oswald S. Crocket.
YORK (O.), C. RIDING—Archibald Campbell.
YORK (O.), N. RIDING—Hon. Allen Bristol Aylesworth.
YORK (O.), S. RIDING—William F. Maclean.
YUKON TERRITORY—Alfred Thompson.

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

BERGERON, J. G. H.—Beauharnois.
BUREAU, J.—Three Rivers and St. Maurice.
CLARKE, A. H.—Essex, S.
ETHIER, J. A. C.—Two Mountains.
GERVAIS, H.—Montreal, St. James.
GUTHRIE, H.—Wellington, S.
HUGHES, S.—Victoria and Haliburton.
JOHNSTON, A.—Cape Breton, S.
KNOWLES, W. E.—Assiniboia, W.
LOGAN, H. J.—Cumberland.
MACPHERSON, R. G.—Vancouver City.
MCCARTHY, M. S.—Calgary.
ROCHE, W. J.—Marquette.
SCHAFFNER, F. I.—Souris.
TAYLOR, GEO.—Leeds.

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

ERRATA.

VOL. I.

Col. 995, between lines 27 and 28, insert 'Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior).'

Col. 1103, 17th line from foot of column, heading: 'Rifle Ranges, Kemptville, N.S.,' should read: 'Rifle Ranges, Kentville, N.S.'

Col. 1688, lines 30, 31, 32 to read as follows: 'a fitting opportunity to witness the progress and development accomplished in Your Majesty's possessions on this continent,'

House of Commons Debates

SECOND SESSION—TENTH PARLIAMENT

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, March 8, 1906.

The Parliament, which had been prorogued from time to time to the 8th day of March, 1906, met this day for the despatch of business.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at three o'clock.

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

Ottawa, March 7, 1906.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that the Governor General will proceed to the Senate Chamber, to open the second session of the Tenth Parliament of the Dominion of Canada, on Thursday the 8th instant, at 3 o'clock p.m.

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

The Honourable,
The Speaker of the House of Commons.

A message was delivered by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod, as follows :

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

Accordingly the House went to the Senate Chamber.

And the House being returned.

ELECTION PETITIONS — JUDGMENT OF THE SUPREME COURT.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada the judgment of the said court in the matter of the appeal in the Wentworth election case, by which the judgment of the Honourable the Chief Justice of the Common Pleas and of the Honourable Mr. Justice Teetzel, sitting as election judges, voiding the said election, was affirmed and the appeal dismissed.

In conformity with chapter 9, section 46, of the Revised Statutes, I issued my warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for the said electoral district.

CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS.

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

For the electoral district of Compton ; and
For the electoral district of Sherbrooke ;

by which the elections for the said electoral districts have been declared void.

In conformity with chapter 9, section 46, of the Revised Statutes, I issued my warrants to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out new writs of election for the said electoral districts respectively.

ELECTION CASES APPEALS.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have also the honour to inform the House that I have received from the registrar of the Supreme Court of Canada judgments and decisions of the said court in the matter of the appeals made from the decisions of the trial judges in the Lower Courts relating to the following elections :—

For the electoral district of North Cape Breton and Victoria ;
For the electoral district of Pictou ;
For the electoral district of Cumberland ;
For the electoral district of Shelburne and Queen's ;
For the electoral district of King's, N.S.;
For the electoral district of Halifax (two judgments) ;

by which the appeals in the first four cases were allowed and in the three latter ones the appeals were dismissed.

ELECTION PETITION DISMISSED.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have also the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Honourable Mr. Justice Lemieux and the Honourable Mr. Justice Hutchinson, two of the judges selected for the trial of election petitions, pursuant to the Dominion Controverted Elections Act, a certificate and report relating to the election petition for the electoral district of Stanstead, by which

the petition in the said matter was dismissed.

VACANCIES.

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

Of Walter Scott, Esq., member for the electoral district of Assiniboia West, by resignation ;

Of John Henderson Lamont, Esq., member for the electoral district of Saskatchewan, by resignation ;

Of the Hon. Sir William Mulock, K.C.M.G., member for the electoral district of North York, Ontario, by the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown ;

Of Colin F. McIsaac, Esq., member for the electoral district of Antigonish, by the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown ;

Of Thomas George Johnston, Esq., member for the electoral district of West Lambton, by decease ;

Of the Hon. J. Raymond Prefontaine, member for the electoral district of Maisonneuve, by decease ;

Of Geo. Riley, Esq., member for the electoral district of Victoria City, British Columbia, by resignation ;

Of Daniel D. McKenzie, Esq., member for the electoral district of North Cape Breton and Victoria, by the acceptance of an office of emolument under the Crown;

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

I have also received to-day the resignation of Peter Talbot, Esq., member for the electoral district of Strathcona.

I have accordingly issued my warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new writ of election for the said electoral district.

NEW MEMBERS.

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

Of William Chisholm, Esq., for the electoral district of Antigonish ;

Of Fred. F. Pardee, Esq., for the electoral district of Lambton West ;

Of Ernest D. Smith, Esq., for the electoral district of Wentworth ;

Of the Hon. Allen Bristol Aylesworth, for the electoral district of North York, Ontario ;

Of Aylmer Byron Hunt, Esq., for the electoral district of Compton ;

Of Arthur Norreys Worthington, Esq., for the electoral district of Sherbrooke ;

Of George Ewan McCraney, Esq., for the electoral district of Saskatchewan ;

Of William Erskine Knowles, Esq., for the electoral district of Assiniboia West ;

Mr. SPEAKER.

Of Alphonse Verville, Esq., for the electoral district of Maisonneuve.

MEMBERS INTRODUCED.

Hon. Allen Bristol Aylesworth, member for the electoral district of North York, Ont., introduced by Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Hon. Mr. Paterson.

William Chisholm, Esq., member for the electoral district of Antigonish, introduced by Hon. Sir Frederick Borden and Mr. Sinclair.

Ernest D. Smith, Esq., member for the electoral division of Wentworth, introduced by Mr. R. L. Borden and Mr. Henderson.

Frederick F. Pardee, Esq., member elect for the electoral district of West Lambton, introduced by the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier (Prime Minister) and Hon. C. S. Hyman (Minister of Public Works).

Aylmer Byron Hunt, Esq., member elect for the electoral district of Compton, introduced by Hon. Sydney Fisher (Minister of Agriculture) and Mr. Henri Beland.

William Erskine Knowles, Esq., member elect for the electoral district of West Assiniboia, introduced by Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier (Prime Minister) and Hon. Frank Oliver (Minister of the Interior).

Arthur Norreys Worthington, Esq., member elect for the electoral district of Sherbrooke, introduced by Mr. R. L. Borden, and Mr. J. G. H. Bergeron.

George Ewan McCraney, Esq., member elect for the electoral district of Saskatchewan, introduced by Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier (Prime Minister) and Hon. Frank Oliver (Minister of the Interior).

Alphonse Verville, Esq., member elect for the electoral district of Maisonneuve, introduced by Mr. J. E. Leonard and Mr. Armand Lavergne.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 1) respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office,—Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, (Prime Minister).

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE.

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

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

In again summoning you to meet for the despatch of business, I am glad to be able to congratulate you on the prosperity prevailing throughout the Dominion.

The severe bereavement which Queen Alexandra has sustained through the death of her father, the King of Denmark, has occasioned much sorrow throughout the empire, and I am satisfied that the warm sympathy of the people of Canada will be readily extended to Her Majesty.

It afforded me much pleasure as the representative of His Majesty to take part in the inauguration of the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan as constituent members of the confederation. The universal rejoicing on the assumption of provincial autonomy everywhere visible was gratifying to witness, and I venture to say that in no part of the world could a more contented population be found. The universal sentiment was one of abounding confidence in the future.

The bountiful harvest with which we have been blessed in the past season, together with the continued development of our industries and transportation facilities, have so stimulated business in all parts of Canada and have given such an impetus to our exports and imports that the trade both with the United Kingdom and foreign countries for the current fiscal year gives promise of being the largest on record.

The flow of immigrants seeking homes in the three prairie provinces still continues, and from the present outlook the number will be in excess of any previous year, and it is gratifying to note the increasing proportion from the British Isles.

A treaty on behalf of Canada has now been concluded between the United Kingdom and Japan which it is confidently hoped will largely increase our trade with the people of that progressive empire. When the formal documents have been received they will be laid before you.

The rapid destruction of our forests now going on will, unless the operations of the lumbermen be prudently regulated in the future, and a system of reforestation adopted, result in grave consequences—affecting the uniform flow of our rivers and limiting our valuable water powers to a few months in the year. A Bill will be submitted for your consideration empowering the government to set apart forest reserves on lands under its control.

In accordance with the offer made by my ministers to the government of the United Kingdom, the imperial treasury has now been relieved from the cost of garrisoning Halifax, and arrangements are in progress for taking over the defence of Esquimalt, and hereafter detachments from the Permanent Force of Canada will have charge of both those important stations.

You will be invited to consider the propriety of making such a change in the fiscal year as will bring it more in harmony with the active business season.

The result of the investigation into the administration of leading life insurance companies in the neighbouring Republic has naturally created some uneasiness in the public mind as to the condition of Canadian companies. A commission has therefore been issued to inquire into and report on the management and financial standing, not only of companies holding Canadian charters, but also of all companies doing business under license in Canada.

Satisfactory progress is being made in the exploration and surveys of the Eastern Division of the National Transcontinental Railway, and it is expected that contracts for the construction of two important sections embracing together about 400 miles will shortly be executed.

The interim report of the Canadian section of the International Waterway Commission will be laid before you. The work of the joint commission has been somewhat delayed owing to a doubt as to the jurisdiction of the American section. The great development of commerce on the waters dividing the two countries and the opportunities for the generating of electric power at many points necessarily evolve questions which can only be dealt with by international arrangement or by treaty. At Niagara the commission will have to consider how best to preserve the scenic effect of the falls, while not unduly restricting the use of the flow of the Niagara river so valuable for power purposes.

A report has been received from the Transportation Commission containing several important recommendations; the document will be laid before you.

The legal experts appointed to revise, classify and consolidate the public general statutes passed since the revision in 1886 have completed their task, and it is expected that the volumes will be ready for distribution before July.

A measure for the better observance of the Lord's Day will be submitted for your consideration.

You will be invited to consider among other subjects Bills to amend the Railway Act, the Fruit Marks Act, an Act respecting Usury and also the Dominion Elections Act.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

The accounts for the past year will be laid before you ; the estimates for the nine months embracing a portion of the proposed fiscal year terminating on the thirty-first of March, 1907, will be submitted for your approval at an early day.

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

I invite your earnest attention to the several subjects I have mentioned and to the general business that will come before you, and I trust your deliberations will be guided by wisdom and moderation.

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

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

Motion agreed to.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved :

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

Motion agreed to.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Joint Librarians of Parliament for 1905.—Mr. Speaker.

ADJOURNMENT—AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT—INSURANCE COMMISSION.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). Before the House adjourns I would like to ask the Prime Minister when we may expect the report of the Auditor General. It would have been a great convenience to the members, on this side of the House at least, as well as a very great advantage to the public service generally, if we could have had that report at an earlier date. It is perfectly obvious that it must be in the hands of members for a certain time before they can properly consider estimates that are brought down. In the ordinary course this session would have been called early in January. I suppose we shall have some explanation later on as to why the date of opening has been delayed so long, but if the House had opened at the usual time, early in January, it would certainly have been a very great inconvenience, it would have caused great delay of public business if the report of the Auditor General had been delayed until the present time. If the report could have been brought down earlier for the purpose of a January session, I fail to understand why it could not have been brought down earlier for the purpose of a March session, and I would like very much, if the Prime Minister is able to afford any explanation, that that explanation should be given now, together with information as to when we may expect the report.

I would also like to ask the Prime Minister to lay upon the table of the House the Commission which has been issued to certain gentlemen for the purpose of conducting an investigation into the operations of insurance companies in Canada. We have, it is true, what purports to be a copy of it furnished to the public press, but I think it is desirable that, for the benefit and information of the House, we should have an exact copy of the Commission laid upon the table of the House, at the earliest possible moment and it would be desirable also, I think, that the House should be furnished at the earliest possible moment with information as to whether or not it is the intention of the government to authorize, or to pay for out of the public exchequer, the services of counsel, in connection with the investigation.

It seems possible that the investigation might fail to satisfy that public uneasiness which has been referred to in the speech to which we have listened to-day unless some step of this kind were taken or authorized by the administration.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I have to remind my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) of the practice which he knows as well as I do myself and to state that I am not in a position to give him any information or to give him the reason why the report of the Auditor General has not been presented to parliament this afternoon. My hon. friend is aware that the Auditor General is bound to present his report within a certain period. As the session has been called late perhaps we may anticipate that there will no excuse whatever if the report is not presented within the time—in fact I have no doubt it will be presented within the time prescribed by parliament and perhaps the Auditor General will avail himself of the time which is given to him to gratify parliament with an early presentation of his report.

I take this opportunity to answer at once

the reflection of my hon. friend as to the late period at which the session has been called. The reason, is known to the government, but it is better perhaps that I should give it exactly as it is. Parliament is aware that during last session it was announced that a thorough investigation would be made by a competent commission appointed to inquire into the working of the tariff with the view of ascertaining whether or not certain changes were necessary and to what extent the tariff was satisfactory to the people. The members of the House are also aware that the commission started early in its work, or a few weeks after prorogation. After having held one or two sittings in Toronto—I think it was—they went to the new provinces beyond Lake Superior, but the people at that time were so busy with the harvest that, upon the representations made, it was thought preferable to postpone the sittings of the commission in the West for a few weeks. The commission resumed their sittings as early as possible under such circumstances and prosecuted their work without any intermission at all except that which was unavoidable until the latter days of the month of January. Parliament was convened immediately after the commission had closed its sittings. In fact parliament was summoned on the very day ofter the last sitting of the commission in the city of Ottawa. It would have been utterly impossible to have convened this session earlier than it has been called together. That is the explanation of the time at which parliament has been called and I think it will be found to be a reasonable one.

I may say to the House, and I have to convey to it a very sad piece of information, that it had been our intention to have a revision of tariff during this session, but the House is aware of the fact that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) some few weeks ago,—in fact, almost immediately after the tariff commission had concluded its sittings—met with a very painful accident, an accident of a more serious nature than was thought at first. He has been confined to his bed for three weeks now and it is not expected that he can get out of the house for three or four weeks more if indeed at that time. Under these circumstances, the Minister of Finance being unable to give to the work of the tariff commission the attention which he had intended and which we had expected him to give to it, we have come to the reluctant conclusion that it will be impossible to have a revision of the tariff this session. What we propose, therefore, is to have, if possible, a very short session. We do not propose to introduce any legislation except such as is absolutely unavoidable, to have the Supply Bill passed and to summon parliament again early in the month of November to deal not with the general business of parliament but with the special question of the revision of the tariff. The fiscal year it is proposed to bring to the month of April instead of to the month of July. The present fiscal year will not conclude until the month of July and therefore it is not expected that the general business of parliament—the reports and so on—can be ready in the month of November, but we anticipate fully that it may be ready early in January and we shall ask the House, when we call it again in November, to deal with the question of the tariff.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What I understand is that the fiscal year will begin on the 1st of April or rather conclude on the 31st of March and that estimates only for nine months will be voted this year ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes ; in fact, that is hinted in the speech from the throne and we shall introduce a measure to change the end of the fiscal year from June 30 to March 31. I think my hon. friend asked me also about the instructions to the commissioners.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The insurance commission.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes. They will be laid before parliament on Monday next. In regard to another question which has been asked by my hon. friend as to whether or not the commission will be authorized to employ counsel, it is provided already that there shall be counsel to carry out the investigation and to assist the commissioners in the carrying out of the investigation. The counsel who has been selected by the government, I think, will be found acceptable to both sides of the House and to the country generally—Mr. Geo. F. Shepley, K.C., of Toronto. I do not think it would have been possible to have selected a more competent man and the instructions which have been given to Mr. Shepley are that he is authorized to employ any additional counsel he may think fit to assist him in the work.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Would that include actuaries ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am not aware that it includes actuaries. But the instructions to Mr. Shepley are to get all the assistance he desires and which is necessary to have as thorough an investigation as is possible, in fact, such an investigation as will satisfy my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) himself.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). Mr. Speaker, I desire to say now that I protest against the government taking away the undoubted right of parliament to name the commission that ought to investigate the insurance question. Recently, in the state of New York, when the legislature was not in session, the governor of that state took

advantage of the law and instead of appointing a commission issued a commission to members of the legislature, the representatives of the people, to make an investigation. They made a very thorough investigation of this question and when parliament was almost in sight of its annual session I contend that it was the duty of the government to await the meeting of this House and to come to this House and say that they intended to appoint a special committee of the House to investigate this insurance question. I still believe that a parliamentary committee is better for the purposes of an investigation than a formal commission like the royal commission which has been appointed to investigate the insurance question. We all know what royal commissions have been in the past. They are limited in their scope, they have resorted to the methods of the courts, whereas, if we had a parliamentary committee with the fullest scope that could be given to it in this direction, it could elicit the facts under the ordinary rules of business. I do not see that this action of the government is one to be approved; rather is it to be condemned and especially to be condemned on the part of liberals who always contended that royal commissions were objectionable and that parliamentary committees were the proper tribunals to investigate matters of this kind.

As to what the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has said as to a November session, I believe the great bulk of public opinion will be favourable to it. Certainly a great many of the members in this House will not object to a session in November. As far as that announcement is concerned I have no objection to raise, but I do now, on behalf of 400,000 policy holders in this country who own 800,000 policies, protest against this method of investigating the affairs of the insurance companies of Canada in view of the revelations made in the state of New York and in view of the excellent work done by the committee of the legislature. I protest against that investigation being handed over to a royal commission instead of being reserved to a parliamentary committee.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 4.15 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, March 9, 1906.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister), moved.—

That a special committee of seven members be appointed to prepare and report, with all convenient speed, a list of members to form the select standing committees ordered by this House yesterday, such select committee to be composed of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Mr. R. L. Borden, Mr. Paterson, Mr. Hyman, Mr. Haggart, Mr. Calvert and Mr. Taylor.

Motion agreed to.

INSURANCE COMMISSION.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. By command of His Excellency the Governor General, I beg to lay on the table a copy of the Order in Council adopted on the 28th of February ordering an investigation into life insurance and a copy of the commission issued to the commissioners appointed under said order.

ADJOURNMENT—INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Before the House adjourns I would like to ask the government, or, at least, two of the members of the government, if the returns ordered last spring, or early in the summer, and which we were not so fortunate as to have brought down before the close of the session, but which the ministers promised should be made ready during the interim, have been prepared and are ready to be laid on the table. One of these returns related to the Department of the Minister of Public Works. It was quite a lengthy report. For the preparation of it the minister asked a considerable time, which, of course, was not unreasonable. I asked the hon. gentleman, if possible, to have it ready before the beginning of this session. I presume that it is now ready and will be laid on the table soon. The other return related to the Department of the Interior. The motion for this return, passed last year, was for a list of those to whom timber licenses, leases, &c., had been granted. I hope that this will be brought down very early. I would like also to ask the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Oliver) if he is ready to lay on the table or will soon be ready to lay on the table, the report on the scrip inquiry, and whether the evidence taken at that inquiry is to be placed at the disposal of members.

Hon. C. S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works). I may say in regard to the return to which the hon. Mr. Foster refers that I will be ready to lay it on the table of the House on Monday.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The papers in connection with the scrip inquiry are ready to be brought down, and can be laid on the table at any time.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the evidence be included?

Mr. OLIVER. It has not been printed. It is bulky, and it is not desirable that it should be printed, unless by the order of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. It will be presented to the House ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, if the House so wishes. The report in regard to the timber licenses, will be laid on the table within a very short time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). In this connection, I would suggest to the Prime Minister that the system of the House is not very thorough. A return may be ordered at the instance of some hon. gentlemen and it may not be brought down during that session. At the following session, the gentleman by whom the motion was made may not be a member of the House. The return may be ordered in the last session of parliament, and, it may be forgotten altogether and not brought down. It would seem to me to be a comparatively simple matter to have laid upon the table of the House, at the beginning of each session, a list of the returns ordered during the previous session and not brought down, so that members would have the information, and also the attention of the different departments would be brought to the circumstance that certain orders of the House have been complied with. I do not know what the system is with regard to this matter, or whether it is treated in any systematic way. But if not, I would venture to suggest to the leader of the House, and to you, Mr. Speaker, that some amendment might be made, so that the information might be before us at the commencement of each session.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There has been no system up to the present time. Every member who moves for papers is supposed to look after them, and, hitherto, that seems to have been sufficient. Sometimes a member may forgot, or the occasion for which he required the information may pass, or public interest may not warrant the production of the papers. But, if the papers are really required in the public interest some member is generally ready to look after them. The Secretary of State is the minister who takes charge of these matters. The work, I think, is done very thoroughly. Up to this time there has been no system, except that which I have described, if it be a system.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would it be possible for the Secretary of State to furnish us with that information for the last two sessions ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). A return in which I was interested was moved for at a comparatively early period last session, and was afterwards referred to. It was important, in my opinion, that the information should be brought down. The return had not been brought down by the dying days of the session, and I do not know whether it has been brought down yet or not. When an order is made for a return of that nature, the return ought to be brought down during the session, unless extremely strong reason is given to the contrary.

Mr. FOSTER. Yesterday the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) made inquiry with regard to the Auditor General's Report. It did not seem to me that the answer of the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on that point was very satisfactory. The right hon. gentleman having the oversight of the whole business of the House and, of course, being most anxious that that business should be proceeded with the fullest information possible and as rapidly as possible, one would think that he would have noted the absence of such an important document as this and would have made inquiry with reference to it. I am not sure whether he has done so since yesterday's reminder or not. In any case, I submit that the excuse offered is not a good excuse for the failure to bring down this report—simply that it is not legally required to be produced until fifteen days after the opening of the House. The ex-Auditor General, a man of great experience, who was very many years in office, said that there was no difficulty at all in having the earlier portions of that report out before the end of the year and in the hands of the members, and the whole report could be ready by the first of the year. As the government made a change in that office, it is to be supposed that they changed it for the betterment of the service and increased rapidity of the work, and that it could not have been difficult—at least, need not have been difficult —for the new Auditor General to have had his report ready for members of the House. I was anxiously looking for it for months, I expected to get the first instalment of it about the last of December or along in January, so that I could have it studied up. But now it appears from the Prime Minister's communication with his officer that it is impossible for us to have it in due time, and that it will have to be crowded in with all the other hurried work of the session. I wish the Prime Minister would look after these things a little better.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Well, Mr. Speaker, I wish to repel the soft impeachment of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) that I have been neglectful of the supervision which he thinks I have over the officers of the government. My hon. friend knows from long experience that the Auditor General is not an officer of the government, he is an officer of parliament, and I have no more control over the Auditor General than my hon. friend has himself.

Mr. FOSTER. A very good theory.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. But I have to say this, that I have spoken to the Auditor General, and he tells me he expects that part of his report will be ready on Monday, and the other part in a very few days. I do not know what will be the practice of the present Auditor General, but I may say of the previous one, that I often asked him to bring his report down to a certain period, say the 1st of January, or the last of December, or to some definite period, and to reserve anything that might be necessary for a future instalment. But the late Auditor General always insisted upon carrying on his report week by week until the very eve of the session. I do not know what will be the practice in this respect of the present Auditor General, but I have had the pleasure of meeting him, and ascertaining from him that the report will be ready in due time, and I think it will satisfy the curiosity of my hon. friend.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. All the same, we remember that it is nearly eight and a half months since the close of the last fiscal year, and one would suppose that was a sufficiently long period in which to prepare and print that document, and furnish it to members of parliament before this. If the proposal of the government is carried out, to terminate the fiscal year on the 31st of March and to begin the session early in November, a proposal with which I heartily concur, as I stated last year, that will give the Auditor General seven months in which to prepare his report and have it ready for the commencement of parliament. Well, not only seven months, but nearly a month and a half more have elapsed, yet we have not the Auditor General's Report, so it is clear that for the future that gentleman must make haste more rapidly than he has done during the past. I venture to think that the House should endeavour to ascertain why it is that this report has been so long delayed this year.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 3.20 p. m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, March 12, 1903.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT, 1900, AMENDMENT.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 2) further to amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900. He said: This Bill is practically the same as the one introduced by me towards the close of last session. It is designed to accelerate the bringing on of by-elections in case the administration of the day does not see fit to act within a given time.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE HOUSE OF COMMONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 3) further to amend the Act respecting the House of Commons. He said: This Bill is supplementary to the one which I have just introduced. For the purpose of accomplishing the desired result, it was necessary that the two statutes should be amended, and I thought the best course to follow was to introduce a separate Bill for the purpose of amending each statute.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CRIMINAL CODE, 1892, AMENDMENTS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 4) further to amend the Criminal Code, 1892. He said: The main provisions of this Bill are in fulfilment of a promise which I made towards the end of last session to introduce legislation with respect to the practice of members of parliament and of legislatures receiving rewards for their services in parliament or in a legislature, or in the departments of the government. I believe that the Minister of Justice proposes to introduce a Bill along similar lines. This Bill which I am now introducing deals incidentally with several other matters. It provides that the members of the Board of Railway Commissioners are persons holding a judicial office within the meaning of section 131 of the Criminal Code. It also makes certain provisions with respect to section 133 of the Criminal Code, providing that the enactment contained in that section should extend to and include the Commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway, and persons holding the office of such commissioners from time to time.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DOMINION CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT, AMENDMENTS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 5) further to amend the Dominion Controverted Elections Act. He said: The immediate occasion of the introduction of this Bill is a recent decision of the Supreme Court of Canada by which the existing law has been interpreted as preventing further proceedings upon an

election petition, if it is established upon preliminary objection that the petitioner has been guilty of hiring a team for the conveyance of voters to the polls. A curious anomaly of the law as it exists at present is, that under a judgment of the Supreme Court of Canada, and under the law as interpreted by them, a petitioner who has been guilty of very much grosser corrupt practices, who has been guilty of bribery, personation, or any offence of that character is not disqualified from carrying on a petition; but if, instead of any of these acts, he has committed the less serious offence of paying 25 cents or 50 cents to convey a sick voter to the poll, he is absolutely debarred from becoming a petitioner, and any petition filed by him falls to the ground. I think it is undesirable that the law should remain in this condition, and therefore I am introducing this Bill. I may say in this connection to the Prime Minister, or to the Minister of Justice who, I believe, have under consideration some amendments to the Dominion Controverted Elections Act, that I should be very happy indeed to have this Bill referred to a committee of which I have given notice on the Order Paper, or to some similar committee, in order that the whole question of the prevention of corrupt practices, and of further important amendments of the Dominion Controverted Elections Act, should engage the attention of that committee and the attention of the House of Commons and of the government, before the conclusion of the present session.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE RAILWAY ACT, 1903, AMENDMENT.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 6) in amendment of the Railway Act, 1903. He said: This Bill is required to correct what, I think is an unintentional piece of legislation passed in 1903, whereby as the law now reads, a land owner, in case of an arbitration by a railway company, is precluded from expediting proceedings, and getting the matter determined. Before 1903 either party, the land owner or the railway, could expedite the proceedings, could apply to the proper court for the appointment of the arbitrators and get the matter wound up. By some peculiar wording of the statute as consolidated in 1903—one can hardly tell how it crept in, but these things happen—the judges are now deciding in Ontario, and I think deciding correctly on the letter of the statute, that only the railway company can expedite the proceedings. Manifestly that is an injustice to the land owner. This Act is to rectify that and allow the land owner and the railway company the same rights in regard to expediting the proceedings.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CERTIFICATES TO MASTERS AND MATES OF SHIPS.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 7) to amend the Act respecting certificates to masters and mates of ships. He said: This is the Bill that I introduced last session, later in the session than otherwise would have been done because of an objection made to the Bill as I first introduced it. The Bill as it is now introduced was not debated last session. It is principally to provide that masters and mates in inland waters shall be British subjects as it is provided that masters and mates of American vessels shall be United States citizens, in order to give the Canadians the same protection against American citizens as the Americans have against Canadian citizens. It provides secondly that the examiners of these masters and mates shall be competent lake navigators instead of non-professional men as they are or may be now.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE RAILWAY ACT, 1903, AMENDMENT.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 8) in further amendment of the Railway Act, 1903. He said: This is in effect the Bill on which we had a lot of discussion last session, the Bill which the Minister of Justice was kind enough to call my hardy annual. The hardy annual is hardier to-day because the rights of the people are being trampled on more than they were then, and I presume it will continue to grow hardier every year until it is properly dealt with. The Bill is not exactly in the same words as last session; it is drawn in a different form in order to meet every objection then raised to the Bill except the main one that the people are not entitled to the protection. That objection I ask this court to overrule.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE RAILWAY ACT, 1903, AMENDMENT.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 9) to further amend the Railway Act, 1903. He said: This Bill is similar to a Bill which I have introduced on more than one occasion in this House. It provides that the charges of the express companies shall come under the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission. It provides also that the telephone companies and the railway com-

panies shall only be allowed immediate damages in cases where a railway company has to admit the wires of any telephone company. The third clause provides for a maximum two cent passenger rate on all railways in Canada.

THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS ACT, AMENDMENT.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 10) to amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons. He said: This Bill proceeds on the lines indicated by the hon. the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) a moment ago respecting the Bill which he obtained leave to introduce, except that he is proceeding by way of amendment to the Criminal Code, while I proceed by way of amendment to the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons. However my hon. friend sees the propriety of submitting this Bill as well as the other to the committee which I hope to see appointed when it is asked for by my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) or myself.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

MONEY-LENDERS ACT, AMENDMENT.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 11) respecting money lenders. He said: This Bill is precisely the same as the Bill which was passed in the Senate in 1900. It protects borrowers from being subjected to exorbitant rates of interest. It will be found on examination that this Bill proceeds practically on the lines of the Bill introduced in England some where about 1900.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

THE LORD'S DAY.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 12) respecting the Lord's Day. He said: By way of explanation I would like to say that in the action of the Attorney General of Ontario and the Hamilton Street Railway, the Privy Council, in July 1903, held that the Ontario Act to prevent the profanation of the Lord's Day, treated as a whole, was beyond the competency of the provincial legislature to make. It was therefore deemed advisable to make legislation by this parliament which undoubtedly has the power to legislate in the form in which this Bill is introduced. The Bill prohibits sales, the prosecution of ordinary work or business, excursions, games for prizes, the opening of places of public amusement for which an admission fee is charged, to advertise any performance or other thing prohibited by this Act. The provincial Acts now in force in any province shall remain in force.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

JUDGES OF PROVINCIAL COURTS.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 13) respecting the judges of provincial courts. He said: This is a Bill to amend an Act which was introduced and passed last year by which we increased the salaries of judges of the provincial courts. During the discussion it was stated that the judges would not after that engage in arbitration. It has been found that in some instances the judges have not understood the Act in the way that evidently the government intended it should be understood. This Bill is to prevent the practice of judges engaging in arbitrations other than those assigned to them by the government or cases of that kind. The Bill I now introduce provides that this shall not apply to any arbitrator who has actually entered upon his duties before the passing of this Act, not that it would create any complication, because generally there is provision in the instrument or Act under which arbitrators act that would prevent any difficulty—but inasmuch as it might be a hardship to some gentlemen who are at present engaged in arbitrations. It may be said, it was said last time, that judges as honourable men would not act. I do not know that there is anything dishonourable in a judge acting under the law as it exists, and the judges evidently assume that the law allows them still to act as arbitrators. This is to prevent that.

There is also provision in the Bill to enable us to get returns, more particularly in reference to the duties performed by county court judges, so that parliament will be in a position to secure what has been announced as the policy of the government or at all events that the distribution of the business will be more equitable than it has been in the past.

ADDRESS IN ANSWER TO HIS EXCELLENCY'S SPEECH.

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

Mr. WILLIAM ERSKINE KNOWLES (West Assiniboia), Mr. Speaker, it is not without much mental perturbation that I rise to address you on an occasion such as this. I would, Sir, that I were able to speak as I should wish, and as I feel this occasion demands from me. I must, in the first place, express my gratification at, and my appreciation of the honour that has been conferred upon me in my being asked to assume this task, which I now have in hand. I desire, however, to take it rather as a recognition of the importance of western

Canada in this stage of the nation's history, and especially as a recognition of the importance of that great constituency of West Assiniboia, which I have the honour to represent.

There are, Mr. Speaker, a great number of paragraphs in this speech from the Throne, but it is my purpose to speak to only a very few of them, and, that the time of this House may not be unnecessarily taken up, I shall without delay address myself to those two or three announcements in the speech which it is my purpose to refer to. I purpose, in the first place, making some remarks on the subject of life insurance, a subject which is attracting a great deal of attention throughout Canada at the present day, and a subject which will, no doubt, attract a great deal of the attention of this parliament during the present session. I submit, Sir, that the whole theory of life insurance is good. The philosophy of men endeavouring to make provision for their widows and orphans is doubtless sound. But the danger is that in the stampede for business and in the mad rush for personal gain, certain persons may forget the primary end of life insurance, and may make their own personal ends primary to that which in itself should be primary. The danger is that they may be tempted to make the end which should be secondary the primary purpose of their exploitation of the life insurance business. There is nothing surer than that we cannot have life insurance unless we are willing to pay for it, but I submit it is one of the first duties of this parliament to see that when men do pay for life insurance they shall get genuine life insurance. It is incumbent on this Canadian parliament charged with the duty of safeguarding the best interests of the Canadian people, to see that the widow is not left destitute and that the orphan is not robbed of the rightful provision which may have been made by a prudent father. I doubt if there is any subject which this parliament can take up for consideration which is the foundation stone of a greater number of Canadian homes and hearts than is this very subject of life insurance. I believe it is at the bottom of the confidence and assurance, not of thousands, not of tens of thousands but of hundreds of thousands of Canadian homes at this present hour. And Sir, I trust that this Royal Commission which has been appointed by the government will address itself to the duties which are placed before it, conscious of the enormous responsibilities which rest upon it, desirous of using every power which is placed in its hands to the end that that commission may attain the object which this government had in view in appointing it. Some of the life insurance companies have been good enough, Mr. Speaker, to come forward and voluntarily offer their assistance to this commission. For my humble part I view their readiness askance. If a judge were upon the bench and if some person were to be tried by him—and life insurance in Canada is now on its trial—if some person were to be tried, or if some corporation were to have its system investigated and that corporation should suggest to those appointed to investigate, what part of its career should be open for investigation, I should think that would be a most anomalous condition and open to grave suspicions. I trust that this life insurance commission will be guided entirely by its own motives, entirely by its own judgment, For my part, I think no more of the life insurance system in Canada from the fact that certain life insurance kings have come forward and stated their desire to help this Royal Commission on insurance. There have been suspicions aroused in this country because of the sad exposures which have been made of the insurance business in the state of New York. I believe it is wholesome that such exposures have been made, for if there be any fraud in New York or if there be any fraud in Canada the sooner we know it the better. And I am not so sure that there may not be fraud in Canada. If the opportunity has presented itself to insurance men in Canada just as it presented itself to insurance men in New York, I would be very slow to expect that all the insurance men in Canada are so honest and so high in their idea of honour and principle that they would let escape the chance to make themselves personally rich. I trust the members of this insurance commission will address themselves to their task, not with the desire to make good fellows of themselves with the life insurance men, but rather for the purpose of finding fraud, rather expecting fraud, and if you look for fraud it is only in that way you will find fraud if fraud there is. It is impossible at this juncture to say what legislation may eventually be presented to the House on this matter. I doubt if such legislation has yet been decided upon by this government; in fact the very importance of the commission consists in this, that the report which they shall make will form the basis and give the data upon which legislation will be presented to this House in due course of time.

There is another paragraph in the speech from the Throne which I as the representative of a western constituency am especially desirous of referring to. His Excellency has, I think, most naturally expressed the pleasure he had when visiting our western provinces in September last; I say most naturally, because surely when we recall the fact that from the year 1867 down to the first of September, 1905, the great purpose of confederation was awaiting its consummation, and that only on the first of September last that consummation was attained; it surely, Mr. Speaker, was most natural that His Excellency should find great pleasure in being present at the birth of the new provinces. The weather, Sir, was beautiful

on the day of the inauguration ceremonies. I am happy to say that the weather in the western prairies is almost always beautiful—unfortunately my voice is poor to-day for I have been under the doctor's care ever since I came east. We had present on that occasion distinguished personages ; distinguished personages who too seldom visit the west, and who, I trust will come oftener. We had on that occasion cordial harmony among all the people of the western provinces ; a harmony too soon to be rent asunder by a political warfare so bitter and so passionate that I suppose Canada has never seen its like. We had our children there in thousands raising their voices in the prairie air, singing their Canadian songs so beautiful and with such ardent youthful patriotism. I am not at all surprised, Sir, that His Excellency should be touched with the scene, and that he should in the speech from the Throne give vent to the pleasure which he felt on the occasion of his visit to the cities of Regina and Edmonton. And, Sir, I am here to-day to say that every man, woman, and child in Alberta and Saskatchewan have as happy a remembrance of the visit of His Excellency as he has of his visit to us. Sir, we are pleased to know that in the highest position in this country we have a man who takes such a vital interest in the West; an interest which I am sure is well deserved. The day will never come when any visitors will be more heartily and gladly welcomed within the borders of Saskatchewan and Alberta than will be His Excellency and his gracious partner in life whenever they wish to honour us with their presence. I have said Sir, that it was a most happy occasion. There was harmony and peace on that early September day, but I am sorry to say that that harmony was soon rudely broken.

I am sorry to have to say, Sir, that scarcely had the smoke of that departing train vanished on the horizon of the prairie than men came into our midst to begin a religious agitation; and I am bound to say that this outbreak of bitter religious hatred did not arise among ourselves. It was brought in from the east. We, in the west are not responsible for that. We are capable of looking after our own religious affairs, Mr. Speaker. We worship at our own shrine, use our own prayer book, and teach our children as we wish; and we desire no interference from men in any eastern province. When the day comes that we are in such consummate ignorance that we need their assistance in religious matters, we shall be happy to ask for that assistance. Mr. Speaker, I make no apology for bringing this matter before this House. It is true that it was a provincial election which we were launched upon; but I am sure that all the western members of this House, both Liberal and Conservative, will bear me out in saying that the issues threshed out in that campaign were not provincial issues, but Dominion issues. The issue was the Autonomy Bills that were passed in this House by the hon. members now present. We heard scarcely a word about provincial politics. We discussed and voted upon the measures called the Alberta Act and the Saskatchewan Act respectively. There were a great many amusing features in that campaign. I never saw a country so full of legal men. I have heard section 91 of the British North America Act learnedly discussed in prairie school houses by men who never held a law book in their hands. I have heard the opinions of Canada's greatest legal lights rudely traversed and these men declared to be in error. I am sorry to have to say that there was a darker side to that campaign. I am sorry to say that in the discussion of the Alberta and Saskatchewan Acts we were called on as Protestants to rise as our forefathers did in the days of old, when the Armada set out to attack the shores of England. We were reminded of the thumb screw and the rack. It was a campaign of monstrous intolerance. All those who had anything to do with the Dominion government were described everywhere as men banded together to rob the western people of what they held dearest. Agitators came from the east to attack the dearest treasure of a man's soul, his religion, and to use it for the most base and contemptible purposes. Mr. Speaker, I am reflecting on no political party in Canada, I have every respect for a good Liberal, and I have every respect for a good Conservative : but we were up against a thing called the Provincial Rights party, from which may the good Lord ever deliver us. That campaign, however, came to an end, and the ballots were at last taken. The Liberal party has never desired any other tribunal than that of public opinion; it knows no court of appeal other than that of the polling booth, whether in the great cities of the east or on the lonely prairie of the west; and to that tribunal we appealed, into the polling booth we went and out of fifty seats that were contested in the Northwest the Liberals won forty and our opponents ten. Since then we have had by-elections in the constituencies of Saskatchewan and West Assiniboia. In Saskatchewan the Liberal candidate was elected by acclamation, and in West Assiniboia, which I have the honour to represent, the Provincial Rights Association met and the Conservative Association met, and they decided to bring no man into the field. It has been said that the present Liberal government of Saskatchewan won power through the influence of the back townships; but in Western Assiniboia we have the three largest cities, any one of them larger than any other town in Saskatchewan—Regina, Moosejaw and Medicine Hat; and yet our opponents met in convention and decided to put nobody into the

field. As I have said, Mr. Speaker, I mak no apology for bringing this matter into this House, because it was a Dominion issue which was fought out in that campaign; and, as the late election was held by virtue of the legislation of this House of last session, it might be in order for me to report respectfully to you that the two infant governments of Alberta and Saskatchewan have commenced their duties under the most happy auspices. In Alberta we have a cabinet which leaves little to be desired, one that is both capable and strong. Indeed, our only objection to it is that it is too strong, because the opposition is composed of only two members, the leader and the whip. In the province of Saskatchewan we have a government which, in proportion to the size of the House, is more strongly entrenched in power than the present government of the Dominion; and that government is presided over by a man who I believe has the affection of almost all the members of this House. Whether he has the affection of all or not, I am sure that he has the admiration and respect of every member of this House, and I am happy to report that he and his cabinet, one of whom was also an estimable member of this House, are addressing themselves to their duties with that same industry and efficiency which they manifested in the performance of their duties as members of this House. After all is said and done, after the elections in Alberta and Saskatchewan, which, as I have said, resulted in the return of forty Liberals to ten opponents, and after the by-elections which went by acclamation, I believe I am free to say to-day —and I believe that many of those who do not see eye to eye with me in political matters will bear me out—that this school question which was used in the Northwest Territories as a tool for purposes of the most base and contemptible kind, has been sunk into the limbo of forgotten things.

His Excellency also makes reference to the prosperity of the country and to the immigration which has taken place. I am happy to say that the immigration which promises to flow into our country in the present year is likely to be larger than any we have yet seen. There are many coming to us from Continental Europe, and this is an immigration which particularly impresses itself upon our eastern provinces, as they pass through them from our Atlantic ports. But there is another large inflow which I do not believe hon. members from the east fully appreciate. In the town in which I have the advantage to reside, the good city of Moosejaw, we have now a twice-a-day train service from the cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis, and every day two trains are crowded with agriculturists of the very best type from the adjoining republic coming to settle on our western prairies. This large and valuable element is perhaps not so much appreciated by hon. members of this House and its importance not so fully recognized as it deserves to be, because these people do not pass through our eastern cities as do the immigrants from the European continent; but it is one whose value in the building up of our country we cannot too much appreciate. Here let me say a word with regard to the Doukhobors and Galicians against whom we have had cast so many slurs in past years. I desire here to give my testimony to the fact that these Doukhobors and Galicians are men who are wringing out of our Northwest Territories the money that goes east and helps to build up eastern manufacturing industries and enables eastern capitalists to invest in automobiles and other luxuries which are the perquisites of wealth. Let those who are so ready to criticise and cavil at my fellow citizens, the Doukhobors and Galicians, come out to the Northwest and they will there see for themselves what honest industrious citizens these immigrants make —citizens who would not be a discredit to any country.

Sir, the Dominion of Canada has nothing to-day to complain of. Our west is enjoying unprecedented prosperity, and the outflow of that prosperity is shown in the many prosperous factories which are doing business in the east. Our western crop last year of wheat amounted almost to one hundred million bushels, and that crop we had great difficulty in moving to the sea-board. Our farmers would come almost at daybreak to the grain elevators and wait until daybreak the next day and even then could not always succeed in getting their wheat unloaded. Yet we find faint hearted people who say that we do not need another transcontinental railway line. Sir, that line cannot be built one day too soon. In my humble opinion it should have been constructed five years ago. Until that line is in operation, there will be no chance of relieving the great congestion in traffic under which we are suffering. The west, Mr. Speaker, is to-day only on the threshold of its greatness. We have as yet only one transcontinental line completed and the country served by that line is as yet but sparsely settled. In a few years we will have three through lines; and the development which the country will then have reached very few people at present really can realize. Let the men of the east go on building more manufacturing establishments because we shall need all the products they can supply. The capitalists and manufacturers of the east are, as a rule, unable to-day to realize the great possibilities of the west. You must live in that country, Sir, before you can begin to realize the great demand which is bound to come from the settlers on our vast prairies for everything the industrial centres of the eastern provinces can supply. I am happy

to say that we have every reason to believe that under the new minister of the Department of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) who now so ably and acceptably presides over that department, the prosperity we enjoyed in the past will continue. That prosperity which heaven's smile has awakened in the west has come to stay, and we shall soon see that great country take its place side by side with the east. Out on our broad prairies, Liberals and Conservatives alike, English speaking and men of other races, Doukhobors and Galicians—all who dwell under that prairie sky desire to go on marching from day to day faithfully, honourably and persistently until they attain the height of Canada's national greatness. Sir, I beg to move that a humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to the speech from the Throne.

MR. WILLIAM CHISHOLM (Antigonish). It is with much diffidence, Mr. Speaker, that I rise to second the motion of my hon. friend from Western Assiniboia (Mr. Knowles), that an humble address be presented to His Excellency in reply to the speech from the Throne. When I was asked by the right hon. and revered leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to undertake this task, I hesitated, much as I appreciated the honour, because I felt conscious of my utter inability to fittingly do justice to the occasion. But inasmuch as I regard the invitation as a special compliment to the province from which I come and the constituency which has honoured me by having recently chosen me as its representative in this parliament, I felt that my duty compelled me not to persist in my reluctance. Besides I was further encouraged to undertake this responsible duty by my confidence that hon. members on both sides will favour me with that kindly indulgence which the House always extends to new and inexperienced members. When I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that last Thursday afternoon was the first opportunity I ever had of witnessing, even as a spectator, the deliberations of this House—or for that matter the deliberations of any parliament or legislature—you will, I am sure, sympathize with me in my inexperience and view my shortcomings with all the greater leniency. I therefore cast myself on the indulgence of this House when I attempt, in my humble manner, to offer a few observations on the speech from the Throne. Before proceeding to do so, however, I desire to say that the hon. gentleman who preceded me has dealt so exhaustively and in such eloquent and felicitous language with the salient features of the speech that but little remains for me to do except re-echo the sentiments he so happily and forcibly expressed.

It must be gratifying to hon. members on both sides, and to the country at large, to know that Canada is making such great progress and enjoying such marked prosperity. The gigantic strides which our young nation has made in every avenue of business, since the advent of the present government to power, has attracted the attention, and indeed the admiration, not merely of the United Kingdom and the neighbouring Republic, but of the whole civilized world. As Mr. Alfred Mosely has said in the London 'Times,' Canada is today the brightest jewel in the empire. No country, sir, has a happier, a more contented or a more prosperous population than Canada possesses. Every branch of industry—agricultural, manufacturing and commercial —has felt the throb of progress during the past ten years and developed to an unprecedented extent. Our agricultural productions have surpassed our most sanguine expectations, and for these products our farmers have received greater prices on the whole, than ever before. In our cities and towns the throb of machinery and the busy hum of industry greet the ear. Our manufacturing establishments have extended and prospered as they never did before. Indeed the great difficulty which our manufacturers experience is in keeping pace with the demand and coping with the increased business they are called upon to perform. At no time in our history have our working men been more busily employed or received better pay. Only by a comparison of the statistics of our country from time to time can we estimate and properly appreciate the progress we are making. However, I do not propose, Mr. Speaker, to run the risk of trespassing beyond the limits of the patience of this House by presenting an array of figures. As a rule figures are dry and unattractive, although those I would present on this occasion should be interesting inasmuch as it is the happy, pleasing tale of our country's progress and prosperity they unfold.

While assuring you that I do not purpose to enter into any statistical details, I desire to submit a few facts and figures illustrating our country's progress. When I tell you that in 1896 our exports and imports were $121,000,000 and $118,000,000 respectively while in 1904 they had increased to $214,000,000 and $259,000,000 respectively, and that since the latter date there have been proportionate increases, we gather sone idea of the progress we are making. Take agricultural exports: For the seven months ending January last, our agricultural exports amounted, in round numbers, to $84,000,000; for the corresponding months of the previous year, these exports were $66,000,000, an increase of $18,000,000. Is it any wonder that a broad, happy smile suffuses the honest countenance of the farmer? Take also the case of the manufacturers: For the seven months ending in January last, the manufactured goods exported from Canada were $13,250,000, while for the corresponding period of 1904-05 they

amounted to $12,000,000. Is there any sorrowful wail in the announcement of these figures ? Do these figures show that the manufacturing industries of our country are languishing, paralyzed or tottering into decay ?

In our mining industries we observe similar development. The production of our mines for 1905 showed an increase of $1,800,000 as compared with 1904, and this despite a reduction of about $2,000,000 in the Klondike. Applying the usual tests for determining the country's development we find that the business of Canada has increased during the last ten years two-fold. Ten years is a short time even in the lifetime of a man ; ten years is a very short time in the history of a country. Yet, in ten years we see this splendid increase.

Let us compare the total trade of the country at different times. In 1896 our total trade was less than $240,000,000. During the year just closed our total trade exceeded $500,000,000. Even if we make no progress in the next five months over the corresponding five months of the past year we shall still have reached the sum of $514,000,000 in our total trade for the year. Another gratifying fact that I might mention is that in its trade per capita Canada occupies third place among the countries of the world. Belgium and England are in advance of us, but Canada makes a good third. These figures should inspire us with pride in our country and should fill us with unbounded confidence in our future.

Nor has this progress been confined to one particular part of the country. In every province of the Dominion there has been general prosperity. The honourable mover of the address referred to the great prosperity of the west. I may be pardoned if I speak of the condition of affairs in the east. A very substantial measure of prosperity has been enjoyed during the past year by the people of the maritime provinces and especially the people of Nova Scotia. In the east a new city arose a few years ago, the city of Sydney. I was surprised to learn, as I did from an article in the Maritime ' Merchant,' that, within a radius of 18 miles of Sydney, 17,112 men were employed with a monthly pay-roll of $765,049. It may not be unknown to you Mr. Speaker, that a few years ago the Cape Breton towns were in a semi-comatose and decadent condition. Thanks to the wise policy of the local legislature of Nova Scotia and the generous encouragement of this government, the scene has been changed. The Dominion Coal Company was established there some years ago, and its establishment marked the beginning of a new era of industrial prosperity for Cape Breton and for Nova Scotia. After that came that gigantic enterprise the Dominion Steel Company. With its geographical situation with the conditions that obtain industrially—coal and ore iron being found out on the spot—there can be no doubt at all that other industries will soon spring up in that quarter, making for the wealth and prosperity of our Dominion. Sydney, I may say to you, is to-day but in its swaddling clothes as an industrial centre. Yet you will be surprised Mr. Speaker to know that more money orders were issued last year from that office than from any other office in eastern Canada. The older cities of Halifax and St. John fall behind Sydney in that respect. In referring to the local conditons in the east, I do so in no sectional spirit, but as giving a sample brick of the progress and prosperity enjoyed from one end of Canada to the other—it is the same pleasant story from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

Mention is made in the speech of the gratifying progress made in connection with the Transcontinental railway and the surveys of the eastern division of that line. It is gratifying to know that already 395 miles of the eastern division have been laid. Although the western section is not under the directional control of the government, yet as it is an integral part of this grand enterprise, it is interesting to note that already nearly a thousand miles of the western portion has been placed in the hands of the contractors. The importance of this railway it is impossible to over estimate. It will make for the greatness of Canada not only materially but sentimentally as well, for it will have the effect of cementing the different provinces of the Dominion. The fathers of confederation recognized the importance of such means of promoting this sentiment of unity, for, at the time of the union in 1864, it was made a condition of confederation that the Intercolonial Railway should be built to connect the eastern and the western provinces as they then stood. In like manner, when this transcontinental railway shall have been completed, there will be a unification of the provinces of Canada and this growing national spirit will be intensified.

As to the importance of this transcontinental railway it is unecessary for me to make any comment. Now that the tide of immigration has set in toward our shores, now that we are receiving this influx of settlers from England, Scotland, Ireland and the United States, the imperative urgency of this road becomes apparent. The honourable mover of the address fears that it has come too late. Let us hope that such is not the case. When that road is built, and when the vast trade that has been developed between the eastern countries, such as China, Japan and India, and the European countries, finds a highway across Canada, this transcontinental railway will be taxed to its utmost capacity. The eastern portion of Canada, Nova Scotia, as the long wharf of the Dominion, will then become the loading and unloading ground for this great world traffic.

In connection with the question of immigration, I wish also to say that it is most gratifying indeed to find such a large number of Americans coming over to this country to make for themselves here happy and peaceful homes. They are a most desirable class of settlers, they are thoroughly familiar with the conditions which confront them on their arrival, and it is gratifying to know that those who have already come into this country have taken kindly to our institutions, and that they are making the very best class of settlers that we have. Whilst we all have an abiding faith in Canada and her institutions, and have the fullest confidence in her ability and capacity to absorb and assimilate all nationalities and all classes that may come to her shores, and that they will become good peaceable and contented citizens generally, all working together towards the common goal—the making of Canada into a great nation—still it is most satisfactory to know that a very large proportion of the immigrants we received during the past year were of British origin; and there is good reason to hope that still larger numbers of this class of immigrants will avail themselves of the splendid opportunities open to them in this country. Every steamer from the old country is loaded with immigrants from England, Scotland and Ireland. The immigration buildings at St. John and Halifax are indeed busy scenes when these steamers arrive. Cars loaded with colonists are being sent out westward conveying this immense immigration that is coming to our shores. Instead of our present population of six or seven millions. I do no hesitate to predict that in another decade Canada's population will reach fifteen, twenty or twenty-five millions.

Reference is made in the speech from the Throne to the taking over of the garrison at Halifax by the Dominion government, and making provision for the defence of Esquimalt. Sir, these are matters of historic interest. For one hundred and fifty years Halifax has been garrisoned by imperial troops. The last of these troops left our shores a few days ago. In some quarters we hear it alleged that Canada is recreant to her duty in the matter of defence, that she does not seem ready to assume her proper share of responsibility in contributing to the army and navy. It is indeed said that we are sponging on the British government in accepting the protection of her army and navy while refusing to contribute to their support. Mr. Speaker, nothing could be more incorrect. It is true we are not contributing directly to the imperial exchequer, but we are doing our duty, we are paying our way. Whilst we are grateful to Great Britain for the protection her army and navy affords us, and whilst we appreciate all that Great Britain is doing for us in that respect, still we do not by any means receive this protection as a charity or as a gratuity. We have done our duty manfully and well. Those who misrepresent Canada by saying that she does not bear her just proportion of the burden of national defence, I would refer to the speech of Sir Charles Tupper before the British Empire League in Ottawa in 1898. On that occasion he alluded to the fact that at the time of confederation, when commissioners went across to the old country to negotiate with the imperial authorities, the commissioners being Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir George Brown and Sir George Etienne Cartier. They discussed the relations between Canada and the imperial authorities, or rather the obligations that Canada should assume with respect to her defence ; and an agreement was made in writing that if a million dollars a year was spent by Canada on her militia, England with all the power of her army and navy, would be ready to assist Canada on all occasions and to protect her interests. Well, Sir, what has Canada done ? Not only has she spent a million dollars a year on her militia, but she has done far more. In building the Canadian Pacific Railway, without one dollar of imperial aid, Canada has contributed towards imperial defence, because Great Britain is now able to send troops over the Canadian Pacific Railway to man her fleets on the Pacific ocean. Without the Canadian Pacific Railway she would be unable to do so. The importance of the Canadian Pacific Railway in that connection was then pointed out by Sir Charles Tupper, and it has also been recognized by the Hon. Joseph Chamberlain in some of his speeches on imperial federation. But Canada has done more than that. She is now building a national transcontinental railway, and the benefit which the Canadian Pacific Railway has been to Great Britain in the manner I have alluded to, will be doubled by the building of the Grand Trunk Pacific. More than that, Canada has shown that she is ready and willing, when the occasion occurs to assist the mother country, and assist her most generously, as she did on the occasion of the South African war, when Canada sent thousands of her men to reinforce the imperial troops. Therefore, I say, that to-day we find that Canada is doing her duty, not, as I said before, by contributing directly to the imperial exchequer, but by taking upon herself a portion of the burden of defending this country, and by relieving the British government from the cost of garrisoning Halifax and Esquimalt. The cost of garrisoning Halifax and of providing for the defence of Esquimalt will be in the vicinity of a million dollars. It will cost about $800,000 to feed and maintain the men and another $200,000 to maintain the fortifications ; so that we are really relieving the British government to the extent of an additional million dollars annually by taking over these burdens. Canada does not

take over these burdens as a matter of duty, but does it in a spirit of affection, does it cheerfully and of her own accord.

Mention has been made by my hon. friend who moved the address (Mr. Knowles) of the happy conditions that obtain in the new provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. I am sure that every loyal Canadian will rejoice that so large a measure of peace and contentment prevails in that new country. Every other province in the Dominion cordially welcomes the entry of these new provinces as constituent members of confederation. It has been alleged in some quarters that a great deal of dissatisfaction exists in that country in consequence of the school clauses in the Autonomy Bills. The result of the by-elections for the federal house, the result of the local elections for these new legislatures—these should be a sufficient answer to the pretension that there is dissatisfaction in that country. These show clearly that the grievances alleged to exist there are simply figments of the disturbed imaginations of morbid newspaper men who are desirous of stirring up strife and sectionalism. But, Sir, if further proof were required of the happy condition that prevails in these new countries this is found in the third paragraph of the address from the Throne. There can be no mistaking the language that is there used. His Excellency in the speech from the Throne says :

> In no part of the world can a more contented population be found.

It is true that generally the speech from the Throne mirrors the opinions and views of the government, but in this particular instance that is not the case ; this particular paragraph is the testimony of the representative of the Crown who was out there himself, who saw for himself the conditions that exist and who knows whereof he speaks. It is gratifying, I say, to find such testimony, such conclusive testimony, of the peace and contentment that there prevail, and it augurs well for the future of these great provinces that such a condition should exist. The time was, and not very long ago, when the toiling masses seemed arrayed on the one side against the manufacturers on the other, when the rouge and the bleu viewed one another with suspicion if not with positive aversion, when Lower Canada and Upper Canada seemed jealous of each other. But that time has happily gone by, such sentiments are fast disappearing, in fact have already practically disappeared. We all recognize and understand the proper signification of true Canadianism. We realize the fact that if Canada is to be the great country that she is destined to be and that we all hope she will be, this prejudice and intolerance must cease. About a year ago we were threatened with one of those political religious storms that have done so much in the past to mar the progress and prosperity of our country. But the embers of intolerance could not be fanned into flame. The spirit of the nation was sound to the core.

I say it is particularly gratifying to know that in these new provinces of the west such a happy condition prevails. Vain are the hopes of those who hope to make this a great country unless the different nationalities which inhabit it live in peace and harmony. We have begun to appreciate the fact that in a country with a mixed population such as is ours, all cannot think and believe alike. But we respect each others opinions—call them prejudices, if you like—nevertheless. There will be bickerings and misunderstandings it is true ; but if the destiny of the country is to be successfully worked out it must be in a proper spirit—the spirit of generous forbearance, of toleration and mutual consideration.

I wish also to refer to the clause in the address which states that a measure to provide for the better observance of the Lord's Day will be introduced. It is gratifying indeed to find that such a Bill is to be submitted to this House. The due observance of the Lord's Day is a matter in which every citizen of Canada should be particularly interested, for if Canada is to be a great nation we must build on a sound basis, and a fundamental requirement is that a proper regard be had for the Christian Sabbath. Whilst our country cannot be legislated into morality, yet it is desirable that the sentiment, the principle of the recognition of the Lord's Day should be established. I have much pleasure in seconding the address which has been moved.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.) Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to extend my congratulations to the mover and seconder who have just spoken. In very well chosen and sometimes eloquent words they have addressed themselves to the task of proposing that this formal address be presented to His Excellency in response to the speech from the Throne. With nearly everything that these gentlemen have said I am sure that we will all be disposed to agree. Let me say, particularly to the hon. gentleman who moved the address, that I greatly regret that he was not in the House during the past session so that he might have been able by his eloquence and ability to urge upon this government and the leader of this government that the people of the west are able to take care of their own religious questions. I venture to think that possibly if we had had his presence during the past session he might have been inclined to put forward that doctrine with some qualification. It is also a little remarkable that so large a portion of his address should have been devoted to a subject which he describes as consigned to the limbo of forgotten things. I am glad indeed to learn from a gentleman as familiar as he is with conditions in the west, that the character of the immigration is so satis-

factory. So far as the Galicians are concerned, my own personal observation, on the last occasion when I visited the west, confirms what the hon. gentleman has so appropriately stated. I have no personal knowledge with regard to the Doukhobors to whom he has also alluded. I might be permitted to say that if it is necessary to have an automobile in order to enable one to properly appreciate the good qualities of these settlers I regret that I am not in a position to class myself among those who have that privilege.

The hon. gentleman who seconded the address is from my own province and my congratulations to him are also hearty. He has given us some statistics which are very gratifying indeed in so far as they show the growth of the country. He referred to the broad, happy smile which overspreads the honest countenance of the farmers of this country. I do not think it is so broad or happy as the smile which overspread, I believe, the countenance of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), when some of these same farmers were urging on his colleagues, the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Finance, the importance of adherence by the Liberal party to the fiscal principles laid down in the Ottawa platform of 1893.

I desire before making certain observations on the matters referred to in the speech from the Throne, to express my very deep regret and the regret of gentlemen on this side of the House, at the loss we have sustained in the lamented death of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Hon. Raymond Préfontaine. Those of us who differed from Mr. Préfontaine on public questions recognized his great ability, the sincerity of his devotion to public interests, and especially the strong personal character and force which was behind the administration of his department, and which I believe would have done very much to bring about a better condition of things along the great St. Lawrence waterway. Mr. Préfontaine was a man of strong character; he was a man of strong opinions, he was fearless in the expression of his opinions, and I am sure that not one member of those who sit to the left of Mr. Speaker ever at any time felt the slightest personal feeling against him. We all liked him, we all recognized his ability, and we join with gentlemen on the other side in expressing our very great regret indeed that he should have been cut off in the vigour of his manhood, in the prime of his life and in the midst of the very great work in which he was then engaged. The occasion of his death led to the government of the French Republic recognizing this country and the public men of this country in a manner for which we all feel grateful. That recognition, not only by the French government, but by the British government as well, is deeply appreciated by every citizen of Canada regard

less of his political opinions. It afforded a happy opportunity for the manifestation of that friendly spirit, that entente cordiale which exists now and which I hope always will exist between the republic of France and the British empire to which we own allegiance.

I will not refer at great length to the cabinet changes which have taken place during the recess. We have lost the presence in this House and in the government of Sir William Mulock; a man of very great experience in public life, a man of very great ability, a man between whom and myself—although we had some occasionally vigorous passages in parliament—there was never anything but the most friendly feeling. We have in his place the new Postmaster General; and I may be permitted, I suppose, to take the opportunity of congratulating my hon. friends opposite from the province of Ontario upon the touching proof of esteem and appreciation which they have thus received from the Prime Minister. This is strikingly evidenced by the fact that not one of them was regarded by the right hon. gentleman as competent to take charge of the Post Office Department. There are among these hon. gentlemen on the other side a great many men of experience in public life; men whom we on this side of the House at least have regarded as competent and capable to preside over almost any department of government. I regret that our opinion in that respect must be modified by the attitude of the Prime Minister towards these gentlemen. We all recognize the very great ability of the present Postmaster General (Hon. Mr. Aylesworth); a very eminent lawyer indeed, second, I am led to believe, to no man in Canada in his position at the bar. But, I have yet to learn that the duties of the Postmaster General require especially the services of a very eminent counsel, and I would have supposed that some of the able business men opposite would have perhaps been quite as competent to fill that very high position as my hon. friend, who I am sure will give every satisfaction to the public interest in discharging the duties of that office. The duties of the Post Office Department are undoubtedly important, but is there any reason to believe that any one of the fifteen or twenty gentlemen whom I see opposite—or whom I might see if they were in their places—would not have been just as competent to discharge the duties of Postmaster General as the hon. gentleman who has been selected for that office.

We deplore a little the late hour at which this session has been called. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister has alluded to the unfortunate accident which has happened to the Minister of Finance. I desire to express my very great sympathy, and also the hope that we may soon see that hon. gentleman in his place, in his usual

good health and able to attend to public business. I accept the statement of the Prime Minister that owing to that unfortunate accident it is impossible to proceed with the revision of the tariff this session; although one might, I suppose, come to the conclusion, and not unreasonably, that after an interval of some seven or eight months the government might have arrived at a conclusion with regard to the tariff and might have made a revision this session notwithstanding the accident to the Minister of Finance. However, as I said, I accept unreservedly the statement of the Prime Minister and I shall make no further comment with respect to that particular subject.

But, if the government have not been able to come to a conclusion on the tariff in time to enable them to revise it at this session—I may say in passing it has been the same story now for five years ; that the tariff would be attended to at the next following session without the slightest possible shadow of a doubt—if the government have not been able to come to a conclusion on the tariff the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) has been able to come to a conclusion upon a very important public question and has been able to announce a complete and absolute change from the policy of the government as laid down, not more than four years ago in a state document, and as reiterated by the Prime Minister in his recent speech in Toronto. I say, there must have been a complete change of policy on the part of the government, or else the Minister of Agriculture must be plunged in the most hopeless ignorance of what his own colleagues said at the colonial conference in 1902. We know that the Minister of Agriculture keeps pretty closely in touch with all public affairs and therefore we cannot attribute ignorance to him. Let us see what the Minister of Agriculture stated. I have one or two brief extracts from a speech which he delivered in Montreal on January 27, 1906, and I take the report of his remarks from his own organ the Montreal 'Herald,' in order that there may be no possible doubt about what he did say. He said :

> You know that when we gave a preference to Great Britain we did not ask for anything in return. That is the true principle upon which a preference should be given. What is given should be given free and spontaneously. When you come to making a bargain, when you come to haggling over conditions, you create all sorts of discordant notes, you create difficulties and you create friction, you create jealousy and you create suspicion.

We shall see a little later on when we come to quote from the language of his colleagues at the Colonial conference, whether this is not a most direct and forcible criticism upon the carefully thought out memorandum which was presented by the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance on that occasion. But that is not all. 'We farmers,' he says—I will not refer to the three tailors of Tooley street ; that is an old story :

> We farmers of Canada want no preference in the British market. . . . Our agricultural products require no preference in the English market. . . . I am going to say frankly as a farmer and Minister of Agriculture, that I am rather glad that England has decided not to give us a preference.

Then, further on, he said :

> England has not adopted a preference for Canada, and I think she did right.

The Minister of Agriculture, the Prime Minister and other members of the government have reiterated time and again the principle that so long as this remained a political question in Great Britain no opinion should be expressed one way or the other by public men in this country as to what Great Britain should do. There has been a general election in Great Britain—is the Minister of Agriculture so absolutely ignorant of political history as to believe for one moment that that question has been ended in Great Britain by the late election ? Yet before the echoes of that election have died away he ventures to stand up and assert, not only as a farmer but as Minister of Agriculture, that we do not want any preference from Great Britain, and that he is very glad that the people of Great Britain have given the verdict which they did, and that he for his part thinks that Great Britain has done right. If Great Britain has done right, it is not for the reason that the members of the administration of which he is a member did not ask Great Britain to take the opposite course. Let me read a resolution unanimously adopted by his colleagues who represented this government at the Colonial conference, and let us see how far it accords with the statement made by the Minister of Agriculture in his speech at Montreal. I will not allude to the circumstance that Col. Howard Vincent, on a certain festive occasion in this city when speaking of the campaign for preferential trade within the empire on which he had entered, was bidden Godspeed by the Minister of Agriculture. If it were not for the well known temperance principles which actuate that hon. gentleman on all occasions, I would be inclined to suppose that for once he had departed from his usual custom, and that he should not be held responsible for what he said on that occasion. But let us see how far the colleagues of the hon. gentleman are in accord with the principles which he has laid down on this great question in his recent speech at Montreal. Here are the words of his colleagues embodied in a resolution passed unanimously at the Colonial conference of 1902 :

That this conference recognizes that the principle of preferential trade between the United Kingdom and His Majesty's Dominions beyond the seas would stimulate and facilitate mutual commercial intercourse, and would, by promoting the development of the resources and industries of the several parts, strengthen the Empire.

And further on :

That the Prime Ministers of the colonies respectfully urge on His Majesty's government the expediency of granting in the United Kingdom preferential treatment to the products and manufactures of the colonies, either by exemption from or reduction of duties now or hereafter imposed.

You could not have a stronger or more express contradiction than that between the words of the Minister of Agriculture at Montreal and the words to which his colleagues unanimously gave their concurrence in the resolution which I have just quoted. But, Sir, we have more than that. We have a separate memorandum put forth at that Colonial conference embodying not the views of all the colonies, but the views of Canada alone as expressed through her responsible ministers present at that conference. Here is the language of that memorandum :

While urging that the benefits of the preference were such as to entitle Canada to the desired exemption from the duties on food products in the United Kingdom, the Canadian ministers stated that within certain limitations they were prepared to consider the request of Mr. Chamberlain for further concessions in return for the desired preference in the markets of the United Kingdom.

And a member of that very government who put this forward as embodying the views of the Canadian government and the Canadian people, sees fit, whether with or without the mandate of his colleagues I do not know, to absolutely contradict and dissent from the words which I have just read in his presence and in the presence of this House. Further on :

The Canadian ministers stated that if they could be assured that the imperial government would accept the principle of preferential trade generally, and particularly grant to the food products of Canada in the United Kingdom exemption from duties now levied, or hereafter imposed, they, the Canadian ministers, would be prepared to go further into the subject and endeavour to give to the British manufacturer some increased advantage over his foreign competitors in the markets of Canada.

Meanwhile the Canadian ministers determined to present to the conference a resolution affirming the principle of preferential trade, and the desirability of its adoption by the colonies generally, and also expressing the opinion of the prime ministers of the colonies that His Majesty's government should reciprocate by granting preferential terms to the products of the colonies in the markets of the mother country.

Over and over again, not only in the resolution to which Canada was a party, but also in the separate memorandum of the Canadian ministers, was a policy set forth absolutely different from that which the Minister of Agriculture has propounded at Montreal. The memorandum went on to say :

The Canadian ministers desired to have it understood that they took this course with the strong hope and expectation that the principle of preferential trade would be more widely accepted by the colonies, and that the mother country would at an early day apply the same principle by exempting the products of the colonies from customs duties. If, after using every effort to bring about such a readjustment of the fiscal policy of the empire, the Canadian government should find that the principle of preferential trade is not acceptable to the colonies generally, or the mother country, then Canada should be free to take such action as might be deemed necessary in the presence of such conditions.

I assume under these circumstances that the Minister of Agriculture has already in his pocket a request from the Prime Minister to give up his portfolio. There can be no question as to the policy which has been pursued by the government in at least one instance, and under less aggravated circumstances. I will not quote the speech of the right hon. the First Minister, nor his letter to the Hon. Mr. Tarte in full; but I shall quote just one sentence from the Prime Minister's letter, dated Oct. 21, 1902:

To remain a member of the government, and at the same time advocate a policy which has not yet been adopted by the government, was an impediment to the proper working of our constitutional system.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if it was an impediment to the proper working of our constitutional system that Mr. Tarte should have advocated a policy which had not yet been adopted by the government, how much more is it an impediment to our constitutional system that a minister of the Crown should publicly declare himself as absolutely opposed to a policy which has been set forth in a most solemn and constitutional document, and which has since been affirmed by the First Minister ?

But this is not the only instance we have had during the recess of new constitutional departures by ministers of the Crown. My hon. friend the Postmaster General found it necessary to address several public meetings in a by-election which made him member for North York. In doing so he made some rather important announcements, and was corroborated, with regard to some of these announcements, by another minister of the Crown, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman). Speaking at Newmarket on the 3rd November, 1905, as reported in the Toronto 'Globe,' the Postmaster General said, regarding certain measures passed at the close of the recent session :

But I do think there is one feature in regard to which amendment may well be looked for,

and it is in regard ot the system of pensioning ex-ministers of the Crown. As I said before was not there, and I am not personally responsible, but I want to say on this occasion as a minister of the Crown or speaking as an individual, that personally I am opposed to the whole superannuation system. I can see personally no more reason why a public servant should have a superannuation allowance than any farmer who is working hard all his life, or blacksmith or merchant, should have a superannuation allowance.

Well, it is rather a novel constitutional theory that because a minister of the Crown accepting office did not happen to be in the cabinet at the time a certain measure passed, he is not responsible. I have always regarded it—I have the authorities under my hand, but will not go to the trouble of quoting them—as an elementary constitutional principle that any gentleman accepting a position in the cabinet, whether here or in Great Britain, made himself absolutely responsible for the measures that cabinet had passed and their actions with regard to these measures. There can be no question about that. My hon. friend the Postmaster General may have some warrant for his statements—I do not know about that—but I think it is a matter as to which we should have some explanation from the First Minister.

Then my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman), speaking at Sarnia, said, as reported in the Toronto 'News' of the 14th November, 1905 :

> Sir Wilfrid Laurier, seeing the Indemnity Bill is unpopular with the people, has given his promise that it will be reconsidered at the next session when measures will be taken to have it satisfactorily amended.

Again, an hon. member of this House, the hon. member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee) said, speaking at Oakdale, as reported in the 'Globe' of the 18th October, 1905 :

> He believed the pension clauses of the Bill were a mistake, and he was totally opposed to them. If elected he would work and vote for their repeal, and he understood the government would see to the revision of the Act in this respect early next session.

I bring these matters to the attention of the government and the country in order that we may have some proper understanding as to constitutional usage, as understood by the government, with regard to such matters. I have only this further to say respecting the subject alluded to by the Postmaster General—and it was alluded to by myself when speaking in the same by-election and in the by-election at Wentworth—that I should be very glad indeed to have the whole question opened up and the subject thoroughly discussed ; and in that discussion I should be most happy to have that particular measure in which I am supposed to be most personally interested taken up in the very first instance. If there is to be criticism upon the measures of last session, it seems to me that the best criticism lies in this, that they were passed so late in the session, and that they received no adequate explanation and justification. Let them be justified now or repealed. I believe that so far as the indemnity to members is concerned, it can be justified. I am prepared to discuss that question on the floor of the House. The pension measure was drawn hurriedly and not well considered. I agree with my hon. friend the Postmaster General that there are some features of that Bill which ought to be amended, and will give my support to amendments of it in that regard. And if there are any charges or statements to be made with regard to this measure, or with regard to the circumstances under which it was passed, it is right that those statements and those charges should be made here on the floor of the House in the presence of the gentlemen who are affected by them ; and I trust that we shall have that full, free and open discussion which will enable any hon. gentleman in this House to bring to the attention of parliament and the country any circumstances or features of the subject which he may think require condemnation by this parliament and the people.

I do not propose to revamp the discussion of last session with regard to the Autonomy Bills. I then took such ground with regard to those Bills as I thought right and in the public interest. That ground has been described and characterized in various ways. In some quarters it has been characterized as bigoted, in other quarters it has been characterized as anaemic. I think it was presented to this House with a fair measure of clearness, and I do not think there was any bigotry in the hearts of the members who supported the propositions made from this side. But referring to the establishment of the new provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, there is one matter upon which I desire to say a few words, and that is the extraordinary series of incidents which led to the passing over of the man who had been prime minister of the Territories since 1891, and who had been a member of the Territorial council or legislature from 1888 to 1906. Mr. Haultain's record in the Territorial government received, I think, on every occasion, a practically unanimous endorsement by the people of the Territories. On the last occasion on which he appealed to the people, he went to them on the issue of provincial autonomy. They declared themselves in favour of the proposal that they should be established into new provinces. The government took up that question in January, 1905. Mr. Haultain was summoned and came to Ottawa. The Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Fitzpatrick) who had, largely, the care and preparation of the measures that were brought down, is in his

place. I speak in his presence and he will correct me if I am inaccurate in what I am about to say. Mr. Haultain, in connection with the preparation of these mesaures, gave the government the benefit of his great experience and great ability; not only that, but he placed at their disposal the Territorial officers, so that every possible aid might be afforded to this administration in the preparation of these Bills. He did this generously and fairly and properly;—so great was his regard for the proprieties of public life, so complete his observance of the reticence which the conditions imposed upon him as a gentleman that, while that discussion with the members of the administration went on, he absolutely refrained from any communication with me or with my political friends as to the nature of that measure. He was opposed to certain provisions of the measure; and he had a right, as prime minister of the territories—nay, more, as a citizen of this country—to have his own opinions as to the wisdom of those provisions.

And what happened? Two provinces were established. Mr. Haultain took up his residence in the province of Saskatchewan. He had been prime minister of the Territories for fifteen years; he had been a member of the Territorial council for nearly eighteen years. Yet the lieutenant governor, whose chief adviser he had been for many years in that great country, saw fit to pass him by and to call a member then enjoying a seat in this House and who had not been a member of the Territorial legislature, at any time, I believe. Ignoring Mr. Haultain, the lieutenant governor called to the office of prime minister the gentleman to whom I have referred. I say that was not generous treatment, it was not fair nor even decent treatment, of Mr. Haultain. And I say, further,—and I say it of hon. gentlemen opposite to their faces—that I do not believe that this would have been done by Lieutenant Governor Forget except for interference from these hon. gentlemen. There may be a denial of that, but I venture to think that that denial will not be generally accepted by the people of Canada. The lieutenant governor, it seems to me would never have ventured to take the course he did with regard to Mr. Haultain if there had not been some dictation or some interference from those is power here at Ottawa.

What does it mean, if my assumption is correct? The office of lieutenant governor is an important office under the constitution. Is that office to be degraded, so that it shall become a mere part of the party machine? Is the lieutenant governor to co-operate with the government officials and the ballot thieves who steal elections? I venture to think that, of all the incidents by which the present administration will be judged, there is none that will more redound to their discredit in years to come than this ignoring of Mr. Haultain.

And we have the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Oliver). He is not in his place. I wish he were; I would like to make one or two observations in his presence in regard to his attitude during that election. He went into the new provinces, taking the ground that he was bound to interfere in the elections, because, as he said, his department had been attacked. How his department could be attacked in a provincial election in Alberta and Saskatchewan, I fail to understand. But if we wanted any denial of the statement of the Minister of the Interior, we could not have a more express and specific denial than that which has been given to-day by the member who moved the address, and who said that the discussion was upon subjects, with which the Department of the Interior is in no wise concerned. The Minister of the Interior went into these provinces, and, both by precept and example, he encouraged his officers to treat with the most absolute contempt a resolution which had been most unanimously passed by this House during a previous session. This resolution covered nothing new; it was simply an embodiment of a principle which had been acted upon by this government over and over again since it took office in 1896, a principle which had been declared over and over again by the Prime Minister himself when dealing with the interference of public officers in political affairs. This resolution was as follows:

> That whilst it is desirable that every official in the employ of the government of Canada should enjoy perfect freedom of political opinion and the untrammelled exercise of his franchise in accord therewith, no official should be engaged or be permitted to engage in partisan work of any description in the election of a representative to a provincial or Dominion legislature.

That resolution, accepted by both political parties, accepted by the Prime Minister, was passed by the House—much to the regret, as I observed at the time, of the Minister of the Interior. And what did the Minister of the Interior say about it in an interview in the west? Before reading that to the House, let me call the Prime Minister's attention to the way in which that principle has been enforced in the past with regard to Conservative officials. Over and over again, public officers have been dismissed by the present administration upon the statement of a member of this House that they had spoken or canvassed in favour of a political party. One man in the constituency I formerly represented, the city of Halifax, was dismissed upon the representation of Mr. Benjamin Russell, now a judge of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, that this officer at a public meeting, had asked him a question with regard to the Manitoba school question. This is what the Minister of the Interior said: They have the power of speech, and therefore they are entitled to express their political opinions. They are entitled to express them

to homesteaders ; they are entitled to express them to men under their control ; they are entitled to go upon public platforms and express them ; they are entitled to express them as presidents and officers of Liberal organizations.

That is the idea of the Minister of the Interior as to the way in which a solemn resolution of this House, unanimously passed, should be observed by himself and by his officers in the west. And these officers felt very much encouraged. We do not know how many feats of daring they performed ; we do not know to what extent their efforts along certain lines have prevailed in the west. But we know that the curtain has been lifted just a little in one or two places, and we have a slight idea of the wonderful things which the officers of the Interior have accomplished in bringing about that endorsement of the government which has been referred to to-day with so much fervour by the gentlemen who moved and seconded the address to His Excellency. Two of these men, John F. Nelson, fishery inspector, and Charles Sutherland, Indian farm inspector, were polling officers, officials of the government of this country. Encouraged, I presume, by the precepts of the Minister of the Interior to which I have just alluded, they became polling officers, and they went just one step in advance of anything that has ever been perpetrated in the way of election frauds, even under the administration which has been in power since 1896. I do not know whether these men have been dismissed. Can the Minister of the Interior tell me whether they have been ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Does the hon. gentleman want an answer ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER. Well, one of the gentlemen was not in the employ of the Department of the Interior, therefore he was not dismissed. The other gentleman was in the employ of the Indian Department and he has been dismissed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I presume that the same course will be followed with him as was followed with the postmaster at Thessalon, and with the Indian Agent at Macleod. In three months we will find this gentleman whose services certainly deserve to be rewarded, promoted to another post, at a better salary, and still enjoying the patronage of the government of this country. That is the course which has been taken in a recent instance by this government with regard to public officials. Well, these gentlemen did not go through some of the usual formalities in ballot swindling which have been carried out by the tools, or the employees, of the Liberal machine in Ontario; they did not go through the formality of manipulating or switching ballots, they conceived a much more brilliant idea. They were dispatched to the back townships, from which the Prime Minister of the Territories announced that he expected a very strong support indeed, and he got it. The back townships were what he relied upon, and those men were determined to see that the back townships duly supported him. A ballot box was taken with them; the journey to the north was long and wearisome, and these gentlemen stopped by the wayside in some small community. They marked one hundred and fifty ballots or thereabouts, for the Liberal candidate, they did not give the Conservatives, the Provincial Rights candidate, the benefit of a single ballot; and they returned shortly after the election with the news of a magnificient sweep in the north in the cause of good government. The Minister of the Interior seems to imagine that he has done a remarkable thing in dismissing one of these men, that he has accomplished the wonderful feat in dismissing him. Is this man at large? Is he still walking as a free man in the Northwest? With whom is the administration of justice vested in that country ? So far as it is not vested in the provincial government, it is vested in this government, and one would think that when one of their own officials, although acting upon the precept of a minister of the Crown, had seen fit to commit a fraud of that kind, justice would not be slow to pursue him. For what reason have not some steps been taken to bring these men to justice ? This government, I presume, will throw the responsibility upon the provincial government, a government headed by the gentleman who has been eulogized so highly to-day by the mover of this resolution. Then the provincial government will say, I imagine, that as this man was an officer of the Dominion government, it is fitting that this government should take measures for his speedy and condign punishment. But it is the same old story. The Prime Minister smiles. I venture to think, Mr. Speaker, that this is not a matter for merriment.

Sir, we have had in this country a pretty long history of ballot frauds. We remember that a man by the name of Pritchett swore that he was employed by the Liberal machine to commit countless ballot frauds, not only that, but to train others to commit them. He went to the United States. He was supported there for a certain time by a salary, the source of which I do not know—I am not sure whether any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House could give us any information on that subject. He was supported there for a time, and when his salary did not reach him with the accustomed regularity, he came back to Canada. He made affidavits in the United States. We asked the government why they did not prosecute him, and the answer

was that he had made the affidavits in the United States, and they were not the subject of a criminal indictment in Canada. He repeated the statements on oath in Canada, and still he was not indicted. Well, no prosecution has been taken against him from that day to this, he is still at large in this country. He has, in effect, challenged the late Ontario government and the Dominion government to take proceedings against him, but no step has been taken to that end. In the riding of West Huron one man, beyond doubt, switched twenty ballots at one poll. I was a member of the committee which investigated that matter. That man was a criminal beyond question. He was an officer of this House, he was a deputy returning officer, it was admitted that he was an officer of this House; but from that day to this he has gone scot free. My hon. friend who now represents Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron) brought to justice certain of these scoundrels in the St. James Division, Montreal. Justice then did bestir itself, this administration bestirred itself, but it bestirred itself for the purpose of releasing from custody those men who had been committed to prison by the courts. I venture to think, Mr. Speaker, that this is not a subject for mirth, it is a subject for grave inquiry. These tools are not often punished. They seem to regard themselves as absolutely safe provided their party friends are in power and are in control of the administration of justice. The name of Canada should be famed throughout the world for the proper administration of criminal justice. Outside of these election frauds, I believe criminal justice is well and truly administered in Canada. But when has any government since 1896 whether at Ottawa or at Toronto, up to the recent change of government in that province—when has any government set its forces at work for the purpose of punishing these election frauds ? The answer is. never, one exception, namely, that this government, in 1896, used funds from the public treasury of Canada to attack their political opponents in the province of Manitoba. I will leave to the Prime Minister and to the Minister of the Interior to explain why it is that these officials of theirs who have been guilty of this astonishing and unheard of fraud, should be now walking as free men in the west without any apparent fear of any criminal prosecution being brought against them ?

There is one other subject, Mr. Speaker, upon which I desire to say a few words, and it is with regard to matters mentioned by the hon. gentleman who moved the address (Mr. Knowles). He referred to the insurance investigation. I do not look at that subject exactly in the way in which the hon. gentleman presented it to the House. I am not inclined to look askance at insurance companies. When they come forward and ask us to conduct a thorough examination, I think that is exactly what we might expect of honourable men who know that they have nothing to fear. I do not propose to be an alarmist in regard to this subject; I propose to consider none of these men guilty until they are proved to be guilty, and I do not for one moment suggest in advance that there has been anything wrong with regard to the conduct of insurance companies in Canada. But I think it was decidedly unwise for the government to forestall action by parliament just on the eve of calling parliament together. Public uneasiness has been referred to. It would have been proper, I think, for the government to consult the representatives of the people among whom that uneasiness exists and to learn from them something of the ideas of the people with regard to the investigation which should be carried on. The government have seen fit to depart from what I think would have been a wise course ; they have seen fit to constitute a commission, and I desire now to raise my protest against the appointing of judges of this country to positions of that kind. I do not think it is in accordance with the statute which we passed last session. I have not a word to say against Judge McTavish. I do not know him intimately, I have but a passing acquaintance with him, but I believe him to be an honourable man and I have no doubt he is a man of ability. I have not one word of criticism with regard to him except one, possibly, that I shall mention a little later on; my criticism is of the system and not of the appointment of Judge McTavish. We passed in the closing hours of the last session of parliament a statute in which we placed these words :

> No judge mentioned in this Act shall directly or indirectly, as director or manager of any corporation, company or firm, or in any other manner whatever, for himself or others, engage in any occupation or business other than his judicial duties, but every such judge shall devote himself exclusively to such judicial duties.

Now if this investigation is to be of the thorough character which we believe it will assume, how is it possible for Judge McTavish to devote himself exclusively to his judicial duties ? It is true there are words in the preceding part of the section which must be held on a strict legal view to control the words I have alluded to, but I venture to say that the government has contravened the spirit, if not the letter, of this statute by appointing Judge McTavish. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice spoke of this practice two or three years ago and he deplorel the appointment of judges to positions of this nature. I deplore it ; I do not think it is a good practice. If we have to appoint judges in Canada to positions of this kind, if we cannot find men at the bar or in business in Canada to assume these

duties and to receive the confidence of the people that they will act fairly and uprightly, then there remains only one alternative; let us appoint the judges, but let us provide by statutory enactment that any duties of this character shall be part of a judge's judicial functions and that he shall receive no salary or emolument from the government of the day by reason of accepting a position of that kind. I do not believe it is necessary to go that far; I believe men can be found in Canada, men absolutely honourable and possessing the confidence of the people of this country who might be appointed to those positions instead of judges. For my part I desire to place on record my protest against appointing judges. We have had some experience of it in the past, and the result of that experience has not been a beneficial one. We have had judges in the province of Ontario appointed to deal with matters highly controversial in a political sense and, I say this with regret, but I am obliged to say it, the practice, which has been pursued of appointing judges in Canada to positions of this kind has lowered and has not raised the standard of public respect for the judiciary. If there is one thing in this country that we desire to maintain unimpaired more than another it is the standard of the judicial bench and the standard of public respect for the judicial bench. I have not one word to say against the bench of Canada, but the next worse thing to a bench that is not to be trusted is to have implanted in the minds of the people any possible suspicion of the men who sit upon the bench to judge the people of the country with regard to their lives and to their property.

Now for that reason I regret the appointment of Judge McTavish to that position. I might, if I saw fit, say a word or two with regard to some judicial appointments which this government have made. I do not desire to do so, I refrain from doing so simply for the reason that I think there is no worse feature which could possibly be brought into our life than the public idea that the bench of Canada is not what it ought to be. But I will say in passing that I sincerely trust that the government of this country in making appointments in the future will have less regard to partisan service and more regard to proper standards of learning and efficiency, than on some few occasions in the past. I do not desire it to be understood that I condemn the appointments of this government to the bench as a whole. They have made many excellent appointments to the bench of this country but they have made some few which have not my approval and have not, I believe, the approval of a great many men of their own party in the ranks of the profession to which I belong.

There is another observation with regard to this commission which I would like to make, and I do so with all possible respect to the gentleman whom I propse to mention. Mr. Langmuir of Toronto is a gentleman whose personal acquaintance I have not the honour of enjoying. He is, I believe, an able and honourable man, a man of spotless character. I understand he is a man of good ability and of thoroughly honourable and spotless character in every way, but he is the managing director of a corporation which has twenty-one directors and out of these twenty-one directors sixteen are directors of insurance companies. Now I do not think this is fair, either to the public or to the insurance companies, or to these gentlemen who are interested in the way I have mentioned. One of the directors upon that company is my friend the member for West-Toronto, Mr. Osler, and I believe, in fact I know, that Mr. Osler regards the appointment of Mr. Langmuir as very unfortunate for the reason that Mr. Osler is one of the directors of a corporation of which Mr. Langmuir is managing director and is also himself a director of an insurance company. The evil of the appointment is this, if there is nothing wrong in the transactions of the insurance companies of Canada—and I intend to believe there is nothing wrong until something wrong is proved—if there is nothing wrong in the transactions of these insurance companies, then it is not fair to the insurance companies themselves that a gentleman occupying a position of that kind should be appointed because the public unrest may still continue in view of the fact that he is closely in touch with the interests which would be so seriously affected if any wrong doing were disclosed. And on the other hand if there is anything wrong in the transactions of the insurance companies of Canada then certainly it is not right that a gentleman should be appointed who is so closely in touch with the interests which are to be investigated.

I only say this word further, in conclusion, that I sincerely trust that the language of the commission has been made so absolutely clear that as to render impossible the course which was pursued in the West Elgin investigation, of which commission Judge MacTavish was a member. With all possible respect to the three judges who constituted that commission, and believing sincerely that they acted according to what they deemed right, nevertheless I feel constrained to say that on that occasion at least they took a very narrow view indeed of the scope of the investigation which was committed to their charge. Mr. Finlay McDermott was the man whose seat had been stolen; admittedly stolen by the same methods as those to which I have alluded. He went before that commission and desired to be represented by counsel in the investigation of the very ballot frauds which had brought about his defeat for the time being. I looked over the record of the

proceedings to-day. The judges in the first instance thought he could not interfere in the investigation; they said: there are Mr. G. H. Watson, K.C. and Mr. R. A. Grant, and these gentlemen will conduct the investigation, and if you have any information as to these frauds entrust it to Mr. Watson and Mr. Grant, and they will deal with the subject very satisfactorily. What charming and refreshing simplicity, to say the least. Later on, I believe, that counsel for Mr. McDermott was allowed to intervene but only in this way; he was not permitted to examine the witness in the ordinary way but the commissioners said to him: If you have any question to propound to a witness, propound it to us first and we in turn will propound it to the witness. Just imagine Mr. Hughes in New York conducting an investigation along this line.

I trust that the terms of the commission have been made so absolutely explicit that the investigation will not be handicapped by any such methods as those to which I have referred. The appointment of Mr. George F. Shepley is a good appointment; he is a very eminent counsel, a very able and honourable man. I have just one word to say about that; Mr. Shepley was appointed by this government in connection with the West Hastings ballot frauds and I have good reason to believe and I do believe that Mr. Shepley's initiative was very much handicapped by the instructions he received. He took very little initiative on that occasion. I am not saying that by way of criticism of Mr. Shepley because it is needless to say that he would carry out his instructions well, but it is desirable that his instructions with regard to this insurance investigation should be made public in order that we may know whether or not he has instructions to take the initiative and to make a very thorough and a very complete investigation, and a very able investigation too as he undoubtedly is competent to do. He is conducting the investigation as counsel and we ought to know that his instructions are such, that if that investigation is not carried out with the thoroughness and vigour which have characterized the investigations in the United States, the people of Canada will know whether to hold Mr. Shepley or the government responsible.

There are other matters in the speech upon which I might comment but better opportunities probably will occur later in the session, and I do not desire to detain the House. Sufficient it is to say that our wish is to aid the government in expediting business. The tariff has been eliminated from the matters which we are to consider. If the government will expedite the work by being ready, by being prompt, by bringing down their measures without any unnecessary delay, they will find us ready to second their efforts. Let them display business methods, let them not indulge in delay and procrastination, and they will find gentlemen on this side of the House disposed to assist them in every way in bringing about an early completion of the public business of this session.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister. Mr. Speaker. The House has listened with marked interest to the addresses which have been delivered by our two young colleagues who have placed in your hands the resolution now before us. It is at this moment my very great pleasure to offer them my congratulations and to welcome them to this House. Both my hon. friend from West Assiniboia (Mr. Knowles) and my hon. friend from Antigonish (Mr. Chisholm) succeed gentlemen who during their parliamentary career won for themselves a large share of the esteem and respect of the members of this House. My hon. friend from West Assiniboia spoke warmly of his predecessor in the representation of that constituency. Those who have been associated with Mr. Walter Scott will agree that if my hon. friend (Mr. Knowles) did pay him a warm tribute of esteem, that tribute was fully justified. Mr. Scott impressed himself on this House by his ability, by his industry, by his courage, and by the devotion which he manifested upon all occasions to these western interests of which he was especially the representative. Indeed, such was his devotion to the interests of the west that he thought it due to himself to renounce the seat which he had in this House so that he might be able to give to the new province of Saskatchewan the whole of his ability, his energy, and his devotion. I am proud to say, notwithstanding the little slur which has been attempted by my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) that the people of Saskatchewan have responded nobly to the appeal of Mr. Scott. In this connection I would say that I am surprised—I say it deliberately—I am surprised at the attack the hon. the leader of the opposition thought fit to make on the lieutenant governor of Saskatchewan. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden) did not hesitate to say that for his part he had no doubt, nay more, that the whole of the people of Canada were satisfied that the lieutenant governor had been interfered with by this government, and perhaps by myself; and that unless there had been such interference he would have called Mr. Haultain and not Mr. Scott. I have only this to say to my hon. friend, that in throwing out that innuendo (it was not an accusation) against the lieutenant governor of Saskatchewan, he simply gives evidence that he does not know at all the character of the lieutenant governor of Saskatchewan. If he knew that gentleman as I have known him for more than thirty years, ever since he and I, we being of the same age, were in the city of Montreal; he as law student and I as a young lawyer, the leader of the opposition would know that any attempt to interfere with Mr. Forget in the discharge of his duties would have been met with a strong rebuke, no matter whence that attempt to interfere

came. Mr. Forget could not have followed any other course than that which he followed. I have only to recall the facts which are familiar to all, to justify my statement that Mr. Forget could not have followed any other course in calling for an adviser to aid him in carrying out the government of that province. Mr. hon. friend (Mr. Borden) spoke of the attitude taken by Mr. Haultain when he was summoned to this House to help us in framing the constitution of the new provinces. I give all credit to Mr. Haultain for having assisted us and for having gone on with us so far as we were disposed to go on with him. But every one knows that as soon as a question arose as to which we could not agree with Mr. Haultain, and as to which we had to take issue with him, from that very moment Mr. Haultain ceased to give us his views and the benefit of his opinions, and from that moment he became an intense partisan. Everybody knows that Mr. Haultain thought fit—I am not questioning his motives—to take part in the struggle during last session in the by-elections in London and North Oxford. And every one knows also, that the language he made use of in both constituencies left no doubt at all that if he had the power he would do everything he could to destroy the constitution which we have given to the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta.

Under these circumstances why should the lieutenant governor call to his counsels as his chief adviser a man who, instead of being in sympathy with the constitution which had been given to the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, was openly avowing his intention of putting a ruthless hand upon it? Under such circumstances the lieutenant governor would have been worse than a criminal—I do not hesitate to use the word—if he had not called to his counsels somebody who was disposed to have everything in the new province made as harmonious as possible. It was his duty to see that there was harmony in the land, and not discord; and therefore the lieutenant governor, though he was a friend of Mr. Haultain of many years' standing, could not do otherwise than to call to his counsels a man who would advise him to work the constitution harmoniously for the benefit of all. The response of the people has been the best justification of the action of Mr. Forget. My hon. friend knows as well as I do that as a constitutional governor he is not limited in any way in his choice. There is only one limit upon his choice, he can choose whom he pleases provided his choice is endorsed by the people of the province. He was subject to no other restriction, as my hon. friend knows as well as I do, because he does not charge against Mr. Forget that he has done anything unconstitutional, but something which was not generous or fair. Well, Sir, I leave it to the members of this House to say whether Mr. Forget should have been so generous as to call an enemy of the constitution instead of a friend of the constitution.

Then, my hon. friend thought it advisable to cast some slurs upon the verdict of the people. True it is, there were twenty-four or twenty-five elections, in which I think seventeen members were returned as supporters of Mr. Scott; and it turns out that in one of these elections there was some fraud committed, and that one of the returning officers who were guilty of this fraud was an officer of this government. He was dismissed; but my hon. friend is not satisfied with that, and says he should have been prosecuted. My hon. friend knows as well as I do, and he acknowledges it, that it is not the duty of this government to prosecute offenders, that we are not charged with the administration of the law, but that this duty devolves upon the province. Therefore, if there has been an offence committed, whether the offender is an officer of this government or an ordinary citizen, he is to be prosecuted not by us but by the Attorney General of the province of Saskatchewan. My hon. friend said, however, that because he was one of our officers we should have prosecuted him, and he recalled some instances in which he alleged we had been negligent of our duty. Why did not my hon. friend refer also to the fact that during the last election, which took place in the month of November, 1904, when it was brought to our attention that certain offences had been committed against the electoral law and against the rights of the people, we did not hesitate to prosecute and to appoint counsel to look after the prosecutions? The gentleman who was appointed for that purpose was Mr. Shepley, to whom my hon. friend has just alluded. When frauds were proved to have been committed in Lanark and Frontenac, the guilty parties were not brought to justice, and officers were appointed by this government to see that the law was observed. But the elections which took place in the Northwest were not our elections, but provincial elections. Had they been elections of ours, we might have thought it proper to have appointed counsel to look after the observance of the law.

My hon. friend has also referred to the fact that in the electoral division of St. James some frauds were committed, and that one of the offenders who was brought to justice and convicted was afterwards released. For my part, I am very glad that the hon. gentleman has brought that matter again to the attention of the House. It will teach us the lesson henceforth that when petitions are brought to us for the release of prisoners we should scan very carefully the names on these petitions, so as to make sure that there are not among them the names of any of the prominent friends of my hon. friend. Perhaps my

hon. friend is not aware that on the petitions presented for the release of the man who was convicted in St. James' division for irregularities were to be found the names of some of the most prominent of his followers who are sitting not very far from him at the present time.

My hon. friend also alluded to the fact that we are this year meeting at a very late date. I am sorry to say that this is the case; indeed, spring is already upon us. But I think we can manage to have the blessing of prorogation before the summer will be upon us. This is perhaps all the more reason why the session should be short; and if we are diligent, if our measures are ready, as I believe they are, and if the gates of eloquence are not too widely opened, there is no reason why we should not prorogue at a time when we can go to the country and see the apple blossoms in bloom. If I read correctly a speech made by my hon. friend a little while ago, we may be kept here till the snow flies, because he said he rather expected the session to last six months. Well, Sir, I hope that on a reconsideration of the subject my hon. friend will come to a decision more in accord with the ordinary dictates of humanity.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not say six months. I said to the first of September; but in saying that I placed reliance on the promise of the government to introduce tariff legislation. It was my misplaced confidence in the government's promise that lead me to make the statement.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If my hon. friend, when he spoke thus, had in his mind the promised tariff legislation, now that he is certain that this legislation will not take place, but will be referred to another session, perhaps he will allow us to dispose of the business of this session in due time, so that we may have the other session about the time the snow flies.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I will not only allow you, but help you.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If my hon. friend keeps his word, the session will close in good time, because I am happy to say that all the legislation we have to submit to the House is ready for submission.

My hon. friend has also referred to the absence of Mr. Fielding. The accident to the Minister of Finance has unfortunately turned out to be more serious than was at first supposed, and it is not expected that he can appear in this House before many weeks are over. In the meantime we shall have to proceed without him ; and barring the question of the revision of the tariff, I think we can make reasonable progress. Were it not for the absence of my hon. colleague, I would say that we are meeting under the most auspicious circumstances. Kind Providence has been as usual very generous. We have had an abundant crop, fine weather to harvest it, a beautiful season in which to ship it, and above all we have had good prices. I did not observe that my hon. friend was very enthusiastic on this subject. He passed over it very quickly and gingerly. Perhaps the cause of this reserve on his part was that under the present regime good times have become a matter of course. Or perhaps the old feeling still prevails. There was a time indeed when it was an accepted doctrine of the Conservative party that Divine Providence could not by any possibility be with the Grits and that the Conservative party alone had the instinct of government. In one of the recent elections which took place in the province of Nova Scotia, there was an argument on this point between a Grit and a Tory. The Grit was modest. He did not claim anything for the present government. All he claimed was that for most of the time Providence was kind to the Grits. The Tory would not admit that, but said that all things considered, Providence had been acting very strangely. Next to agriculture which has been very flourishing, trade and commerce has been making great progress. Our imports have continued to increase, and our exports, which last year were rather depressed, have since developed great energy. It is almost certain that during the present year the trade of Canada will pass the 500 million mark. In this connection it is very satisfactory to know that not only is our trade increasing in the old channels but is also finding new channels ; and I am glad to be in a position to say that the treaty with Japan, which has been referred to by His Excellency, was signed on the 31st of January. That treaty is of immense importance to us, in view of the recent discovery made in the province of Alberta. There a discovery has been made far more important than that of gold and diamonds. That semi arid country which was supposed to be only fit for grazing, has been found well adapted for the growth of fall wheat, and no doubt in the Orient we shall have a ready market for the new product, thus saving the long haulage by the Atlantic coast.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the right hon. gentleman give a little explanation as to the treaty with Japan ? I know there was a treaty framed by Great Britain in 1894. Is this an entry for Canada under that same treaty or is it an absolutely new treaty ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It gives us all the advantages which accrue to Great Britain under the present treaty. In this matter as well as in others Canada is forging ahead. It is obvious that Canada is to-day becoming the great attraction to all civilized races. So marked is our superiority in this respect that we are exciting the

jealousy and envy of some other countries which also have lands to settle. We have no quarrel with anybody nor do we desire to have any. We rely on our own superiority and are satisfied to rely on that alone.

My hon. friend has referred to certain words which were made use of by my hon. friend the Postmaster General. I have only this observation to make in that connection. There is solidarity amongst all the members of the government. They must all conform to the one standard, but no one expects that all individual members of the government shall think identically upon all subjects. At least we do not expect it on this side. It may be that on the other side, all minds are built alike and cast in the same groove, but that is not the case with us. When however there is question of framing a policy for the government, that policy cannot be framed unless there is giving and taking among the different members. Liberals have more difficulty in drawing conclusions and framing policies than is experienced on the other side. The Tories have a happy faculty of following like sheep wherever they are led. But judging by my own experience as leader of the party on this side it is very difficult to get members of the government and the party generally to take that easy view that every man must follow blindly as he is led. We have greater difficulty in reconciling opinions, and there may be occasions when it is only after long effort a man will surrender his own views for the public good. Any other method of framing a policy and carrying it out cannot succeed with us. Our men are allowed to keep their own opinions, but they must submit to the view of the majority when it comes to be a question of adopting a general policy. My hon. friend the Postmaster General said nothing else when he referred to the vexed question of the indemnity and pensions. I had a conversation with my hon. colleague upon that question before he made the remarks which the hon. gentleman quoted, and I told him that my view was that the legislation we had adopted last year was perhaps susceptible of some revision and amendment. Not for the moment will I question the principle, but will reserve that for another occasion, but even admitting the principle of the pension adopted last year, it may be that in many respects the legislation may be improved upon. So far I agree with my hon. friend the Postmaster General. Let me add that I agree also completely with my hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, upon this point namely, that it is better these matters should be threshed out manfully before the House. There is no excuse whatever for any hon. gentleman refraining from expressing his opinion when he has the opportunity of doing so and afterwards airing his grievances when it is too late for him to affect the action of parliament. But I have to take some issue with my hon. friend regarding some remarks he made on the admission of the Postmaster General into the cabinet. My hon. friend expressed his surprise that I had chosen the Postmaster General from abroad when I had the opportunity of making a selection from among the members of this House. Well, Mr. Speaker, I was very sorry to lose my hon. friend (Sir William Mulock.) But when I lost his services, I thought we could do no better than call to the council of the nation such a man as my hon. friend, the present Postmaster General, (Mr. Aylesworth). It is true that there were at least twenty men on the floor of this House quite able to perform the duties of his office and continue the great work inaugurated by Sir William Mulock. But no doubt there is a difference between the Grits and Tories on this point. If my hon. friend had been in my place, he would have found a great scramble among his friends in the House for the position and he would have been beset on all sides by his supporters in parliament anxious to serve their country in a cabinet position. But that was not the case in the Liberal party. I was left perfectly free to act as I thought best in the interests of the country, and all the supporters of the government submitted at once and gracefully to the decision I took and the choice I made. All approved the choice and showed themselves ready to rally behind my hon. friend the Postmaster General.

Mr. FOSTER. I would suggest that we should take an intermission and laugh.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is a free country, and I shall not attempt to prevent my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) from laughing if he thinks this a laughing matter. He thinks it laughable that able men should submit to be passed over in favour of some other man. It is not the custom of my hon. friend so to read his duty—everybody knows it. And there was the reverse of laughing in those days.

Now, my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) referred to another subject—the insurance commission. He takes issue with the action of the government on this point. He thinks that we should have proceeded differently, that we should have consulted parliament. Sir, our action is before parliament. Let me say, first of all, that, if we have appointed that commission, it is because I believe that such wrong doing has taken place here as in the state of New York. I believe the Canadian Companies are unimpeachable; I believe they are honest, and that the investigation will show it. But, Sir, the insurance companies should be like the wife of Ceasar, they should be above suspicion. There is no doubt that there exists in the public mind a certain hesitance, a certain disposition to believe that

things are not quite all right in insurance, that it is possible that money may have been diverted as it was diverted by the insurance companies in New York. It is of importance, and of the greatest importance, that these things should be cleared up, that the investigation should go to the bottom of the whole question, that every man who has a grievance should be able to bring it up and that there should be an absolutely thorough inquiry into this subject. That is what we have in mind. What did the hon. gentleman mean by saying that we should have consulted parliament? What should we have done? It was suggested the other day, and may be suggested again, that we should have had an inquiry by a committee of this House. Let me suggest to my hon. friend that a commission such as we have appointed can probe the whole system of insurance with greater efficiency than could a committee of this House. If you have a parliamentary inquiry, it must take place here in Ottawa, whereas a commission can go to Montreal, Toronto or any place else. It can inspect the offices of the company. The commissioners can walk into the office of a company and ask that everything be placed before them. In this way they can make an investigation far more thorough in its nature than any investigation that could be made here in Ottawa. My hon. friend is not easy to satisfy. It is very difficult indeed to satisfy him. He is not satisfied with our choice of Judge MacTavish or Mr. Langmuir. By his position as a judge of the land, Judge MacTavish is prevented from being a director of any company, or having anything to do with the administration of any company. Mr. Langmuir is a business man and is connected with several companies. What I would like to ask my hon. friend who attacked the choice of Mr. Langumir—though he admits him to be, as everybody knows he is, a most honourable man, a man of unimpeachable character—is, whether he believes, that if we are to have an inquiry taken part in by a business man, we could find a man who is not connected with some company? The thing is preposterous. In this age every business man of prominence is connected as director with one, perhaps with several companies. When you have chosen men of unimpeachable character, such as Judge MacTavish and Mr. Langmuir, it seems to me that you have provided for the very best inquiry that could be had. Such is, at all events, our object, and I have every reason to feel confident that the result will be commensurate with our intentions. But if this inquiry turns out to be unsatisfactory, if it does not search every hole and corner, if it does not probe every part, if it leaves anything undone which should have been done, then, Sir, it will be time enough to look for another inquiry. But, I have every reason to believe that, with the strong character of the commission which we have appointed, the inquiry will be thorough and the light of a complete investigation will be thrown upon the operations of the insurance companies. And that is what we want. We want to have the light thrown upon these matters. If there are offenders who should be exposed, or if on the other hand, as I believe, the administration of the companies is thorough and honest, the truth, whatever it may be, should be known.

I have only one word to say, because I would like to close the debate if possible—and that is to thank my hon. friend for the kind words he has spoken of the late Mr. Préfontaine. The hon. gentleman has spoken truly. Mr. Préfontaine, was a strong minister, a strong character. At the same time, he was peculiar in this, that, while he ruled with a strong hand, he was of the gentlest possible disposition. No man approached him but was satisfied that in him he found the gentlest of men. Yet, once he had made up his mind, he went steadily. And he did good work for the country. His death was attended with dramatic incidents second only to those which attended the death of Sir John Thompson in Windsor Castle. Mr. Préfontaine died in the land of his ancestors. But even this unfortunate incident, this loss to a people composed of the descendants of French and English ancestors, may result in good in leading to a still greater rapprochement between England and France.

I welcome my hon. friend's disposition to help us in carrying to completion the work of the session. He will find us ready with our work, and with little legislation to lay before the House. And with the assistance of the opposition, there is no reason why the session should not be concluded in less than three months.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North-Toronto). Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to take up the address in consecutive order. Some parts of it have been very exhaustively and thoroughly dealt with, and it is not worth while spending time in multiplying words upon those particular parts. There are, however, two or three points in connection with the address which I think might be mentioned. The first is with reference to the treaty with Japan. A person who was not acquainted with the history of this matter might very well have supposed from the speech, and from the remarks that were made, that this was a brand new treaty made with the young and rising empire of Japan, and for which the government should and might very well take to themselves special credit. Well, when one looks into it, it all simmers down to this, that it is but the late confession of a blunder, it is but the tardy attempt to retrieve a mistake, to say the

least of it, made many years ago. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that in 1894 a treaty was made with Japan by the British government. As with many other treaties made by the British government with foreign nations, there was a possible inclusion of the different colonies of the empire. For many years the British government have made provisions for the inclusion of the different colonies, but have always left it open to the colonies themselves to say whether they wished the provisions of the treaty to be applied to themselves. Well, Sir, when this government came into power that treaty was already made, and a limited period was fixed for the inclusion of Canada in those benefits, and the limited time during which this choice or option might be taken had not expired. This government, Sir, at that time, I suppose, carefully looked into the matter, and they came to the conclusion that they would not be included in the treaty, and consequently would not share in its benefits. For what reasons they came to that conclusion, I do not know. But such was the conclusion come to, and from 1896-7 up to the present time, Great Britain, and Germany, and France, and the United States of America have all had all the benefit that flowed from that treaty, or similar treaties whilst Canada has been absolutely debarred from any of those benefits. Some two years ago, I think it was, we on this side of the House drew attention to the fact that there was still a possibility that Canada might be included within the provisions of that treaty. Then and then only this government woke up, then and then only it stirred around, and after the lapse of two years they come to us with what is styled a treaty with Japan. Well, Sir, if there is one reason now why this treaty should be hailed and acclaimed with delight and with applause, as I believe it should be, there were ten reasons ten years ago why it should have been adopted and its provisions taken advantage of by this country, simply because ten years of added benefit over and above what this country can now obtain would have been obtained by intercourse with that country at a period of time when, probably, its demand upon such products as Canada could have afforded would have been even greater than they will be in the years to come.

Well, Sir, in this matter of trade which was alluded to by the right hon. leader of the government, the prosperous features were portrayed, that part of the shield was held up to this House and to the country. I find no fault with that. Whatever bright and prosperous features there are to this country in its trade development, we on this side of the House are most heartily glad to see and to appreciate. But there are some things that might be said with reference to the general trade policy and the general trade practice of this government which probably are not so bright, and would not produce so much satisfaction. This government came into power on a very well defined basis of denunciation of the policy of the government that preceded it. In certain general broad lines the preceding government's policy was wrong, it should be replaced by a policy which would be better and bring larger results. One thing that was especially denounced was the large amount of trade that was being done with the United States of America as compared with the smaller amount that was being done with Great Britain, more particularly in reference to imports. Well, Sir, this government has been in power from 1896 until to-day, and how stand the balance and contrast of trade as regards the United States and Great Britain? That our imports from the United States have increased by leaps and bounds, last year nine and a half millions greater than they were the year before, and from 1896 an increase of one hundred and fifty eight or one hundred and sixty per cent in our dutiable imports from the United States of America. There have been increases in imports from Great Britain as well, but relatively and by percentage tested, they have not been nearly so great as those from the United States. Take the other side of the equation, and consider what we export to the United States. The percentage of goods which we export to the United States, or in other words that the United States buys from us is immeasurably less than the percentage of goods which we buy from the United States, and shows no tendency to increase but rather the opposite. On the other hand Great Britain buys from us more and more, but we buy from her less in proportion and in relative contrast than we do from the United States of America. Therefore, in these essential particulars, no stroke of policy made by this present government seems to have bettered the conditions with which they found so much fault when we were in power and when they were in opposition.

Well, further than that, they have exhausted themselves in efforts in one direction, as before they exhausted themselves in criticism with reference to our inability to get any kind of reciprocal trade with the United States of America. These gentlemen have not succeeded. They have tried, they have acknowledged their failure ; therefore in this respect their policy has been no improvement upon the policy of their predecessors. The conclusion that you must reach is that in ten years of effort and ten years of their policy not one single foreign port has been opened to the increase of Canadian products on any more favourable basis than it was before these gentlemen went into power. With all their resources and all their protestations of their power, they have not been able to break down the tariff walls of a single foreign country or to

introduce into a single foreign market one single product of Canada on a more favoured basis than before 1896. But, trade is increasing. Yes. But it is altogether a false assumption that it has increased because of the better trade policy of the present government. It has increased in spite of their lack of enterprising trade policy. It has simply been the expression of the productiveness of the Canadian soil and of Canadian industry flowing in 99 per cent of the instances along the very same channels that this trade sought before these gentlemen came into power. They have not discovered the lands, they have not revealed the fertility of these lands, they have not developed the lands; every great used line of transport which we have had during ten years and which we have to-day was laid by their predecessors and was in going order when their predecessors gave over the reins of government. They have projected some routes of transport since, but up to the present their new routes of transport, developed along exactly parallel lines to the old, have not contributed one-hundredth per cent of the volume of traffic from the products of our lands and industries which have found their way into foreign markets. That is at least a sobering thought that these gentlemen might keep close at hand. To listen to the mover and the seconder of the address one would have thought that until the Grand Trunk Pacific was originated and put into course of fulfilment, that Canada had no great lines of transport in the west or in the east. One of these gentlemen was so enthusiastic as to say that the Grand Trunk Pacific was five years too late, and that when it was completed, there would be an end once and for all to anything like congestion of transportation for our products. Will that gentleman simply look at the map of Canada and follow it. Will he look at the lines of railway and transport from the lakes out into the western country, and trace upon it the line of the Grand Trunk Pacific. Will he look at, side by side with the proposed new line, the almost innumerable lines of transport which already permeate that country and will he not come to a somewhat sober conclusion as to what a very small part the Grand Trunk Pacific, when it is completed from the lakes to the rocky mountains, will play in carrying the mighty stream of products that is to be taken out of that country and brought into that country in the course of trade. Why, Sir, in this as in everything else there is an attempt to float into magnificent proportions what after all is but a very small part of the mere machinery of transport that Canada possesses. When this immense Transcontinental Railway was brought in full flush before this country, where was it supposed to go and what was it supposed to do ? As an apology for the immense credits and expenditures of money by this country for this project, the Prime Minister and all his followers led the people to suppose that a great new unentered and hitherto undeveloped territory was to be opened up by the Grand Trunk Pacific. He, and the others, at that time seemed to have the idea—and the country adopted the project under the inspiration of that idea—that this road was to go outside of the beaten track and that it was to open up a new and undeveloped area in our Northwest. Look on the map at the located line on which the tenders are called for and on which contracts will be given. It traverses no new and undeveloped portion of Canada's great Northwest. Leaving the city of Winnipeg it gets to Portage La Prairie in some way or other, close beside or over the tracks of railways already built and running. Leaving Portage La Prairie it traverses the great Northwest through a garden, within ten or at the most fifteen or twenty miles from railways to-day running and serving the country very well indeed. Build it to Edmonton along its present located line and it is powerless to move a single bushel of wheat or take in a dollar's worth of product outside of a stretch of country some ten or fifteen miles on each side which is bounded at the present time by the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Canadian Northern, in territory which these two railways could have well served, and served without the addition of a single dollar's expense to Canada. Therefore, we must be sober in our statements with reference to the Grand Trunk Pacific. A good work it will do, but as to what it can do and will do in comparison with other roads, is altogether another question. The idea that it was to open up a new and undeveloped Northwest is entirely mythical; it is absolutely false, and yet the measure was adopted by parliament under that false assumption. Had it gone further south it would have tangled itself up with lines already built. Before it could have opened an undeveloped but rich tract of country it had to get north of the Canadian Northern Railway into that vast stretch running up into the Peace river, the opening up of which would have been some excuse for the extension of the credit of the country to it and for the millions of dollars that Canada gives towards the completion of that road. So much with respect to this transport question.

Nothing was said about the finances of the country. In the speech from the Throne, in the speech of the Prime Minister, the state of our finances was passed over very lightly. Do gentlemen opposite ever stop to think of the years into which they are heading; of the tremendous financial responsibilities which they are soon to take up, and for ten years to continuously carry, whether this country be prosperous financially or whether it be in depression. Do they know they are marching into the teeth of a financial problem which should make

every staid and shrewd financier almost tremble at the thought of the weight and magnitude of the obligations. But these gentlemen opposite are perfectly light hearted. They are making no preparation for the coming day which may try men's souls in this Dominion. They are heaping up ordinary expenditures by the million of dollars each year; they are heaping up the ordinary capital expense by the million dollars each year and they are marching into the teeth of five or seven years to come when they shall be obliged to go into the money markets of the world for $147,000,000 to take up old and maturing debt, and for at least $100,000,000 for extraordinary capital expenditure on railway account. This is no light task. With all the sails set and all the gales favouring during the last ten years, we pitch our hopes high indeed and we make a big draught upon favourable anticipations if we look to see the ten years following equally as flourishing and equally as expansive in the way of both revenue and of production. It is not possible to suppose that will be the case in this country of ours, and yet in these ten favourable years what single apportionment of the funds of this country, what single measure of precaution has been taken towards laying the foundation for the years of stress which are just now upon us in the way of money raising, and for contingencies which every reasonable and sensible man must acknowledge are possible to come across our path. What provision made? None. But, an increasing extravagance in the expenses, an increasing prodigality in laying about for methods upon which money can be spent and spent in great amounts. Why, Sir, as an example, your Minister of Finance stood by his chair last year, six days after the financial year had passed, when he required to make no estimates because the year was over, when not a single dime more could be spent than had been contracted for and had been already spent and charged to the year which had just passed;—he brought his estimate of revenue, his estimate of consolidated expenditure, his estimate of capital expenditure, his estimate of increase of debt, and he laid them before us after the year had absolutely expired, and when his calculations ought to be within a few dollars and cents of the exact truth of the case. And he said: My revenue this last year has been so much, my consolidated expenditures have been so much, my expenditures on capital account have been so much and my increase of the debt has been so much. To-day the accounts are printed and before us, and he was only one million dollars out in his consolidated expenditure reckoning, and he was only four million dollars out on his capital expenditure, and his increase of debt as printed by himself, is five and a half million dollars, while his statement, six days after the financial year had expired, made it but one and a quarter million dollars. What are we to think, Mr. Speaker, when such loose, absolutely loose methods are in vogue to-day in the accounting department, the finance department, above all others, which will allow, after the expiry of the financial year, such gross miscalculations hitherto unexplained. Well, Sir, I said we are approaching years when much has to be accomplished from a financial point of view. You may strain the revenue to a certain extent but there is a point beyond which it will not answer to your touch. When in the few years that have passed you have strained the revenue of this country up to a grand total of some seventy million dollars or more, nearly doubling it in that time, what sane man expects that with our population and our development, great though it is, we can expect the same buoyancy in the revenue for the next ten years. Lightly indeed my right hon. friend passed over what might have been the statements made: that whereas, in 1896 we the Liberal Conservative government took $28,000,000 of taxation out of this country, last year he took $54,000,000 out of the country—whereas in 1896 our total expenditure was some $41,000,000, last year the total expenditure was $78,000,000. Oh, but they say: the people don't feel it. Let us get right down to the idea that there is not one dollar of that $71,000,000 that you raised as revenue last year that did not come out of the people's pockets. There is no other place for it to come from. It is not whisked out of the atmosphere by some wizard's touch. It is not absolutely earned by some operation other than the toil and sweat of the individual labourer. The fact remains, that whereas in 1896 we took a moiety of toll from the sweat and labour of the people, you last year took double the amount, and you took it out of the balance of their earnings to the amount of $78,000,000 spent. $72,000,000 of that taken out of the pockets of the people. That makes about $15 per head of our population or nearly $90 for every family in this country that you took out of the residue of their earnings over and above their living expenses. That money came from the people, and the drain is enormous, and the drain to-day is double what it was in 1896.

Now, Sir, what have you to do? In the next four years $134,000,000 of debt matures, and you will have to go into the money markets of the world to raise that sum; in seven years' time you are to raise $147,000,000; and in addition to that you are to raise at least $100,000,000 for the great railway expenses upon which we have entered. $247,000,000 with a treasury increasing as buoyantly from the revenues of the people as it has increased in the last ten years, and with times as buoyant and as hopeful the world over, might not be a task which would be too hard to accom-

plish; but what man is going to become sponsor for ten more years of plenty and equal buoyancy of revenue, ten more years of equal prosperity in the world and the world's money markets, to those we have seen in the past? $247,000,000, and of that only $47,000,000 is available in the sinking funds of the country. $200,000,000 is new money to be found; and, Sir, if bad years do come—and they may come and they will come, and it is the prudent financier who takes contingencies into thought—if they do come, and these obligations, which are absolutely inevitable, come upon us, there is a time for heart-searching, I think, in store for this country, which may alter somewhat the views of these gentlemen who lightly and airily talk about raising $247,000,000, or taking it out of their own pockets if the country cannot raise the money.

One word with reference to the insurance commission. There is no need of my saying what has been better said by the gentlemen who have preceded me. I agree entirely with the view of my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) by my side. I will not go quite so far as the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who spoke this afternoon. I am bound to believe that Canadian business men and bankers and insurance men are doing their work well and doing their work honestly. I am not going to be one of those who raise the scare of suspicion and take for granted what has not been proved, even though on the other side of the line most outrageous things have been brought to light which no one would have suspected, before the Armstrong committee got in its work. I do not believe we are built that way on this side of the line. I do not look for disclosures of that kind. The government have chosen their policy of a royal commission. There is another commission that might have been made—an inquiry by parliament itself. The government have taken their line, we will hold them to it; we will watch the investigation they cause to be made, and parliament will stand here to censure them and their commission if it does not do its full work, and to supplement it if necessary by the powers of parliament, which are ample for that purpose. But, Sir, there is one strange comment on the all-knowingness of this administration that occurs to my mind just now. On the Supreme Court bench in this city there is an able and distinguished judge, and just the other day a letter over the signature of that able and distinguished judge appeared in the public prints, and the kernel of that letter was an emphatic and absolute and wholesale denunciation and reprobation of some legislation which took place in 1899—legislation by this cabinet a member of which this learned judge at that time was; and that letter recalled to me an incident

that took place in the committee history of this country. In 1899 a very influential man came to the Minister of Finance and to the government and opened up a scheme for the loosening of investments. The traditions of the Finance Department had been stern and strong. This proposal was to open up investments in which there was a great deal of prospective danger. The matter was threshed out in the committee, where I myself opposed the proposal, and appealed to the Minister of Finance to stand by the traditions of the Department of Finance, and to hold the reins firmly upon the manner and method of investments. I had the committee with me. Whether I had the Minister of Finance with me or not I do not know, but member after member of that committee not belonging to my own party rose and backed my assumptions and backed my belief. At the next meeting of the committee the very men who had spoken with me before found new light, and the influential gentleman was backed by a cordon of supporters which swept away the old boundaries as though they had been chaff and opened up the investments which this distinguished judge on the Supreme Court to-day condemns and deplores. If there be any trouble in insurance work in this country, the main part of it will be found to be on the line of its investments—that I am quite certain of—rather than on the line of its general management otherwise.

Much has been said about the Northwest provinces. I quite agree with the passage in the speech which speaks of the entry of these territories into the sisterhood of provinces of this Dominion, with prospects bright, with tremendous resources developed and undeveloped. That was a great occasion when those territories took upon themselves their majority and joined the sisterhood of provinces. Bright were the skies, the sun shone brilliantly, the weather was all that could be desired. Men's hearts were happy and their hopes were pitched high. It is a great thing when a young man puts on the garment of his majority. Happy for him if his ideals are noble and his principles are good, and the auspices under which he starts are honourable and just.

So with reference to these two provinces, one side of the shield is bright and beautiful; and happy would it be for them if the circumstances surrounding the inception and progress of those Territories into statehood had all been as favourable and as fair. But what were the circumstances? Sir, the mover of the address started out by saying that to the harmony of the natal day, there succeeded all the horrors of internecine strife. What a pity that we had not the sage advice of this gentleman before us last year in this House, which he gave us in that one pithy sentence to-day, when he

said that the Northwest Territories were quite able to look after their own religious matters without any interference from the outside. If only this Nestor had been present with his advice in 1905, and that advice had been taken, to the harmony and the beautiful prospect of the natal day there would have succeeded none of the blackness and strife and trouble which followed. But, Sir, from the very first the auspices were cast sinister. In the election which preceded the granting of a charter to those provinces, the matter was kept as much as possible a profound secret, so that the people of those territories themselves had no opportunity of making their voice and their wishes known in that respect. Members were elected to this House on issues entirely different and foreign from that issue. That of itself was a wrong beginning. It would have been far better if the administration had been open and above board with the people of those provinces and have conferred with them before they made their choice of representatives at the polls. But they did not take that course. They allowed the people to vote in ignorance of what took place immediately afterwards. The charter was concocted secretly and sprung upon this House in the absence of the responsible minister. It was received in rebellion. Revolution broke out. One minister resigned. Others came to the very verge of resignation, and there was wild dismay in the camp. Why? Simply because the measure brought down, and intended to be forced through, surprised alike the representatives and the people of that province. Much has been said with reference to the disposition of Mr. Haultain and his course regarding that matter. The right hon. the First Minister attempted to-day to justify the course of the administration and the course of the lieutenant governor in passing over Mr. Haultain and choosing some other person. The minister's apology and defence was a weak one. Let us investigate it for a moment. Why should Mr. Haultain have been passed over? Was there any more loyal man in the Northwest? Was he at least not as loyal as Mr. Scott? Was he not at least as capable as Mr. Scott? Was he not infinitely more experienced than Mr. Scott? Had he not the trust of his people, evinced in a manner in which it was never evinced towards Mr. Scott? Had he not the latest mandate of the people of the territories? With that mandate he came down to the capital and placed all his resources at the disposal of this government in order to perfect the character of the territories, whose mandate he held and whose representative he was. Himself and his colleague came down together, and together they placed their best information in the hands of the government. At what point was there divergence? Only when violence was attempted to the constitution by the administration at Ottawa. Then and only then. But was Mr. Haultain the only man to be condemned when he made opposition to that? Were others who opposed it not to be condemned as well? Mr. Scott has been lauded; his judgment has been extolled. Let us take it all as right and just and a reasonable estimate; but let us look at Mr. Scott, as he really felt, and not as we saw him in this House. Almost the very moment that he was making a certain face in this House, after he had gone out from this chamber, he sat down and wrote confidential letters to his friends in Regina, in which he reveals the real situation and the real man. Sidelights are some times very important lights. Let us see what sidelights Mr. Scott throws upon this. Well, Sir, Mr. Scott's opinion of the government is refreshing. He says:

> My own opinion on this occasion is that the matter has been bungled almost unpardonably, but I am none the less clear in my own mind as to the proper course to pursue.

Speaking of the separate school situation, he went on to say:

> It was impossible to evade the issue. To leave the subject wholly within provincial control was bound to be objected to by Roman Catholics, because they were bound to look then very quickly and see the last vestige of their separate schools disappear. Laurier had induced Quebec to swallow twice—in 1896 and again in 1899 over the South African business. Neither Manitoba nor Ontario thanked him very emphatically on either occasion.

That is an insight into Mr. Scott's statesmanlike quality of mind. With him the right and justice of a thing is nothing. The point to be considered is will the thank offering of subservient be gained.

> In the present case, the hierarchy would have too much reason behind their contention. I don't for a moment think that the case for separate schools is legally or constitutionally binding——

That is a new light from Mr. Scott. When he faced this House, his speech was quite the opposite—'We are standing upon the rock of the constitution.' That is where the Prime Minister stood; and Mr. Scott clambered up beside him. That is where the rest of them stood. But, in his lucid moments, unbosoming himself to his friend, he says: 'I do not for a moment think that the case for separate schools is legally or constitutionally binding.' And he goes on:

> —but morally the case is pretty strong, and in my view it would be simply now beyond all reason to expect Laurier to induce Quebec to swallow the third time when the weight of the moral argument was strongly against him.

Right, constitutional right, the truth of the matter, the justice of the case, is not involved—it is a question of swallowing, and of how often a man should swallow and the exact moral question involved which

may justify him in refusing to swallow again.

The truth about Mr. Sifton's resignation and the situation here for ten days past is told as nearly in the Leader dispatches—which I did not send, but had cognizance of—as can be told. I do not believe——

Now, this is rich.

I do not believe that Laurier or any member of the cabinet, beyond Scott and Fitzpatrick, thought other than that section 16 of the Bill simply provided to continue existing conditions. We Northwest members advised this provision——

What provision ? 'The continuation of existing conditions.'

And we were told that our advice would be followed.

And so 'none but Scott and Fitzpatrick ;' these were the sinners, the one with white locks in the Senate and the other with curly black locks in the House. These were the two men who knew the inwardness of that clause 16 and who imposed upon their unsuspecting colleagues in the cabinet and their equally unsuspecting colleagues from the Northwest. But there was misgiving.

Laurier's speech indicated nothing further to me—and I followed him closely—even in face of the fact that the reference to revenues and school lands funds made me nervous as furnishing a handle for suspicion.

Scott and Fitzpatrick had walled them up against the Red Sea.

But the one saviour was near. The oft-heralded, the swift-flying saviour, coming from the hot springs in the centre of the far west, arrived in time to let these poor benighted cabinet ministers, and these equally benighted followers from the Northwest loose from the clutches of Scott and Fitzpatrick. Who was it ?

Sifton's analyzing acumen quickly picked out the meaning of the clause which, without question would remove the separate schools from public regulation. I am convinced myself that if Sifton had been a man keen to remain in public life he could have had the thing changed without resigning, but he contends the opposite. The difficulty since found in obtaining modification seems to justify him, but, on the other hand, it is quite possible his action aroused a resentment which would not have been such a factor otherwise.

There you have the veritable Walter Scott, beleaguered by the arch plotters Fitzpatrick and Scott—fighting in vain against the enslaving clause and saved at last by Sifton.

What a different face he puts on in this House. Philip drunk or Philip sober—which?

Now, Sir, the Prime Minister finds no denunciation too strong to hurl at Mr. Haultain for standing up against that clause 16. His own trusted lieutenant, the man whom he chose—say what he likes—to lead the fight and carry the province in favour of his pet project saw the very same danger that Mr. Haultain saw, and he 'swallowed,' whilst Mr. Haultain stood to his principles and his convictions. Now, it is a perilous thing for this country when the Prime Minister makes the statement or maintains the proposition that the lieutenant governor or the director of the lieutenant governor shall refuse to call a man to form a cabinet because he does not accept in a party sense or in any other sense, his own private view. And that was the sin of Mr. Haultain, and for it he must be passed over. He believed that the constitution was violated, that the British North America Act was being stretched beyond its true intent. As a loyal subject he declared his determination to see to it that that was decided by the highest court in the land, and for that action his long years of experience, the trust of his people in him, all these things which would have caused him to be selected, were swept aside and a gentleman who had had no experience and had no mandate from the Northwest was chosen to take his place and to inaugurate the machinery for the election. And what else took place ? Before the elections were brought on the constituencies were made to order and made for a purpose. The premier was made to order, and made for a purpose. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) went to the Northwest to order, and he went there for a purpose. The whole machinery of the official life of the country was directed to the work; and that was done for a purpose; and from the beginning to the end it worked ruthlessly, shamelessly, outrageously, even to the violation of the most sacred right of the citizen, the right to deposit his ballot and to be represented in the councils of his country, even to the dragging of the courts into the dispute and placing them upon the side of the robbery of ballots and defiance of the people's rights. From the beginning to the end—that base and sordid end—the same spirit and impluse is to be noted. From the Prime Minister at the first to the ballot thief at the last, all are links in the same chain, joined together for the accomplishment of the same purpose.

Sir, the Prime Minister is not here. But I think that, as he was walking home tonight and thinking over what he had said here this afternoon, he must have admitted to himself that he was a most consummate 'jollier.' Do not I know, do not you know, Mr. Speaker, do not we all know, that he attempted no serious answer to the positions which were urged with such force by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition? All very nice as a jollier, but for a constitutional ruler, the head of a great party, the head of a so-called Liberal party, to treat these matters in that way was not serious, was not in keeping, I hardly dare to say that it was not becoming, but it does put itself, to my mind, in that way. He excused the Minister of Agriculture on what ground ? Now, the right hon. gentle-

man knows himself that never did a minister make a more serious blunder than did the Minister of Agriculture. His own colleagues sitting about him know it, feel it in their hearts. The common sense of the country sustains the very same position. And yet the minister comes up and says: Oh, we do not go in for pedantic solidarity, we are not built that way. We have our differences of opinion, and whilst we think alike sometimes, we think differently at other times. But, Sir, why is it that what is sauce for the goose is not sauce for the gander? In making the comparison I do not urge it to its literal fulfilment; but what I say is this: What is sauce for Mr. Tarte as a minister of the cabinet ought to be sauce for Mr. Fisher, ought it not?

Now what was the head and front of the offending of Mr. Tarte? Mr. Tarte essayed to be honest; whether he always succeeded or not I am not bound here to decide. But for that once I will bear testimony that so far I could read his purpose and his action, he essayed to be honest, and to drag his own fellow members out from the miserable web of deception they had woven about themselves into plain, honest Anglo-saxon truth telling. Who does not know, and who did not know that the cabinet whose head the right hon. gentleman is, has, since 1896, administered the trade and tariff matters of this country on the basis of protection as a principle? Who does not know that it would be insulting anybody's intelligence to say the contrary? A number of them thought that they could go on for ever practising protection but professing free trade, even in carrying out an active policy. Mr. Tarte was not built that way. He said: Gentlemen, say what you mean and be truthful; if you won't, I will. And so he argued for protection. In what these gentlemen were carrying out, there were differences of opinion as to degrees, but as to principles there was none, in so far as carrying out their policy was concerned. Now, Sir, because Mr. Tarte stood upon the platform of the country and argued for fuller protection for certain things, Mr. Tarte is told by the Prime Minister that he must get out of the cabinet, and he went out. Mr. Fisher as a farmer is one thing, Mr. Fisher as a Minister of Agriculture is another. In which role he is the most effective, I am not bound just now to say. But, Sir, if ever there was a policy solemnly affirmed, it was the policy that this cabinet, in a place even more sacred and authoritative than in this House of assembly, reiterated, namely, in the interprovincial or colonial conference in London, when all the colonies and the empire were together. They solemnly placed themselves on record as in favour of the preference, of giving it by the colonies, and the asking of it in return by Great Britain. And yet, Sir, after repeated statements of that kind, pledges as clean, and as clear cut, and absolute as could be, one of their number rises and, on a public platform, says that as a farmer and as Minister of Agriculture he is glad that Great Britain has not given a preference. He believes it would work harm if she did, and he enters the fight now actively begun in Great Britain, throwing his weight, not as a farmer —which would not be very strong, not simply as plain Mr. Fisher, which would not be very much stronger, but as a member of a Canadian cabinet speaking to the people of the British isles,—throwing his weight against the policy of a preference. Was there ever a plainer contravention of the solidarity of a cabinet? And the answer of the Prime Minister, with all respect, is a trivial answer, an answer which does not answer, and which was not meant to answer, but it was the best that could be done after the rare blunder made by the Minister of Agriculture.

Well, Sir, other members talked besides the Minister of Agriculture. We have had another minister who has opened his mouth and spoken, none other than the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden), the representative of the war forces of this country. At a meeting in the city of Ottawa he delivered himself of a most surprising declaration for a cabinet minister of a colonial government, the government of a colony forming part of the empire to which we belong. What was his statement, Sir? In discussing the question of contributions and help in the protection of Canada and the protection of the empire, after having made several statements with which we will not quarrel with him, he makes this rather astounding statement:

> He dissented from the view of the lecturer on the Monroe doctrine, and stated that behind that doctrine were the guns and warships of the United States, and the land power of 80,000,000 souls. Surely if that doctrine meant anything, it meant that Canada was safe from foreign aggression, it meant that neither Germany, or Russia, or any other foreign power would for one moment, whether England were strong or weak, be permitted by the United States to place a hostile foot in this country. That might not be the law of nations, but it was the law of power, and there was no disguising the fact that the United States had told the world that that was their policy.

Now, Sir, boiled down to one single statement, what is it? That we as a country place our dependence for the inviolability of our territory, not upon our own strong right arm and preparedness to resent insult and aggression, not on the might and power of Britain from whom we sprang and to whom we owe allegiance, but upon the grace and favour of a foreign, and may be at any time, a hostile power. The Minister of Militia of Canada has no better word to utter in this budding era of national sentiment and self dependence which is becoming every day stronger in Canada, he has no better word to give to the people of Canada than this: By the grace and favour of the United States we

may be kept from being swallowed up by the European powers. But did the Minister think one single inch further and ask himself what power would shield us from the aggressiveness of that other foreign power, not in Europe or Asia or Africa but upon this continent and close beside us? It might not be the law of nations he says, but it is the law of power, therein is its terrible menace. The law of power and to be executed to ward off any foreign power from Europe and prevent it getting a foothold on this Canadian soil, but what is to ward off the foreign power on this continent, if the law of power only is involved, from taking the law of power into its own hands and crushing us. What sentiment could be less manly, what sentiment could be less national, what sentiment could be less self-respecting than a sentiment that we must owe to powerful neighbours our immunity from harm and foreign aggression from all others but have no defence and no security against those neighbours themselves if at any time they wished to become the aggressors. I think you may search the annals of countries through and through—the premier is fond of saying that Canada is a nation—you may search the annals of nations through and through and I doubt if you can find an expression made by a dominant member of the government or cabinet of any nation which equals for craven heartedness the expression used by my hon. friend the Minister of Militia. If the United States with its guns and warships is to be our security why not go the whole hog, why not get rid of our fortifications and defences, why not get rid of our military schools, and our little standing army and our bands of teachers and trainers and our militia itself and even the minister himself? And why, if the all-sufficient guarantee is the guns and the warships and the navy of the 80,000,000 of people who are close beside us here should we not pay protection to the United States?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to pursue this any further. I wish merely to say in conclusion, in answer to the taunt that harmony is a property or quality unknown on this side of the House but that it is regnant and exuberant on that side of the House, that there is another side light which shows a little different estimate from what the Prime Minister gave today. It is quite true that in choosing his Postmaster General it was a matter of internal economy amongst the party and the rulers of the party. They arranged that as suited them best. Harmony he said, prevails. One other solution of that might be that the only way to secure harmony amongst the members of the family already in was to take one already out and bring him in over the heads of all. I make a present of that as a possible solution of the course which was followed. But is it all harmony within? Another man has talked, no less a man than the Liberal whip, the member for North Ontario, who unburdened himself at a certain time with astonishing frankness and what does the Liberal whip say? Now I suppose that next to the Prime Minister himself the whip is the important man. The internal economy of the party is all at his disposal, he is close to its heart, he listens to its conscience, he lies down with it in slumber, and rises with it when it wakes, and there is no moment of its dreams or of its waking activities that he is not present as tutor and nurse and confidant and director and so when the whip speaks let us all listen. Harmony exuberant, overflowing, like the mellifluous atmosphere of some southern region, laden with fragrance and instinct with beauty. Yes, but Mr. Grant says:

> We feel great regret on account of Sir William Mulock's retirement. Sir William has held the confidence of the Liberals of the old school.

So there are two kinds of Liberals and that conduces to harmony, to have two bands in one party, especially to have a school of old Liberals and a school of youngsters, it being supposed that old Liberals have some principles and some regard for decency whilst the young ones are more iconoclastic, or socialistic or something of that kind. There is one important point, there are two schools in the party and there is consequently great inducement to harmony. I deplore the passing of Sir William Mulock, as well as Mr. Grant, but I am more sorry for one thing than any other, I am sorry that when Sir William Mulock's sun hoisted itself out of this political atmosphere and took its westering course towards its final setting that it had not done so in the full glory of its pristine principles. I am sorry that it allowed itself to be submerged into a bank of dull nasty mist and cloud of patronage and that a $10,000 office seduced him from his allegiance to the principles which he held so doughtily and so strongly. But his health was bad and of course although it was hard work to conduct the post office here, and to fight the new school of Liberals in the party it was easy work to take up a law practice, thrown aside for 22 years and study up all the cases and the procedure that had taken place in that interim and become a working judge on a hard-worked bench. That was child's play, a sort of sanitarium moral and physical, in which Sir William Mulock was to recruit shattered forces and recover his wonted health.

Mr. Grant goes on:

> We, the Ontario Liberal members, are very much dissatisfied, although we have confidence in Hyman and Aylesworth. But Mulock cannot be replaced.

There is still no mention of Paterson.

The present cabinet, Mr. Grant claimed, was not satisfactory to himself and other Liberal members. One objection is that there are old men administering departments, such as Customs——

Ah, now we have it.

—such as Customs, &c. The only members of the cabinet from Ontario in whom we have confidence are Aylesworth and Hyman. I am speaking as Liberal whip for Ontario in making the statement that the only ones we recognize as worthy of our confidence are Aylesworth and Hyman. 'The Liberal members are becoming tired of tip-toeing into ministers' rooms,' and of the dissatisfaction in general he said that 'a radical section of the Liberal party commanding a larger support in the House of Commons than is generally supposed, is prepared to act, and act soon, against present conditions.'

There are eighteen Liberals from Ontario prepared to act in an independent attitude during the coming session.

The session is here. Shall we at last have that which never before has been seen, that much to be desired prospect of 18 Liberal members acting independently on that side of the House behind the Liberal government.

The member for North Ontario said that if the government proposed a higher tariff he for one would vote in opposition to it.

Was there any other reason than a sprained ankle so unfortunate, that the tariff is not brought down this session? Has the Liberal whip issued a warning, and must four or five or six months be allowed to placate the Liberal whip in order that a proper kind of tariff may be ventured without disastrous consequences.

The Ontario Liberal members had not been satisfied with the way the Grand Trunk Pacific project had been handled. Mr. Grant expressed also their want of confidence in the Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick, whom they considered to influence the actions of the chairman of the Transcontinental Railway Commision. This chairman, Mr. S. N. Parent, was a law partner of Mr. Fitzpatrick and is entirely at the bidding of Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick, and the Ontario Liberals fear that there will be certain arrangements regarding the Grand Trunk Pacifi made which will not redound to the credit of the country.

And finally Mr. Grant declared that the Liberal government was fast becoming a bureaucracy. Now, these heart thoughts, developed in a moment of extreme candour after they had been pent up so long that they must come or something worse would happen; these are made now the property of the right hon. gentleman and he can reconcile these with the great harmony which he says exists on his side of the House.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). I shall not follow my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) in the banter in which he has indulged with regard to the comparative solidarity of the parties in this House and in the country. I shall leave to my colleagues the defence of their own utterances, but I cannot refrain from suggesting to my hon. friends opposite that if they wish to find solidarity in a political party in this country, let them come in to the field in an election in any one constituency or other territory of this Dominion or in any province of this Dominion, or in any general elections, and they will, now, as in the past, find a solid Liberal party on whose unity their attacks have no effect and no influence. These gentlemen opposite have had abundant opportunities since the last session of parliament, they have had election after election, in the great new provinces of the west, in the province of Ontario where they boast themselves to be so strong, in the province of Quebec at which they look with longing hopeful eyes, but in which they can have no chance and no show at all; down in the maritime provinces where Nova Scotia declared itself against them in 1896, in 1900, and solidly and unanimously in 1904; in all the provinces of Canada they can make no impression on the solidarity of liberalism notwithstanding their blandishments towards the electors, and notwithstanding their attacks on the present government and on its policy. I shall not dwell upon this, and I do not know that I would have risen at all but for one or two remarks which perhaps call for a little correction from myself in regard to certain utterances I have made on a recent occasion and which seem to have attracted far more attention than I expected from gentlemen opposite and from those who seem to sympathize with them; remarks which have also attracted attention from those who sympathize with the views which I then expressed. The leader of the opposition quoted verbatim the remarks which I made on that occasion, and which I also take from the Montreal 'Herald' and which are to this effect:

Now, as to our own interest, I am going to say frankly as a farmer and as Minister of Agriculture, that I am rather glad that England has decided not to give us a preference.

I do not think I said: 'as Minister of Agriculture.' I believe I said: 'not as Minister of Agriculture.' I know I intended to say: 'Not as Minister of Agriculture,' and I know that several gentlemen who were present and with whom I have discussed this question since have informed me that the words which I used were: 'Not as Minister of Agriculture.' I also know that the context indicates that I intended to say that. I find a little further down in the same report of that address that I did say:

Speaking absolutely my own personal opinions, I say, I think in the recent decision England has done right.

I wish now, Sir, to make the correction in regard to this publicly as I have done

privately on many occasions since. I was not speaking for the government, I was not laying down a policy for the government of Canada ; I was discussing questions which are not to-day an issue in the political arena of this country. I was discussing the relationship of this country to the other parts of the empire, addressing a group of young men in the city of Montreal who were interested in economical and social subjects, and addressing them on an occasion when these particular questions were no longer an issue in any political contest. I did studiously refrain, as I believe it to be the duty of a public man in Canada, from entering into political contests in other self-governing parts of the empire, for I believe it is right and best that we in Canada should let the other self-governing parts of the empire decide their questions for themselves without our trying to exercise pressure or to interfere in their political contests, just in the same way as I should expect the other parts of the empire and the public men in these other parts of the empire to refrain from trying to exert pressure on the people of Canada in their political contests. I think this explanation is due to myself as well as to those who seem to have taken an interest in my remarks. I will only add, Sir, that I believe that in speaking as I did I fairly represented and expressed the views of the farmers of Canada on this question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. FISHER. Hon. gentlemen say 'no'; —well, they can have their opinions and I can have mine, but I will give my reasons for thinking that I did so. During the past six months or so I have travelled from one ocean to the other through this Dominion; have attended large gatherings of farmers in British Columbia, and have met the farmers in Alberta, in Saskatchewan, in Manitoba ; I have attended the great agricultural conventions of Ontario, of Quebec, and the maritime provinces. I have mingled with these men on all occasions they have met together to discuss their interests and their affairs ; I have discussed with them everything they brought up on these occasions ; I have watched to see what it was they wished to discuss, and I say emphatically now, that on no occasion was this question of a preference in the motherland for our products brought up or discussed by the farmers in any way.

Mr. HAGGART. How do you know their opinion then ?

Mr. FISHER. Because I give the farmers of this country credit, that if they feel strongly on a question, and if they have opinions to express upon a public question they will express their opinions with no uncertain sound and in no uncertain voice.

Mr. COCHRANE. And you thought, because they did not express their opinion, that they agreed with you.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend need not be too hasty; my hon. friend must not put words into my mouth. I do not try to force my opinions on other people, and I do not jump to the conclusion that everybody agrees with me.

Mr. COCHRANE. But you did.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend is a glorious example of the contrary—he never agrees with me.

Mr. COCHRANE. Well, the Minister of Agriculture must be another example. He came to the conclusion that because they did not express their opinions they agreed with him.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. FISHER.—Again my hon. friend is jumping to conclusions, and is putting those conclusions into my mouth.

Mr. COCHRANE. That is the only foundation you had to base your speech on.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. FISHER. But I have another reason for thinking I am correct. We have had a tariff investigation lately in this country. We have had a commission which has visited all the important centres of Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific. I am glad to say that on many occasions the farmers of Canada have taken the opportunity of going before the commission and presenting their views and discussing their interests, and I have no doubt that on many occasions they have discussed the question of the preference which Canada extends to imports from the mother country and have expressed strong views in regard to that preference; but I have never heard or noticed in the press reports of one single instance of the farmers of Canada suggesting before that commission that the question of a preference in the motherland should be connected with our preference, or that our preference should be made dependent upon a preference in the motherland. I have searched carefully to see whether anything of that kind has occurred, and I have asked the members of the commission who heard the representations of the farmers in all parts of Canada and they can not recall one single instance when the farmers of Canada brought that question before them or discussed it or presented any views with regard to it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the hon. gentleman then conclude that the farmers of Canada are opposed to the policy of the government as set out in the resolution of the Colonial conference and in the memorandum of the Canadian government which I read this afternoon ?

Mr. FISHER. No, I do not. I am prepared to say that so far as the preference

in the motherland is concerned, the farmers of Canada are to-day supremely indifferent to it. As it has been reported that the farmers of Canada and the people of Canada are practically taking the mother country by the throat and saying to her, if you do not give us a preference in your markets, our loyalty to the empire will be weakened, and your refusal will tend to disrupt the empire, I mean to say that the man who undertakes to say that of the people of Canada, I care not who he is, is casting an insult on the people of Canada and is not worthy of their confidence. The people of Canada are an integral part of the empire, and whatever any other part of the empire may in their wisdom consider to be best for them to do Canada remains to-day in the empire and is willing to remain a part of the empire.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I ask the hon. gentleman to whom he is referring when he makes that statement

Mr. FISHER. I am referring to many representations and discussions which have occurred ; I do not care to refer to any particular occasion or individual. My hon. friend knows that that impression has been sought to be created in the minds of the English people on the occasion of the recent election, and by men who have not been so careful to abstain from intervention in that election as I have stated I was and as the public men of Canada generally have been.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to discuss this question. As I have said, it is not a question at issue before any people of the empire so far as I know. The hon. gentleman says the question is not settled in England. I cannot say what the future will turn out; but I venture to say that to-day it is settled with no uncertain sound by the common sense electorate of the British Isles.

I had not intended to prolong this debate. I will only say a word or two with regard to what my hon. friend for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) said with reference to the Japanese treaty. My hon. friend, not intentionally, I am sure, slightly mistook the facts with regard to it. A treaty was made between the British empire and the Japanese empire in 1894, a commercial treaty which, as my hon. friend said, it was open to the self-governing colonies to adhere to or not as they saw fit. That treaty was signed in 1894. For nearly two years afterwards the Conservative government was in power in Canada and did not adhere to the treaty. The two years expired in less than a month after we came into office in 1896. Our attention was drawn to the fact that we still had the opportunity to adhere to the treaty. At that time the question of the favoured nation clause in various commercial treaties as applied to Canada was in some doubt, and there was a discussion going on in regard to it. Therefore when we discussed this matter we felt that as the favoured nation clause was one of the clauses of the British-Japanese treaty, it was inadvisable for us to hamper ourselves and Canada in future discussions on trade maters by adding another country to those in which the favoured-nation clause as applied to Canada was in force. We therefore declined to take action with regard to the matter. The time expired for the adherence of Canada to that treaty, and from that day until quite recently we had no power to adhere to the treaty. My hon. friend seems to think that it was open to us at any time during the nine of ten years that have elapsed since that time, to become parties to the British-Japanese treaty. That is not the case. After the time had once expired we could not adhere to the treaty except by the agreement, and the grace, I might say, of the Japanese.

Mr. FOSTER. Which would have been accorded at any time.

Mr. FISHER. That might be or might not be. The government took the occasion of my visit to Japan to open up the question to the Japanese government. I brought the question before the Foreign Minister of Japan. Quite favourable views were expressed by him as to the desirability of our entering into favourable treaty arrangements. As my hon. friend knows perfectly well, such negotiations have to be carried on through the imperial authorities. With very little delay indeed those negotiations were opened. They were somewhat prolonged owing to the war in Japan and owing to the question as to whether our new arrangement with Japan should be a simple adherence to the British people or a separate treaty on the same lines. Eventually it was decided that it should be the latter. The result has been that quite recently His Majesty the King and the Emperor of Japan have signed a new treaty—a treaty which is entirely independent of the British-Japanese treaty, but which is practically on the same lines. Speaking from memory, I think I am safe in saying there is no difference in provisions between the two treaties.

Mr. FOSTER. They both have the same most favoured nation clause.

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is no difference in the responsibility Canada assumes.

Mr. FISHER. No, none in the responsibility of Canada or Japan. I give this information so that the House may be in possession of the actual facts. They are a little different from what my hon. friend himself explained a little while ago.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman has not explained why the govern-

ment ceased to give weight to the considerations which at first caused it not to accede to the treaty.

Mr. FISHER. Because that question was settled long ago. When the preference to Great Britain was established and the Belgium and German treaties were denounced, the question of the applicability of the most favoured nation clause to Canada was practically settled and there was no longer any doubt.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It was open to this country to accede to that treaty long after the Belgium and German treaties were denounced, was it not?

Mr. FISHER. No, we never could accede to it since about August, 1897. We had to enter into new negotiations with Japan as the period during which we could adhere to the treaty expired then and we had no opportunity of acceding to it.

Mr. STOCKTON. Do I understand the hon. minister to say that the people of this country took no interest in the question of preferential trade relations between the mother country and the colonies? If that be the statement he made, is he aware that the legislature of New Brunswick, two sessions ago, passed unanimously a resolution in favour of such trade relations?

Mr. FISHER. I do not think I said that. I said that the farmers of Canada were not worrying over a preference in the motherland for their food products because they have a preference there to-day. They are selling all their goods there profitably and are so busy producing those goods that they are not worrying over the way they are sold in Great Britain.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). If the hon. gentleman thinks the farmers of this country are not worrying to get all they can in the British market, to get the full advantage of the preference, why did he within the last six months withdraw the bonding privileges under which Canadian packers imported American hogs into this country and slaughtered them and sold them in England as the products of Canada.

Mr. FISHER. If the hon. gentleman wishes me to answer, I think I can tell him.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. When the hon. minister says that the farmers of this country are not worrying about the English market and do not want all they can get in the English market, his own conduct belies his words because he has been withdrawing that bonding privilege in order that Canadian shippers may have the full advantage of the English market.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, to discuss for a few moments the address which has been moved this afternoon and as this is the opening of the session, I take this occasion—seeing that no one else has taken it—to welcome here the gentleman who has just been elected from Maisonneuve as the representative of labour in this parliament. It is time that the labouring people of this country elected more of their own class to parliament, and I hope the good work has only begun, and that not only Montreal will send more representatives of labour to this parliament but also Toronto and other cities. Something happened in England quite recently. That was a general election in which democracy triumphed, and the greatest thing in connection with that triumph of democracy was the election of a great number of labour candidates. Among them there was elected a man named John Burns—a man who has been identified with municipal ownership of the great utilities of England, and the Liberal party in that country when the opportunity came to them, made John Burns, this representative of labour, a prominent member of the cabinet. In Canada, however, the Liberal party are ashamed of the principle of public ownership. They repudiate it and take the side of the trusts and great corporations against labour.

There was another significant thing in that election in Great Britain and it turns on an important question discussed this afternoon. One of the characteristics of that election was this, that the late government was destroyed because it saw fit to attempt to coerce the great nonconformist body of England in the matter of education. Too little attention has been paid in this country to that phase of that election, but the great fact remains that the Conservative government which saw fit to coerce the nonconformist body in England in the matter of education was destroyed and put completely out of office as no other government has been for many a day in the motherland.

We have been told by the first minister and others that there is practically no program for this session and that we are to be here for a very few weeks. We are to go away and come back in the fall and complete our labours, and the labour we are then to undertake is simply the revision of the tariff. But what are we here for? Are we here to transact the public business of the country or not? Are we here to earn that large appropriation which has been made by parliament for the payment of members, namely, three-quarters of a million dollars? Is that appropriation now to be paid to the members of this parliament when apparently, from what has been said this afternoon, there is nothing for us to do. And there is nothing for us to do simply because one member of the government happens to have met with a personal affliction. I do not think we are here under any such understanding. The people of this country expect us to transact the public business, and there is any amount of public

business which requires to be attended to. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that there are but a few unimportant Bills to be dealt with and then parliament will be dismissed to meet again in the fall. Well, that is not the understanding I have with my constituents. They have sent me here to look after their interests. They think there are a great many questions of the highest importance which ought to be attended to and grievances which ought to be remedied, but, according to the statement made this afternoon, there is nothing for us to do. That is not the opinion of the country. Go where you will and you will find a number of important grievances which the people want remedied and to which I have called the attention of this House from time to time. So far perhaps my efforts here have met with but little result. But they have set the people thinking, and if we cannot go on with the tariff, there are other things we can deal with. Last session the government appointed a special committee to consider the telephone grievance. A member of the government took charge of the investigation and practically gave a pledge to parliament that the government would rectify this grievance. Although he is no longer in the cabinet, the government are bound by his pledge. What has happened to that committee ? I do not believe it expired last session. Perhaps it is almost in existence yet. We have the statement made in North York by a gentleman who is now a member of the cabinet, that it was the intention of the government to continue that inquiry.

Are these grievances of the people in connection with the telephone service not to be righted? This telephone question is only one—there are many others. The people of the United States to-day are greatly concerned over the passenger rates charged by the railway company. The other day the state of Ohio passed a law providing for a two-cent maximum passenger rate. Indiana is following ; Pennsylvania and Wisconsin are also following; nearly every state in the union has this matter of passenger rates up for consideration. New York and Michigan had already passed such a law. And the same question is up in this country. At meetings everywhere it has been discussed. The people wish to see passenger rates reduced to a maximum of two cents a mile. They wish to see the Canadian railways, which give to their traffic originating in the United States this rate of two cents a mile, give the same to the traffic originating in Canada, And that suggests another great question in which the people are deeply interested. The people think that the express companies' rates should be regulated by the Railway Commission. Has this parliament no time to discuss that question, seeing that it is not to discuss the question of the tariff? Surely that question is worthy the attention of parliament, and I intend to bring it before parliament this session. I do not see that the fact that the Minister of Finance has met with an accident is a reason for parliament suspending its functions. Too much attention is paid in this House to persons and not enough to the people whom we represent. The people have sent us here to look after their interests. They did not tell us that if this man or that man did not happen to be in his place parliament was to suspend operations; they sent us here to attend to the public business. I trust that the position taken by the government to-day that we are here to do business only if a certain minister happens to be in his place will not be acted upon as it was set forth this afternoon, but that we shall deal with the questions that concern the people.

There is another thing about which the people of this country are thinking a great deal, and that is this : While this parliament has power to deal with banking, with insurance, with railways and with a great many other things, and is expected to deal with them, it approaches them too much from the point of view of the corporations who happen to be engaged in these lines of business, and not from the point of view of the people who have to do business with the corporations. There is the railway, and there is the man who pays the freight or fare upon the railway; and, apparently, this House never has time to put through any railway legislation except that which is in the interest of the railways. We have not time to regulate passenger rates; we have not time to regulate the actions of telegraph and telephone companies; we have not time to regulate the banks in the interest of the people. These great corporations are growing enormously aggressive. They have forgotten their true place and are simply trying to make the most they can out of the public while trying to chloroform parliament and prevent any action here that will compel them to do their duty to the public fairly. Take the case of the banks. The banks of this country are most successful; perhaps they are too successful. They have built up enormous reserves, and do not seem willing to allow the country to enjoy the prosperity that they enjoy. This parliament passed a law that the issue of Dominion notes ought to be increased. For some reason, the government have not made use of the power so given. If the government issued more of these national notes, they would get the benefit of the circulation. But, in some way, the banks have managed to prevent the increase of the circulation of government notes to the extent of the power that the parliament has given to the government. In the same way the banks have been restraining the issue of government postal orders. In many ways, they have managed to take more advantage to themselves and give less to the people than they ought to do in view of the great franchises they enjoy. Then, take the telephone com-

panies. They propose to increase their capital stock, and yet, in the face of that, they refuse to give the service they ought to give to the people and the interchange of business that they ought to give to the independent company. They make an improper alliance with the railways because of which no independent telephone company can have access to a railway station. Grievances of this kind in connection with all these great corporations are being presented by the people daily. And yet we are told that parliament is not disposed to take up any of these matters because the Minister of Finance happens to have met with an accident. We are not doing justice to those whom we represent when we abandon our functions and fail to deal with public grievances. We have the opportunity to take up these matters, but the idea is coolly announced that we are merely to have a few weeks discussion on trifling matters, that nothing is to be done, that we are to go away in the summer and to come back in the fall, and that then only the tariff is to be discussed. If that is the view the Liberal party take of the duty of parliament, I think they make a great mistake, and I believe the people will insist on parliament dealing with the actual grievances that exist.

We had a good deal of discussion this afternoon about the coercion of the west. I am still of the opinion that the Autonomy Bill passed last session was neither constitutional or in the interest of the country, and I hope and trust that Mr. Haultain, who has been so much discussed here this afternoon, will find a way in the legislature of the Northwest to have that question re-opened and that it will finally be taken to the Privy Council for adjudication and final settlement. I do not know whether there is any truth in the story that is going about, but I have heard it stated that the government intend at an early day, by petition or otherwise, to ask the imperial government to validate these Acts of last session. If that is so, I greatly regret it. I trust that nothing of this kind will be done, but that Mr. Haultain and those who agree with him will find him a way of getting the matter before the Privy Council. I believe that the Bill was unconstitutional, that its unconstitutionality was shown last session, and I hope a test of its validity will be made.

An hon. gentleman from the west speaking here this afternoon denounced the people of the east for interfering with the religion of the people of the west. I do not know to whom he refers, it was a double edged argument that he used. But I can say this, that the people of the east, if they interfered in any way with that question, did so in order to protect the rights of the new provinces in the west. They were not imposing anything upon them, they were trying to secure to them their rights; and those quotations that were read here this evening all go to show what Liberals themselves thought of these Autonomy Bills that went through last session. They were not in the interest of the west, they were not in the interest of the provinces of the east. A good old verse of the Bible says 'Who so breaketh through a hedge, a serpent shall bite him', and I believe that those who broke through the hedge of the constitution and coerced the people of the west, will yet encounter the bite of the serpent in that respect.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to come to what is perhaps the most important question of this session, that is the appointment of an insurance commission. The other day, for a moment, I expressed the opinion that I did not think the government did a wise thing when they appointed a royal commission to investigate complaints against the insurance companies, when parliament was about to meet within a very few days. The government now see the importance of that investigation. A while ago it was quite apparent that an effort was being made to avoid an investigation, a full investigation, into the conduct of Canadian insurance companies. We know that in the state of New York where these grievances were first exposed, a commission of the legislature investigated them, and we know that that investigation was thorough. We also know that in this country where we have had investigations by royal commissions, they have not been thorough, but on the contrary they were largely invented for whitewashing purposes.

Now, what happened in the state of New York in regard to these insurance companies. It was proved, first, that ninety per cent of all the insurance policies issued in the United States were of the kind known as profit sharing policies. The same thing obtains in this country. The finding of the New York commission was that the profit sharing policy, the policy which covers ninety per cent of those issued in that country, and also covers ninety per cent of those issued in this country, is a bad policy, is a policy that cannot be justified, and has given rise to all that extravagance and wastefulness which has taken place in the States, and which is taking place in Canada. These profit sharing policies are based on the idea that if you pay practically one-fifth more of premium into the insurance company, you will, according to the contract they make with you, share in certain profits that may accrue from that policy and investment of the premium. But it is a bargain which Mr. B. B. Osler once said in court in Ontario, one side has not to carry out. Whether those profits are paid, whether they are divided between the policyholder and the company, is absolutely within the rights and judgment of the company to decide. As a consequence, while ninety per cent of the policy holders have been paying for these profit sharing policies, and

paying one-fifth more of their entire premiums in order to share in the profits, they have not shared in them, and to that extent enormous sums of money have been used, have gone into the reserves, have not been divided among the policy-holders who paid that money and who were entitled to them.

Another thing that was proved by the Armstrong investigation, and which is also true in Canada is this, that nepotism had crept into the administration of insurance companies in the United States, that the general managers appointed their friends and relatives to immense salaries, and put them in the enjoyment of immense commissions in connection with the insurance companies. The same thing has happened in Canada. There is one insurance company in Toronto, the president of which announced the other day that he had an immense salary out of it; that one of his sons had $20,000; that another drew a commission the net amount of which, he said, was less than $20,000; but it is supposed by some people to be $60,000 or $70,000; and that the $80,000 paid a year out of the policy-holders' money in dividends went largely to that one family because they controlled the stock. It has always been admitted here in Canada that an unnecessary increase of capital stock in one great insurance company, in several insurance companies, has taken place. And while gentlemen say here in the House that they do not know that anything wrong has taken place in Canada, sufficient has come out within the last three or four weeks to justify me in saying that there is not a grievance which has been exposed in the United States in connection with insurance companies which does not exist in this country, outside of the charge of contributions to political party funds. So that while statements are made that Canadian companies are probably free, these statements are not borne out by the facts; on the contrary I believe and I am sorry to have to say it, that an investigation will prove, and Sir Louis Davies' statement made the other day also bears it out, that it is high time that the insurance companies of this country were investigated. I think they ought to be investigated here on the floor of this House. A parliamentary committee could sit even if the House was not in session, and a parliamentary committee could bring out all the facts here better than they can be brought out by a royal commission. The Canadian companies were summoned to go to New York, and they had all their papers prepared and were ready to go to New York. In the same way they could come here, and we could get out the real facts much better by a parliamentary committee and in a businesslike way, than can be done by a royal commission adopting the rules of procedure of the courts.

Now, another thing that has come out in connection with the Canadian companies is that, as was stated by Sir Louis Davies in his letter, a complete change has taken place in the character of the investments made by insurance companies. They were limited some years ago to municipal and government bonds and investments of that kind. All that has been changed, and the insurance companies are to-day using the trust funds that the company have control of, using them for investment in companies the securities of which are of such a questionable character that a new term has been coined to express them, namely, that silent assets have to be given with the bonds in order to get trust companies to buy them. Now, I say it requires the immediate attention of parliament when we find these insurance companies having the savings of the people to the extent of a hundred million of dollars, placing a large portion of that money in investments which carry what they call silent assets. In order to sell the bonds they must give a big block of paid-up stock. I make another statement in connection with the administration of Canadian insurance companies. It will be found, if the examination is thorough, that in some way large blocks of this paid-up stock that went with the sale of the bonds, went into the pockets and into the hands of those who are connected with the directors, and that subsidiary companies are controlled by the directors of some of the insurance companies in this country. So there is not a thing that was exposed in connection with insurance in New York that has not been already found to exist in this country, and if it has been found to exist in this country this parliament, instead of hurrying up and getting through, should remain here if it remained until next Christmas in order to correct these grievances in connection with insurance and the way to correct them and the quick way to get out the facts is by a parliamentary committee and not by a royal commission as has been proposed by the government.

Now just let me give two or three facts that bear out in a very pronounced way what I have been saying.

The bulk of the money in the insurance companies belongs to the policy-holders but you would think from the way the shareholders were discussing this thing the other day at their meetings that they owned this money. Now all this money in insurance belongs to the policy-holders, a very trivial amount belongs to the shareholders and yet the shareholders have assumed to themselves the absolute control of this money paid in by the policy-holders. There is $100,000,000 of it in Canada to-day, there is not $2,000,000 paid in by the shareholders, and the great movement in the United States and the finding of the Armstrong Commission is in some way to get back control of that insurance money into the hands of the policy-holders instead of leaving it in the hands

of the shareholders as it is in the United States and as is here to-day.

The policy-holders' money represents the savings of the people actually handed over to the extent of $150,000,000 and 800,000 policies, representing 400,000 policy-holders and over $700,000,000 of capital. The money invested is the life blood of a large portion of the nation's activities. There are two parties in this field of investment, the shareholders and the policy-holders. Broadly the shareholders govern. There is only one mutual company in Canada and the policy-holders pay the money which keeps the thing going and which makes the shareholders' money very lucrative. The policy-holders have hardly any voice in the management. The Canada Life has six policy-holders directors who have no voice in anything relating to the capital stock of the company. The profits to policy-holders have decreased and the expenses have increased. Why should the premiums of old policy-holders be drawn on for wild chases after foreign business. It costs very little to take care of the policy-holders premiums already paid. The profits made with his money are going into extravagant expenses. Look at this table of the Canada Life :

	Premium income.	General expenses.	Expense percentage on premium income.
	$	$	
1896.....	2,025,716	355,810	17.5
1904.....	3,043,178	921,600	30·2
Increase....	1,017,462	565,890	.....
Per cent increase....	50 p. c.	159 p. c.	.....

Agents' commissions on—

Deferred dividend.....	65	p.c.
Non-participals..	45	"
Renewal profit policy.....	7½	"
Renewal non-profit policy	5	"

Can any man in this country justify the president of a life insurance company or a member of his family taking 7½ per cent every year of the renewal premiums on policies in the company ? Now that is a scandal that exists in this country to-day, namely that the president of one of the largest companies in this country, between himself and his own family takes 7½ per cent on the renewal premiums of the policies of that company as commission every year. There are contracts of that kind existing and the policy-holders of this country do not know it. Yet it has been admitted and admitted in an indirect way but I say insurance of that character cannot be justified. It is not in the public interest; on the contrary it is a money making scheme for capitalists who choose to get into that business. It gives them control of immense sums of money and puts them in a position to use those funds, perhaps legitimately but also to use them for their own personal advantage as they have used them. It allows them to underwrite questionable securities as the insurance funds of this country have been used and in view of that fact why should we come here in parliament and refuse to take up a question of that kind ? Why should we hurry up and get through when things of that kind have to be investigated and have to be rectified ? The policy-holders have paid for profits which the companies have earned, but not distributed, except in very small proportion, to the policy-holders. Promises to the policy-holders have not been carried out. Ninety per cent of the policies issued in this country are of that specious kind ' with profits ' according to the Armstrong Commission in New York these deferred dividends are bad in principle and ought to be prohibited. I have already pointed out that 90 per cent. of the policies in this country are of that kind, and that they ought to be immediately abolished

Subsidiary to this exploitation of these trust funds there has grown up a practice of what is called in the United States associated corporations for doing business with insurance companies. Those who control these investment companies also control insurance companies and by reason of this improper exploitation the reserve of insurance companies there has developed the practice of putting the trust funds of insurance companies in schemes that have not been justified and are of a purely speculative character.

The underlying principle of insurance must be that these trust funds must be invested only in gilt edged securities as all trust funds are. Instead of carrying out that principle, the president of the Sun Life boasts that he looks askance at government and municipal bonds, and prefers those enterprises which have been enormously watered and in which common stock is given with the bonds which may later turn up in the insurance company's books as silent assets. Now there is the president of the second largest insurance company in this country, the Sun Life of Montreal, who says he looks askance on the investment of the policy-holders' millions in government and municipal bonds, and prefers to invest those millions—and he has in his charge, I think, over $30,000,000 of policy-holders' money—in all kinds of traction companies which are highly watered, and give free paid up stock with the bond issue. Is that in the interest of the policy-holder of this country ? Is that discharging the duty of a trustee in connection with these funds, that these directors are supposed to discharge ? I do not think it is and I think it is high time that parliament, in the interest of the policy-holders, should undertake to regulate the shareholders and those who control and manipulate these insurance

companies in Canada so that the statement that has been freely made here to-day that there is not much wrong with the Canadian insurance companies is hardly borne out by the facts, but on the contrary we have the evidence of Sir Louis Davies, we have the admissions made by those who are in control of these insurance companies that things are taking place which ought not to take place and that it is the duty of parliament to see that the law is changed forthwith and that better protection is provided for the public.

Another thing that came out in connection with insurance in the United States and is coming out here now in this country is that the inspector of insurance appointed by the state to overlook these companies, and we have them, failed to do his duty.

Can we say that the inspector of insurance in this country has done anything better than they did in connection with the American companies. For, if the inspector of insurance in this country had done his full duty he would never have allowed any company in Canada to have invested in bonds which carried with them silent assets. It was only because of the action of one policy holder in Toronto that it was brought out that Canadian insurance companies were putting the money of the policy holders into these questionable securities. A great many things to cause alarm to policyholders have taken place in Canada, and these things are of a character which ought to compel this house to immediately take up this question and to remove all these grievances in connection with insurance.

I want now to speak on the question of the increased indemnity which has caused a good deal of discussion in the country. I have no hesitation in saying that the people of Canada condemn that measure in all its aspects as it was passed here last session. The promise was made in North York, if I am to believe the Toronto 'Globe', that some kind of an amendment would be made this session. The 'Globe' said.

> We are glad to receive from Mr. Aylesworth the emphatic asurance given to the electors of North York, that it will be his duty next session to see that the question is reconsidered and that the weight of his powerful advocacy will be against these features of the legislation condemned by public opinion.

After the challenge that was thrown out here this afternoon, standing in my place I say, that the public opinion of this country has condemned all those measures in regard to indemnity to senators and members of the House of Commons and pensions and everything else that were passed here last session. I have watched very carefully the trend of public opinion in regard to it. Any number of meetings have been held all over this country, and everywhere the people have condemned this increased indemnity. I stand here and make the confession that I am as much responsible as any one else for the passage of that Bill last session. It is true that I did not vote against it. I must accept my full responsibility for my conduct in connection with it. But I have come to see that a great many people in this country condemned these measures of last session first and foremost because the people think that that increased indemnity to members of parliament was given as a reward by the Liberal party to its followers for imposing coercion on the people of the west. That is the view held largely in the province of Ontario to-day. But there is another reason why the people condemn it. It certainly was open to condemnation also because it was rushed through the House at the tail end of the session, and it was so rushed through because of some secret conference that took place between certain representatives on both sides of the House. And the way was greased for that measure which has been so generally condemned, by the signing I am told of a secret round-robin. The public opinion of Canada condemns that salary grab not only because it was rushed through at the tail end of the session, but because it was the result of a conference of members on both sides of the House and because it was supported by a secret round-robin. Now, I was no party either to that arrangement or to that round-robin, but I must accept my full responsibility for that measure. I trust, however, that the Bill introduced this afternoon by the Minister of Justice to amend the Act relating to the Senate and House of Commons is intended to carry out the pledge that the Postmaster General gave to the people of North York, and which the Toronto 'Globe' took to mean that the objectionable features of that legislation would be repealed this session. I will tell hon. gentlemen another reason why the people condemn that measure. They condemn it because the men who appeared before the people in the election of November, 1904, were willing to accept the honour of being members of this House at the then existing indemnity. Not one candidate who appeared before the electors stated that the indemnity was insufficient and as the people say: They were all glad to take the job at $1,500 a year. And the very first session after that election we get up in this House and we propose to increase our indemnity by $1,000 a session. That is what the people of Canada condemn. This same question of indemnity was up the other day in the British parliament and a great many thought the time had come when the members of the British parliament should be paid some remuneration. But in every one of the speeches made on that occasion there was the remarkable characteristic that they all referred to what the indemnity ought to be in the next succeeding parliament. All the members of the British

House who spoke admitted that they had come to parliament on the understanding that there was no indemnity to members, and therefore if there should be any change in the law that change should come into effect only when the present parliament had expired. The very same principle was enunciated in a remarkable way by Mr. Balfour, the late Prime Minister. We all know that until very recently the Prime Minister of England had a place away down in the order of precedence. It has now come out that the King in his wisdom thought the time had come when the Prime Minister should take his proper rank in all state functions, and he suggested to Mr. Balfour that the Prime Minister of England should rank next to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York. And while Mr. Balfour agreed with the King and believed that the Prime Minister should rank as His Majesty desired, yet he begged His Majesty that the rule should only apply to his successor. That is the principle which should actuate the members of this House in any matter connected with the increase of their indemnity. That is the principle we should have carried out if we wanted to increase the salaries of members of parliament. If we thought it was well it should be done, we should have enacted that the law should not come into force until after this parliament, and until the people had an opportunity of expressing their judgment upon the matter.

Now, there is not a man in this House who can go before the people and justify that increase in view of what has taken place in England. We should have referred the matter to the people; we should not, immediately after a general election, where not one man raised his voice in favour of such an increase, have increased the indemnity in the very first session. Hon. gentlemen on this side of the House will find that it will cause them more trouble than it will cause hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, and I will try and give them a reason for that. Since we met here last session there have been eight vacancies on the other side of the House, and, with the exception of two deaths, six of these vacancies were caused by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House taking office. When the five years of this parliament have expired, nearly every man on that side of the House will have taken office and gone into retirement, and the members of the opposition will be left to face the people as the men who passed the Indemnity Bill and will have to take the responsibility for it. It will never pay an opposition to sit down with the government party when such things as I have referred to can take place. In that election a lot of fresh Liberals will come before the people of Canada as candidates, and they will actually stand before the people and condemn that indemnity grab which the wicked Conservatives passed in 1905. I want to tell gentlemen on this side of the House another and a worse feature of that indemnity grab. It bears this construction, that that vote was designed by some clever manipulator in the interest of the government and the government party to silence criticism and discussion of these Indemnity Bills of last session. When I recall the conduct of the Minister of Justice in connection with them and how he smoothed all the ways to get the Bills through, I believe that he had gone to some expert in casuistry who told him that if he wanted to tie up the opposition for good, the way to do it was to get them into some scrape of this kind, in connection with something that concerned their honour before the people of this country—to get them into some position where they would not be able to go before the people for a year. Whether that was really done or not, all we know is this. that in the recess, by reason of the public indignation over this salary grab, hardly a member of parliament has dared to face his constituents and discuss either the Autonomy Bills or the salary question. There has been a silence in the country throughout the recess. Hardly any member has gone back to his constituents; hardly any member has discussed public questions, and in nearly every case where a member has attempted to discuss public questions, instead of discussing such questions as the Autonomy Bills, the discussion turned to asking the member what about the salary grab. So that we have had a recess with very little public discussion; and now we are to have a session without a discussion of any public question whatever. We have asked the people to increase our indemnity from $1,500 to $2,500 and we are to do no business; we are not to consider the public questions in which the people are interested. The Minister of Finance is ill and cannot take his place in the House, and we are to have a short session. Why did we increase our indemnity if we are not prepared to discharge the public business? All the people will ask is that. What can we say? So I trust that the Bill which the Minister of Justice introduced this afternoon has a clause in it repealing all these votes. If it has not, I intend to move an amendment in this House to that effect, and I intend to show the courage of my convictions in regard to it which were called in question in this House this afternoon. So that hon. gentlemen will have an opportunity in connection with that measure of placing themselves on record on this question. I claim no credit whatever for myself in this matter. I am just as much besmirched, if you use that word in connection with it, as any other member; but I do now see the iniquity of the proposition, and I am willing to abide by the verdict of the people in regard to it, and have it repealed because it was wrong and because it was not a fair

deal with the people who sent us here to represent them. That is what I have to say in connection with this matter. I did go to my constituents in connection with it. I gave them my views of it. Substantially I told them what I have told the House here to-night, and I found that my constituents disapproved of the proposition; and I could not see my way, in view of that, to take the money for my own use. I do not intend hereafter to take that money for my own use, I think the people of this country do not approve of our taking it. When we put the measure through we did it in defiance of an understanding with the people that we were satisfied with the indemnity as it then was, and that if we saw fit to increase it, we should have provided that the law should go into force only after this parliament ceased to exist. So I trust that after all the expressions of public opinion that have taken place, and all the fencing that has been made on this question, hon. gentlemen will have the courage to repeal that law and to square themselves with the people who sent them here to represent them.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to say anything on this question; but, in view of the somewhat extraordinary position taken by the hon. gentleman (Mr. W. F. Maclean) who has just taken his seat, I think it is due to myself as a member of this House to say a word or two. I want to say distinctly that the hon. gentleman himself is the best judge of whether he has been besmirched or not; but for my part, I was in my place when these votes were taken, and I do not believe that I have been besmirched or that my honour or my duty to my constituents has been injured in any degree. As regards one proposition, discussed at that time, in common probably with many other members of the House, I did not feel that I was in a position at the moment to discuss it—that is, the question of the retiring allowances to ministers. My reason for not discussing that question at that time was that I had just returned from New Brunswick, I think on the day the question was introduced, and it came to me as an entirely new question.

I knew there was a policy existing in Britain with regard to the matter; and without having had an opportunity of consulting the authorities as to just what the law in Britain was, I did not feel myself justified in then entering upon a discussion of the question. I realized—what some hon. members do not always perhaps so fully realize—that the affairs of the country could go on for another year or another session even though I did not speak on the question. I intended then, if it turned as I anticipated it would, that a system which better commended itself to my judgment existed in Britain than the system introduced on that occasion, to take the opportunity when I could of ventilating my views to this House. I am not satisfied with the manner in which we settled the question of the retiring allowance to ministers and I am glad to find we will have an opportunity of discussing and reconsidering it. But I want to take no doubtful, vaccillating position on the question of indemnity. I want to say to this House that, in my opinion, a member of the House of Commons who, taking the average of long sessions and short sessions—and there is no reason that we should not have some short sessions, and there is no avoiding very many long sessions—I say that a member of the House of Commons who attends to his duties to the best of his ability and is capable of attending to them—and his constituents are the best judges of that—who is here from day to day attending to the affairs of the country, is well worth $2,500. And whenever my constituents think I am not worth that, I am ready to retire from public life. In the county of Simcoe from which I come, I have no mortgage on the people and they are under no necessity to send me here. If they do not think I earn my $2,500, they will have no difficulty in finding men in every concession worth that indemnity, and they are at perfect liberty to send such men here and I shall retire to a position more suitable perhaps to me than the one I occupy. But whatever way this comes up—I care not whether by round robin or square robin or any other way I knew of nothing dishonourable in the conduct of members of this House on either side with regard to this matter, and I would have been glad, had it been opportune, to have spoken on this question of indemnity and justified my views. But if I was silent, I understood that I was the one to take that money and use it for my own purposes. If I did not think I was justified in taking it for my own purposes, I would not consider I was justified in taking it for any other purpose. I intend to take and enjoy it as far as I can, so long as it is the law of the land; and I have no hesitation in enunciating my views and making my position known in so far as it is in the public interest that it should be known. I have not gone down hat in hand in my riding to my constituents, it is true, but I shall go to them when they want me and when the occasion arises, and I shall not go to them feeling that I have been less fairly their representative in the last session than in the previous sessions. I am sorry to have to differ to some extent from my hon. friend who has just spoken. (Mr. W. F. Maclan); I know, he is an old member of this House. Besmirched! I know that he commands a very powerful organ and that it is dangerous for me to speak even in this mild way in opposition to him. But this is a free country, and I believe the decision last session was in the main the honest expression of the people's representatives; and taking that view I am

not prepared to say that I or any other hon. member need fear censure for what we did on that occasion.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford). Before the question is put, I desire to say a word regarding the speech from the Throne. What this House was called together particularly for was to deal with the tariff problem. Last year when the tariff commission was appointed I asked whether it was a life-saving crew or simply a coroner's jury. By that I meant whether it was intended to rescue the expiring industries of Canada or simply intended to bring in a verdict as to why they died. It appears now the latter is the case. This is not a new matter. I have positive knowledge that for at least four years this government has promised tariff revision. We sent a deputation from Brantford four years ago to interview the government on this very matter. We were asked then to keep a certain industry afloat, which was in a dying condition, and that later it would receive assistance from the government. That was the cutlery industry which has since been obliged to shut down. The minister said the tariff would engage the attention of the government the following year and therefore nothing would be done that year. The ministers were going over to the colonial conference and expected some arrangements might be made there which might affect the tariff and it would not do to make any change just then. Again the following year the government promised relief. They went to the country in 1904, and if I remember rightly the First Minister made at Valleyfield a speech promising shortly a revision of the tariff. We have now come to the second session, and we are told that the principal business which we supposed we were called together for, is not to be dealt with. Why delay for two months the calling of the House together in order that the tariff commission might make their proposed revision, and then, when we meet two months later, be told that the tariff is not to be dealt with at all. That surely is a very strange proceeding. The country expects that if tariff alterations are needed they should speedily be forthcoming. This government however, appears to think that there is no necessity for them to redeem their pledges. I believe this government does not sincerely intend to make any material changes in the tariff. It may be said that no industries are suffering, but I took occasion last session to point out several. Take for instance the binder twine industry, which has some 12 factories, two of which are located in my constituency. They made urgent representations to the government to save the millions of dollars of capital invested in that industry and protect the workingmen engaged in it by giving some compensation for the injury inflicted by the government giving a free entry to American twine. I believe the duty was 12½ per cent when this government came in. Since then, the article has been made entirely free. If I am rightly informed, 40,000 farmers in this country have stock in binder twine concerns. If there is one product more than another in the manufacture of which the farmer has the right to be interested, it is binder twine, an article that he uses every day in summer on his farm, an article that he understands, and the price of which he watches thoroughly. These men ventured their money in this industry in good faith. In my own county, I believe, there are upwards of 4,000 farmers interested in the manufacture of binder twine. These industries in some cases,, are in a dying condition. In others they are in a dead condition. The factory in Brandon is closed up. The fate of other factories is trembling in the balance. Yet the government declare that they are not prepared to do anything.

Then there is the case of the woollen industry. The people engaged in that industry have sent deputation after deputation to impress upon the authorities the need of immediate action. We have seen several mills sold under the hammer. But the government is not ready to move even yet. Other industries must die; other millions of capital must be wiped out before this government will rise to the occasion and redeem their sacred promise that, if returned to power, they would immediately revise the tariff. This is the second session of parliament and now they tell us that although they have travelled all over the country and obtained all the information, still they do not propose to act. I, for one, raise my voice against this conduct. I think this House should have proceeded to deal with this question immediately. It would not have taken very long if dealt with in a businesslike way. There are industries at this moment that demand the attention of this parliament. An increase of the tariff is necessary as much in the interest of the farmer as to the manufacturer. This country is no longer an agricultural country, pure and simple, but is largely a manufacturing country. The products of the factories fully equal, if they do not exceed, those of the farm. Hon. gentlemen opposite may dispute that, but I believe that the census prepared by the Minister of Agriculture, who is an authority on these matters, will show that the factories of Canada are producing as much as its farms and that the workmen in the factories are as numerous as the farmers and therefore entitled to equal consideration with the others. I do not ask that injustice be done to the farmers—far from it. Even farmers in my own county are asking for an increase in the tariff. I believe that the market gardeners in Centre York, represented by an hon. gentleman opposite (Mr. Campbell), have asked for the same thing. Throughout the province of Ontario many farmers are in favour of tariff revision,

and have asked for it. All the more, therefore, do I contend that it was the duty of this government to redeem the pledge that they made over and over again and to prepare for the carrying out of which they have travelled over this country from end to end taking evidence, at great expense to the public. We should have met in January, and we meet in March. Yet notwithstanding this delay, we are told that the revision will not go on. It is true that an accident has befallen the Finance Minister, for which I am sorry. But then the business of this country should not rest upon the shoulders of any one man. It becomes this House to deal with the tariff, which is a matter of the greatest national importance, and which has been fairly brought before this government and this parliament and which this parliament is expected to deal with. I, for one, raise my protest against nothing being said in the King's speech on this matter which I believe would be one of the principal matters for this House to deal with. It may be personally convenient for me, or pleasant for me, to have summer holidays. But the very existence of millions of capital depends upon the action of this House; and it is the duty of parliament to protect that capital and the men whom it employs and who must labour in the summer as well as in the winter.

Now, a word as to a subject which has been mentioned here, and in which I have taken a deep interest. I am glad to see that the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) is still in his place. He is looking at his watch, but I hope he will allow me a few minutes to take extreme exception to his statement regarding preferential trade. I have been a strong advocate of that policy for fifteen years, and I am not ashamed to declare my opinions in this House or elsewhere. I had the honour in 1903 when the Congress of the Chamber of Commerce of the Empire was assembled in Montreal, to be chosen as the Canadian leader on this question, and I had the honour to move the resolution on that occasion. There were representatives there from every important town and city in the Dominion of Canada. And, with only one exception every Canadian representative, from Victoria to Halifax, spoke and voted in favour of preferential trade with Great Britain. The Minister of Agriculture takes little account of merchants and manufacturers, it is true, but appeals to the farmers and says that the farmers have no use for preferential trade. I take issue with the minister; I know that such is not the case. The Manitoba legislature has passed a resolution in favour of this policy. The New Brunswick resolution has been mentioned. And we know that there is a feeling throughout this country from end to end in favour of mutually preferential trade. There is no doubt the minister made a very serious mistake in his statement in Montreal. He was completely out of accord with his own cabinet—or they have misrepresented their stand not only to the people of Canada but to the people of the empire. What did they go to the colonial conference for, if not to place their views on record? And what were their views? They had given a substantial preference, and were ready to go further as soon as Great Britain would move. Was that the view of the Minister of Agriculture? If not, the cabinet misrepresented him on that occasion. I contend that the cabinet has more than once committed itself to the doctrine of preferential trade. It is true that the farmers do not want any more of what the minister calls a 'preference' because it is jug-handle preference—all on one side, and was never intended to bear the meaning that he puts upon it. He says that we have a preference now. Let the minister state wherein we have a preference. Sir, we have not one atom of preference in the British market. The products of Russia, of the United States, of every country that is most hostile to Great Britain, come in there on the same terms as those of Canada. But we know—at least I think I know—that the minister spoke his own true sentiments when he made that speech. And the 'Herald,' his own newspaper has always been—at least has been for several years past—against that policy. It attacked me most severely, and in a very unjust way, because I moved that resolution. And, from that day to this it has been against the policy of preferential trade—there is no doubt about that. The Minister of Agriculture, to-night, has let the cat out of the bag. His explanations here will not be satisfactory to this House, or to the country, or to the empire. I think the minister showed his imperialist spirit last session when he attacked the British attitude on the cattle embargo. He styled that 'an unfriendly act.' These words generally come from an ambassador who is about to break off relations with the country of which he is speaking. I do not know whether the Minister of Agriculture was speaking in that sense or not. But when the words 'an unfriendly act' are used, the next move generally involves something more violent than words.

Whether the Minister of Agriculture meant that or not, that was the impression left upon the minds of many who heard him. Now he comes up and attacks the British preference. We have long thought that this government is opposed to it. I said the first moment the preference was brought down in its present shape that it was a deadly blow at what they had been championing for years. We have been obliged to change the name, and to call it a mutual preference, in order to separate it from what

this government calls a preference. The hon. gentleman says the voice of Great Britain has decided with no uncertain sound that they want none of it. Not so sure, Mr. Speaker, about that. Forty-four per cent, we are told, of the electors of Great Britain voted in favour of the Chamberlain policy pure and simple. That is not so bad when we consider that in the last British house there was not a man elected on that platform. Even Mr. Chamberlain himself during the previous election was opposed to it, and now he sits in the House heading a solid phalanx of about 150 members elected for that very purpose, putting through what the Minister of Agriculture says Canada does not want. If he thinks that question is dead, I do not agree with him. I think the fight is but beginning, and I think he will find that it is going to be a very live question in the British empire for the next few years. While he may rejoice that Great Britain turned down that project apparently, in the meantime we who advocate the policy are by no means discouraged. We know that a solid phalanx of 150 men have been elected there to support the policy, and it is well enunciated as a policy of the unity of the empire based upon commercial bonds.

Though the Minister of Agriculture says that he wants none of it, I think he does not speak for the whole of Canada, not even for those whom he professes to speak for, the farmers. I believe that if there is one class in this country more than another who would rejoice at a mutual preference it is the farmers. They have more to gain than any others. The hon. gentleman tells us we have a preference already. Not a bit of it. We have no preference at all in the British market other than what quantity and quality give us, and that is good in any market. Britain does not buy our cheese because it is made in Canada, but because it is of the right quality. She does not buy our bacon because it is made in Canada, but because it is of the right quality. But where is our preference in the British market ? They have bought their butter from Denmark for years, and if we could deflect a part of that trade in our direction would that not be an advantage to our farmers ? If we could succeed in getting our cattle into Great Britain alive, as they used to enter, would not that be an advantage to Canada ? Still the hon. gentleman says that we want none of this mutual preference. I contend, Mr. Speaker, that if there is one policy that this country does want it is a mutual preference in Great Britain. Therefore I sincerely regret that the hon. gentleman has gone back upon what his cabinet had said they wished for when they visited England. They put themselves on record there as being in favour of a preferential tariff between Canada and Great Britain. I believe at that time they were sincere, if they were not sincere, it is much to be regretted that they misled the public men and the people of Great Britain. The speech of the Minister of Agriculture has been quoted from end to end of Great Britain. He tells us it attracted more attention than he expected. It is true it attracted more attention than any speech the hon. gentleman has ever made. But it was not on account of its wisdom, not on account of its eloquence, nor of its policy, but it was because it caused a tremor throughout the British empire, it caused an unrest, and men looked into each others' faces and said, what does that government of Canada really mean ? We would like to know what this government really means. Here is a minister of the Crown who tells us to-day that he was speaking simply as a farmer. I do not know whether his voice as a farmer is any less mighty than it is as Minister of Agriculture. I think I would as soon accept his word as a farmer as I would accept it as Minister of Agriculture, I think it is quite as valuable. But no doubt he was speaking what he felt in his own mind at the time, and that he did rejoice that in the meantime the Chamberlain policy had been knocked out, as he expressed it. But it is not dead. It is true that for a time it will not become the law of Great Britain nor of the empire ; but I am still one of those who are enthusiastic enough to believe that Great Britain will yet see that it is in her interest and in the interest of the whole empire. I believe she will yet establish a mutual bond of trade between herself and all her colonies, and thus preserve for all time the British empire. The hon. gentleman tells us that we can be loyal without any trade sentiment. That is quite true, Mr. Speaker. We have been giving our lip loyalty to Great Britain for many years past and our trade to the United States. We desire that more of our trade should be given to Great Britain and less to the United States, and the way to bring that about is by a mutual preferential tariff.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have heard something about solidarity in the cabinet. We have been told that it exists in the Liberal party. I do not think myself that it is very creditable to hon. gentlemen to rejoice over those Northwest elections. They may feel a certain pride in those elections that is not shared by all their friends, and it is not shared by any on this side of the House. If there is anything about which we should be ashamed, Mr. Speaker, it is the way those elections have been carried on in the two new provinces. The speech from the Throne says they are the most contented people in the world. I take issue with that statement. I had an opportunity of being in those provinces prior to the election, and I make bold to say that if the voice of the people of Saskatchewan had received a fair expression at the polls, Mr. Haultain would

to-day be at the head of the government. That is my private opinion. We know a little of what was done and perhaps we may know more. We know that employees of this government were doing things that ought not to be done. The trial of those men took place in secret, and most of the particulars have not come out. We are told that those two men who were at that time employees, I believe, of the Minister of the Interior, were fined $200 for pocketing the votes of two polls, putting them in without consulting any elector. Surely, Mr. Speaker, this is a new kind of voting machine they have got in the west. We are told that 150 votes were deposited without any one having marked the ballots but the deputy returning officer. If that is anything to glory in, Mr. Speaker, by all means let us glory, but remember that we are glorying in our shame. There never was an election held in any province in Canada about which we need to be more ashamed than that election in Saskatchewan. If this country is ever to be good and great it must begin to purify the methods by which we place public men in power. I contend that instead of saying that these people are the most satisfied, we should say that they have good grounds for being the most dissatisfied people in the Dominion of Canada. That is not the only constituency, I am told, in which work was done that should not have been done. I believe we will hear more about it, we will see further revelations that will show us that these methods were not confined to one constituency. I believe that Mr. Haultain was entitled to and did receive the larger part of the vote of those people who voted without let or hindrance for the cause of truth and right.

That is my belief. I travelled in that country about the time of the election and I had some means of hearing and knowing what was going on. I expected no different result from what I heard on that occasion. But this I think, Mr. Speaker, is nothing for us to rejoice at, it is far better for us to rejoice in a defeat if it were honourable than in a victory if it were dishonourable, and I contend that the reference to these provinces being in a state of great content is putting words into the mouth of a large section of that people that they do not feel. This I regret to have to say but I take this opportunity of stating what is only a personal view it is true, but a view which was formed to a certain extent from a journey I made throughout these provinces, and I believe that Mr. Haultain to-day has the confidence of more than one-half of the electorate of the province of Saskatchewan. That belief may be held to be falsely based, it is only of course a personal opinion but it is my strong personal conviction that he has that confidence and that therefore another government than the one that is now in power should be in office and if that is the case I contend that the province of Saskatchewan has no great reason to rejoice at what the speech from the Throne says, that they are the most contented people on the face of the earth. I have made these few remarks because I believe these are serious matters and matters that call for more earnest consideration than has been given them by some of the hon. gentlemen of the government side, and I think that the country has reason to expect that more would be done by this parliament than the speech from the throne outlines.

Mr. R. N. WALSH (Huntingdon). I do not desire to detain the House by referring to other matters than the indemnity question which has been introduced. I wish at this, my first opportunity, to place myself on record. As I never at any time supported the measure I have no apologies to offer as some of the gentlemen who have spoken here to-day have done. As to the reasons advanced pro and con I have but one which is sufficient for me. That is, that my constituents are very much opposed to it, even our county Liberal association passed a strong resolution in opposition to it. I feel I am here to carry out their wishes and any measure which looks towards cancelling the increased indemnity, except the increase to the premier and to the judges will receive my support.

Mr. R. S. LAKE (Qu'Appelle). Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to occupy the time of the House to any very great extent this evening but I do think it is my duty as one of the members from the province of Saskatchewan to repudiate in the strongest possible manner the suggestion that has been made that the recent elections which have been held in that province have resulted in an endorsation of the Autonomy Acts which we passed last year. I believe, Sir, that the people of that country will be fully justified in considering that any action which may be taken by their legislature in regard to those Acts is not binding on them for all time to come. The election frauds which have been perpetrated in that country are to my mind some of the most shameful that have ever taken place either in this country or any other country in the world. When the Prime Minister was speaking this afternoon he treated it lightly and said that because some single fraud had come to light in one single constituency that it could not be taken as granted that the people of that country had not had an opportunity of exercising their full franchise. But the Prime Minister has not been fully informed as to what has been going on in the Northwest. He does not know that in more than one other constituency exactly the same species of fraud has been going on as was going on in the district of Prince Albert. In the district of Battleford it has been distinctly charged in the public press, and I

believe there is very good foundation for the charge, that another employee of the Department of the Interior perpetrated exactly the same fraud, that is to say, he went up into the distant country away to the north and there himself wrote out false lists and marked ballots for the Liberal, for the coercionist candidate. Then again we have heard of a very strong and well supported case of fraud in regard to the election in Regina city. If he studied the papers he would also find that in the city of Moosejaw so great was the anticipation that the ballot boxes would be interfered with there that the provincial righters had to keep an armed guard night and day over those boxes and there is no doubt that throughout the length and breadth of the province of Saskatchewan there was the greatest amount of fraud in regard to this election. In addition to all this there were all the forces of misrepresentation and of intimidation and undue influence by federal officials. At the vote which was cast on December 13 last there an increase of some 35 per cent over the votes which were cast just one year previously and I think it is not too much to say that one-quarter of the votes which were cast at this election were cast by men who were dependent upon the government of the day in regard to obtaining patents for the lands for which they had entered and that they were dependent also upon the good-will of the government officials to whom it would be perfectly easy, and it is perfectly easy, to either facilitate the granting of their patents or else to throw every obstacle in the way, and I know perfectly well that this has been done. One gentleman told me he had a message sent to him, through his son, from the Dominion lands agent in his district. The message was to this effect: Tell your father if he wants his patent he had better take a little less active part in the election. That was the message and I think it must be clear to any one here present that the officials of that department have an enormous amount of influence in regard to these matters and that they exercised it in the most unlawful way. The Minister of the Interior himself must know this and I think that in view of the resolution which was passed unanimously by this House last summer, that it is only fair to ask him whether, if it is proved to him that one of his officials up there has taken an active part in this election he is prepared to dismiss that official. I think that is a fair question to ask him. I know that in one instance the Minister of the Interior himself took the platform in support of a coercionist candidate and the chairman of his meeting the most active Liberal in that district was his own sub-agent for Dominion lands. It appears to me that it would be impossible to show a greater contempt for the authority of this House than was shown in many instances in the Northwest during the last election. There has been also a most significant diminution in the Liberal majority throughout that country. In the year 1904, there was a Liberal majority cast of 4,300 votes, whereas in 1905 that majority had come down to 1,432. At any rate that is what is claimed but I think we have ample evidence already that a considerable number of those votes were bogus votes simply marked by the election officials themselves and not by the people of the country. And how was this majority composed, Mr. Speaker? I took the trouble to analyse the vote in the district in which my own property is situated, a district with which I am pretty well acquainted.

I find that of the English speaking vote in that district, two and a half to one was the proportion in favour of the provincial rights candidate, or 642 votes to 265; whereas of the foreign speaking vote the majority against the provincial rights candidate and in favour of the coercionist candidate was upwards of eight to one, or 380 to 45. I am not surprised that under these circumstances the member for West Assiniboia (Mr Knowles) should speak of the Doukhobors and the Galicians as being such very good friends of his. The figures I have given in regard to my own district are not isolated; you will find that similar figures exist in other parts of the country. It is a thing which ought to be expected, because we know that these immigrants who come from continental Europe have been accustomed all their lives to be under the influence of officialdom, and so they came especially under the influence of the officials of this government, and that influence, as far as my experience goes, is always partisan. Then, these same European immigrants, intelligent men as most of them are, educated men as some of them are, still they do not have the opportunity of studying the questions of the day in the same manner as English speaking immigrants. And for the present at any rate they have not the same opportunity of casting an intelligent vote on public questions. When the matter is put before them they are more likely to say: I will vote for my own interest and be quite sure that I can get my land from this government. We have heard it claimed by the government to-day, that the legislation of last year was endorsed by the people. Well, the federal government were extremely anxious that the people should endorse that legislation, and they had a deep interest in its endorsation by the people of the west. They have profited by the elections in Saskatchewan and Alberta, and that being so, I claim they must accept their full share of the responsibility from the very beginning for the methods by which that success was secured. The very first step in the direction of obtaining that success is to be found in the gerrymander which was perpetrated here last session. When you look back at what has since taken place, it will be seen that

it was necessary for this government to endeavour to throw as many constituencies as they possibly could into the northern and more remote portions of the province of Saskatchewan. As I demonstrated last session, the people in the northern portion or the old district of Saskatchewan are in reality entitled to about six seats, whereas the government gave them nine seats out of the twenty-five. The figures upon which I based my argument were supplied by the government and they proved my contention conclusively and it was a significant fact that neither the Minister of Justice who had charge of the Bill, nor the Prime Minister, nor the Minister of the Interior, undertook to defend the distribution of the constituencies in that province. They left the entire defence of that unjust measure to Mr. Scott, member for West Assiniboia, and to Mr. Lamont, who were to be the principal beneficiaries of it after the government. These two gentlemen certainly defended the measure with a great deal of vigour, but I do not think they impressed any one in this House with the justness of the claims they put forward. The election figures since obtained have completely demonstrated the correctness of our contention and the futility of the arguments of Mr. Scott and Mr. Lamont. It will be remembered that we asked for a commission of judges that they might give us a fair distribution of seats, and that appeal, reasonable and just as it was, was refused by the government. Failing in that appeal I undertook at a small committee meeting of representatives of both sides of the House to propose a distribution of my own, and it is a great satisfaction to me now, after the elections have taken place, to find that the distribution I suggested was soundly conceived. Indeed, in my anxiety to be scrupulously fair to my opponents, I did give more representation to the north than it was really justly entitled to. I contend that if the distribution I had suggested had been followed by the government it would have fallen in to a certain extent with what is, after all, the basic principle upon which our constitutional government is founded, that of representation by population; a principle that was outrageously ignored in the distribution that was made by the government. Just let me point out to the House some of the figures in regard to these constituencies. They are practically the same in proportion as those I gave to the House last year; they are slightly increased but they have the same proportionate increase all through. In the district of Souris in the south, one of the oldest districts in that country which gave a majority of 321 for the provincial rights candidate, there were 3,259 votes cast and the constituency returned one member. Now turn to the north, and that is where the government officials were able to get in their work, away in the back settlements in the remote north where our people were unable to follow them. We find that Redberry had 515 votes cast, Prince Albert District, 582 votes, Prince Albert city, 618 votes, Batoche, 799 votes. To this I think you might add the district of Humboldt, which, though it went by acclamation, would in all probability have cast the same proportionately larger number of votes that were cast in the other districts which would give it a vote of 261. Each one of these districts got one member, or five members in the north for a total of 2,775 votes, while in the south only one member was given for 3,259 votes, and much the same thing could be said about South Qu'Appelle as I have said about Souris. I suppose this is what the government will call representation by population. There is one thing in regard to the district of Prince Albert which I think ought to be mentioned here, and that is, that there was apparently a regular set plan to capture that district in the way in which it was captured.

Under the territorial election law, there being no voters' lists in the Northwest drawn up it was possible to have additional polling places formed by the returning officer on the application of any individual, on the sworn statement that there were a certain number of voters who were not within a certain radius of a polling place. The polling places in the Prince Albert district were fixed by proclamation, and up to the hour of nomination none except those who were in the secret knew that there were going to be any other polling places. The nomination passed off quietly and then the returning officer, who, if he did allot any other polling places, was bound under the law to give notice to both candidates that he had done so by six o'clock of that day, immediately took a rig and drove out to a country post office thirty-five miles distant, and waited until the mail had gone—it was a two-weekly mail—and then registered a letter before six o'clock notifying the provincial rights candidate that he had placed three other polls away out in the country to the north at points which were unknown to the provincial rights candidate. This notice only reached the provincial rights candidate on the 7th day of December, when it was a physical impossibility in that country for him to get his men out in order to look after those polls. In the meantime he had met the returning officer in the streets of Prince Albert, and they had passed the time of day, and nothing had been said to him in regard to those additional polls; and, when after he had received the registered letter he went to the returning officer and made a complaint, the returning officer said he had complied with the strict letter of the law. That is the story, as I heard it from Mr. Donaldson, the provincial rights candidate himself. Such things as these are very likely to make men rise up and say, we are determined that we will

enforce the right to govern ourselves and will not have our rights and our liberties stolen from us by such methods as these. I consider that by their distribution of the constituencies alone the Government are responsible to a certain extent for the crimes that have taken place in that far northern country. But this was not all. The government did not feel entirely safe in simply putting the votes in those districts where they could control them. The electoral machinery must be in the hands of men who would employ the criminals to perpetrate frauds such as those which were practised, and which could be practised only with the connivance of the election officials. And so Mr. Haultain was deposed. It has been stated that Mr. Haultain, after the resignation of certain members of the legislative assembly to run in the Dominion elections, had no longer a majority of members of the territorial assembly; but, taking the province of Saskatchewan, that is entirely untrue. Mr. Haultain had a majority of the members of the province of Saskatchewan still at his back at the time he was deposed from being the prime minister of that province.

I was very glad that the Prime Minister came out to-day with a straight statement that he was not in any way concerned with the action of Mr. Forget in calling upon Mr. Scott, because I can assure him that there was a very general opinion throughout the whole Northwest that the deposition of Mr. Haultain and the calling of Mr. Scott were due to the influence of the Prime Minister himself. In fact, it was only the other day that a letter written by Mr. Scott himself to one of his supporters at Drinkwater was published with Mr. Scott's own consent in order to prove some point in connection with the elections; and in that letter, which was dated the 21st of July last from the House of Commons here, Mr. Scott said this:

> I may say that Laurier all along has seemed to be of the opinion that Haultain ought to be called as premier of one of the provinces. Had Haultain acted with any approach at propriety under the circumstances I believe that Laurier would have absolutely refused to pass him over. His whole conduct, however, from first to last in this business has been execrable. His going into Oxford and London, combined with the threat he made at Woodstock on election night to stir up a school question in one of the new provinces if he obtained control, compelled Laurier to change his mind.

I am therefore very glad that the Prime Minister has spoken out, and I think he may well ask to be saved from his friends when they write and make such an accusation against him. Then, with regard to the Lieutenant-Governor of Saskatchewan and his reasons for selecting a partisan to carry on the government, here is what Mr. Scott himself said in his address to the electors of Lumsden:

> A word respecting the fact that Mr. Haultain is not the first premier of Saskatchewan seems called for. The selection of another by the representative of the Crown was due to the attitude which Mr. Haultain adopted towards our new provincial constitution. . . . The selection of myself was doubtless due to the Liberal party in the province having induced me some time previously to accept the leadership of the party. That the Crown acted upon Liberal advice is a charge I shall not try to refute. . . . The truth is that Mr. Haultain's conduct made him a simple impossibility for selection.

That is Mr. Scott's idea of what the truth is, and no doubt he is sincere in stating it. I myself think the truth was that it was absolutely necessary for the future of this government that those Bills should be endorsed by the provinces of the Northwest, and they were prepared to take the readiest means at hand to secure that endorsation.

The Prime Minister this afternoon made a charge against Mr. Haultain in regard to the autonomy legislation. He stated that Mr. Haultain in London and North Oxford would do all in his power—not that he said he would, but that was the gist of his speeches—to destroy the constitution; and further, that he had avowed his intention of putting a ruthless hand upon the constitution. Now, I think that any one who studies the action of Mr. Haultain must know perfectly well that that is a most unfair interpretation to put upon his speeches and his action. It was not that he wished to lay a ruthless hand upon the constitution but that he desired to appeal to the Privy Council in England in order to prevent the First Minister from laying a ruthless hand and violating, as he had done, the constitution of British North America. Mr. Haultain took no partisan course. He acted as a non-partisan and ran his election campaign as a non-partisan pure and simple. It is well known that he took no stand upon the school question and would practically not allow it to be brought into the campaign until the religious and racial question had been ruthlessly thrust into that province by the memo, of the Archbishop of St. Boniface. It had been known for a considerable time previous that pressure was being brought upon the members of the Roman Catholic church to vote for the friends of separate schools, as the archbishop's memo, put it; but it was only very shortly before the close of the campaign that that memo, came into the hands of the provincial rights party and Mr. Haultain was forced to take the stand which he could have taken earlier and which, if he had not been a man of honour, he would have taken earlier in the campaign and have, I believe, secured victory by that means. But it was not the right thing to do, and he only took the stand he did in favour of national schools when he found the influence of a certain church was brought to bear in favour of separate schools. In my opinion the govern-

ment must take its full share of responsibility for the electoral frauds committed in that country. There was the visit of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) to that country which could not have failed to encourage his officials. I do not believe for a moment that the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) or other members of the government knew anything of the details of the conspiracy which was being hatched up there to carry these elections, but their actions made such a conspiracy possible and I hold that they are responsible for the results. Three of the officials in the Prince Albert district pleaded guilty to not opening polls in that district and were fined $200 each. But it is common report that if they did not open polls, at any rate they produced ballot boxes full of ballots. Is not that also a crime—the stuffing of ballot boxes? Yet we do not find the government taking any action to bring these men to justice. If they wish to clear themselves in the eyes of the people, they should send these men to penal servitude for a long period of time; but whatever they do, they can never get over the fact that the Saskatchewan election was gained by unfair methods and that the people of the province cannot be held bound by the results of that election.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I do not wish to delay the House, but in view of the very definite charges made by the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, it would hardly be seemly for me, as the minister responsible for the Interior Department, to allow these charges to pass unchallenged; and while dealing with them, I may refer incidentally to some of the other matters which have been brought into this discussion without, it seems to me, the slightest necessity or excuse. I am certainly at a loss to know in what degree the question of imperial preference is concerned in the reply to the speech from the Throne and am equally unable to understand why the results in the Saskatchewan provincial election should require to be dealt with on the same occasion.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. They were introduced by the mover of the address.

Mr. OLIVER. But as my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) has seen fit to say that the officials of the Interior Department made use of their position to intimidate electors in the recent provincial elections in Alberta and Saskatchewan, I have this to say in reply. I must admit that I was guilty of the crime of being present in Alberta and Saskatchewan during those elections and I did hear the allegations made there which the hon. gentleman has repeated here. My reply to that allegation, wherever I heard it, was this, that if it could be shown to me that any official of the department over which I have control had used his position to intimidate any elector or hold out improper inducements to any elector, I would see that he was instantly dismissed. I asked for proof on platform after platform and the first atom of proof has never yet been offered or suggested. My hon. friend has said that some land agent of the government sent word to some voter that if he wanted to secure his patent he had better cease his activity. If my hon. friend will make good that allegation, I will guarantee him that the agent in question will forthwith cease to serve his country. And if the hon. gentleman does not make his charge good, I shall certainly expect him to apologize to this House for having made it. With regard to the so-called activity of the officials of the Interior Department, these hon. gentlemen have been good enough to suggest that the victory of the Scott government in the province of Saskatchewan was due in a very large measure to that activity. Well, there were two provincial elections in the west last fall—one in Alberta and one in Saskatchewan. Do these hon. gentlemen suggest that the victory of the Rutherford government in Alberta was due to the activity of the Interior Department officials in that province? If they do, they must give these officials credit for a very large amount of influence over the public mind. But if they are not to be credited with the victory in Alberta, I submit that neither are they entitled to be credited with the victory in Saskatchewan. The two provinces lie alongside each other and in each the conditions are similar. The officials of the Interior Department have just as much influence in the one as in the other, and it is not reasonable to suggest that the elections were won in one province by these officials and not in the other.

The gentlemen opposite have rather peculiar ideas of election, it seems to me. Their idea of a proper election is one in which the other party shall be eliminated and they shall have the privilege of casting all the votes. It would appear from what they say that it is an offence for a citizen of the Northwest to exercise the franchise, to express an opinion, or even to hold an opinion; and it is still more a crime on the part of an elector of the Northwest in the person of my humble self to go there and take part in an election. I do not agree with these gentlemen. And I wish to say further that I think it is a very serious question just how far a government has a right, by virtue of its authority, to trespass upon the rights of the citizen in the exercise of his franchise. I had occasion to express my views on that point, and I did express them, in the Northwest. The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) did me the honour to partially quote my expressions. I will take the liberty of stating to the House what I said. I said that officials of the government were citizens, therefore they had the right to vote. I said that, having intelligence—supposedly having intelligence—they had the right to choose on which side they should vote. And I said that, having the power of speech they had the

right to express their opinions. But the question of improper interference is not to be settled in a general way; each case must rest upon its own basis. To say that a man may be driven from the public service because he has a vote, because he has an opinion and expresses that opinion—it seems to me that is a most unwarrantable and most unjustifiable trespass upon the rights of citizenship. Especially is that the case when the political question at issue is not one in which the government having control of these officials is directly concerned. There may be a reason—there might be a reason—for the government exercising an arbitrary and otherwise unjustifiable authority over its officials in the case of an election in which it was concerned. But to say that they must practically disfranchise or de-citizenise their employees in regard to all questions coming before the public, provincial, municipal or otherwise, is, it seems to me, unreasonable, improper and absurd; and, if hon. gentlemen opposite wish to take that position, I can only say that they are welcome to it and that I take issue with them upon it.

As to the Prince Albert election case which has been mentioned, I have seen many arguments in the newspapers holding the right hon. Prime Minister of this Dominion (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) directly responsible for this outrage. The argument is this: the Prime Minister was responsible for the organization of the province—the organization of the province involved the appointment of a provincial premier—elections had to be held and returning officers appointed by the provincial government of which the provincial premier was the head;—and therefore in the last analyses the Prime Minister of Canada was responsible for the stuffing of the ballot boxes in Prince Albert. It has been alleged that those concerned in this 'outrage' were employees of the Department of the Interior. So far as I was able to learn on inquiry, I find that one of these men had been in the employ of the department as a fire ranger; that is, he was subject to be called upon to work for the department during the season in looking after forest fires. He was not in the employ of the department at the time the alleged outrage took place. Another man, Sutherland, had recently been appointed Indian farm instructor, and was technically in the employ of the department. The third person concerned was not an employee of this government, and so far as I know, never had been. The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) has suggested that it was highly improper and an evidence of partisanship that gentlemen who held a position under the government should accept the position of poll clerk or returning officer if an election took place. I take issue on that point. I do not see that the acceptance by an individual of an appointment to act as returning officer or poll clerk is evidence of partisanship. Every man knows that the returning officer, the deputy returning officer and the poll clerk are supposed, at any rate—and so far as oath of office can bind any man they are bound—to act impartially. Now, it must be known that in the outlying districts it is not always easy to secure the services of men who are competent to hold a poll. Therefore, there is nothing unreasonable or improper in the department, under the circumstances, permitting one of its officials to act as such officer. However, these men acted as they did. They were supposed to have held this poll; they did not hold it; they were discovered in their wrong doing and were brought before a court and punished as the law provides. They were brought before a magistrate's court and brought there at the instance of the aggrieved candidate. The court was of his own choosing and the punishment was awarded by that court. It was not the maximum punishment permitted by the law. I fail to see wherein the Department of the Interior or the Indian Department is in any way responsible for the action or inaction of that court. My hon. friend looked at me across the floor, and asked in horror-stricken tones, if these men were still at large. I presume they are. I hope my hon. friend does not suggest that, in addition to the somewhat numerous duties already laid upon my poor shoulders, I should act the part of constable at the far distant point of Prince Albert and restrain the liberty of those who may have trespassed upon what he may consider the rights of others.

If these men are at large I presume they have a right to be at large, and if they have not a right to be at large, then the processes of law are open to my hon. friend and to his friends to take measures to restrain their liberty. As regards the gentleman who was in the employ of the Interior Department, certainly I considered that having done as he did he was not a suitable person to remain in that employ, and he was dismissed. That, I considered, was the limit of the responsibility of my department in the matter. However, I would like to point out one peculiar thing in this connection. As I said, there were three men who went north with these ballot boxes, and three men who came back, but only two were fined. The third man was the one responsible, so far as I can learn, for proposing to hold the polls in that region; he was the man supposed to know the locality, who stated there were so many people there entitled to vote, and he was the guide of this party who were to go up and take those votes. This gentleman was not an official of the Interior Department. It would almost strike one as somewhat peculiar that, when there were three men equally guilty, two of them should be fined, and the third should be still at

large and still unprosecuted? Does that look like fair-play on the part of the aggrieved candidate and his friends? Does not that look something like a persecution of the supposed officials of the government, while the gentleman who was not an official may trespass upon the law as he pleases, and there is nobody to call him to account?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the hon. gentleman say that a warrant was not issued for him?

Mr. OLIVER. I am quite certain there was no warrant.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have seen it stated in the papers that he was not arrested because he could not be found.

Mr. OLIVER. Then I am sorry to say that the press which my hon. friend has studied is not altogether reliable. The gentleman in question is an old resident of that part of the country, there is no difficulty in finding him. His name is Moberly, and he is to be seen from time to time on the streets of Prince Albert. He says there is no danger of his being arrested because he has been concerned in similar business for the opposition party on previous occasions, and they dare not arrest him. There is no better known man in that country than Mr. Moberly, he has left his name all over the country.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What were the previous occasions in which he was concerned?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not a resident of that part of the country, and cannot tell the hon. gentleman what were the previous occasions. I am merely stating what I am told Mr. Moberly said, and which I verily believe to be true.

Mr. BRODER. Since the machinery of justice was in Liberal hands, why did it not take charge of a man like that?

Mr. OLIVER. The machinery of justice in that part of the country will have to answer for itself. I am answering for myself and for the department which I administer, and which has been accused here of certain crimes and misdemeanours. I am not answering for the provincial administration of justice. I know nothing about the law in the matter, I do not know how far these people are subject to the law. But I assume that the machinery of justice in the province of Saskatchewan is subject to be put in motion by any person who may feel himself aggrieved, and that if these gentlemen feel themselves aggrieved it is for them to put that machinery in motion and secure justice.

Mr. BARKER. What about the government?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know that the responsibility rests upon the government of that province any more than it does upon the aggrieved individual. However, that is a matter for lawyers to settle. I am not a lawyer, and therefore cannot give the hon. gentleman an authoritative opinion on that point. I repeat, however, that if there are people in that district of Prince Albert who feel themselves aggrieved, it is their privilege as it is their right and duty to set that machinery in motion.

Mr. BRODER. Is not the action of this man a crime against the state rather than against an individual?

Mr. OLIVER. As I said, I am not a lawyer and cannot answer these intricate questions.

Mr. BRODER. Common sense would answer that question.

Mr. OLIVER. Some of us are short on that commodity.

Mr. BRODER. So it appears.

Mr. OLIVER. There is another point that our friends opposite have dealt with very exhaustively, and that is the action of the Lieutenant Governor of Saskatchewan in failing to call upon Mr. Haultain to form the government of that province. It seems that is an outrage, an imposition, for which the right hon. leader of this House is responsible. I am not very familiar with affairs in Saskatchewan, but I would like to remind the House that if Mr. Haultain had claims on the premiership of either of the two provinces, it was upon the premiership of Alberta and not upon that of Saskatchewan. Mr. Haultain had been a resident of Alberta ever since he went to the west, he had represented an Alberta constituency during all that period of his public life, and it seems to me that if Mr. Haultain had a claim to the premiership of any province it was to that of Alberta, and if he was turned down he was turned down by Lieutenant Governor Bulyea and not by Lieutenant Governor Forget. But whether he was turned down by the one or the other makes no difference, since he was most effectively turned down by the electors of the province of Saskatchewan to which court he made his appeal.

Now, something has been said about stealing elections. I desire to say that Mr. Haultain and his friends, by the issues which they undertook to raise in the province of Saskatchewan, took a more discreditable means to steal the election than the men who stuffed that ballot box north of Prince Albert. I wish to call attention to the attitude taken by my hon. friend who has just sat down, as illustrating the position generally taken by our friends on the other side, and indicating one reason why the elections turned out as they did. My hon. friend has credited the foreign vote with electing the Scott government. Now, Sir, will you tell me in the name of common sense how would the foreign population be

expected to vote except against the people who were continually vilifying them, continually declaring that they were not entitled to their rights as citizens of the country? The hon. gentleman suggests that a racial and religious question was projected into that campaign by a memorandum issued by the Archbishop of St. Boniface, the tendency of which was to secure a solid Roman Catholic vote. Those of us who had the fortune, good or bad, to listen to the speeches that were made during the election in Saskatchewan will agree that a Roman Catholic would be less than a man or more than an angel to vote in support of the men and the party who were abusing him and his church as they were being abused there.

Mr. LAKE. I would like to say that such an attack was never made in my hearing and I was on a great many platforms.

Mr. OLIVER. Well, a great deal went on that my hon. friend did not hear or did not see. I wish to point out the necessary consequence of the wild and unjustifiable statements that have been made and of the attitude that has been assumed by our friends on the other side during this discussion for the simple and sole and only purpose of making party political capital when the circumstances do not justify its being made. My friend from Qu'Appelle, (Mr. Lake), has stated deliberately, has put upon 'Hansard,' upon the permanent records of this country, a declaration that the settlers of this country are subjected to terrorism on the part of the officials of this government. That charge is absolutely unfounded, and I say further that that charge would not have been made if the gentleman who made it had properly considered its necessary effect, and provided he was inspired by patriotic motives. The attempt to divide the people of that western country as between Protestant and Catholic, as between non-English speaking and English speaking, is an attempt that can do no other than harm to that country and to this, and can do no other than reflect discredit upon those who make that attempt.

Mr. URIAH WILSON (Lennox and Addington). Mr. Speaker, I wish merely to refer to what is known as the salary grab. It is well known in this House by everybody who talked to me on the subject that I opposed that. It is well known that for years I opposed the increase of the judges' salaries, and I was opposed to the increase in indemnity. When it was raised $500 from $1,000 to $1,500, we had the promise of the Prime Minister that it would be a great many years before any other increase would take place, and I am a good deal more opposed to the superannuation or the pension to ex-ministers. I had occasion to go home on Saturday, and this vote took place on Monday. I took the pains to go into the distribution office and get a copy of the Votes, and Proceedings and the Orders of the Day, and no mention of any kind was made of this at that time. Now, I am told that this notice was handed in on Sunday night, and appeared on the Order Paper on Monday morning. If that is the case I think some minister is responsible for it and ought to make an explanation to the House as Rule 31 requires two days' notice before it could have been brought up in the House, because I expected to be here when these resolutions were brought up and I expected to say something upon it, because I knew very well then as I do now, that my constituents, irrespective of their party politics, are strongly opposed to the three things, the increased salary to judges, the pension to the ex-ministers and the increase in the indemnity to members of the House of Commons and the Senate. I have heard very little or no complaint about the increase to the Prime Minister or the salary granted to the leader of the opposition. I think people generally look upon these things as being all right, but I wish to place myself on record as being strongly opposed to the other part of these resolutions and I hope before many days we will have an opportunity of dividing the House upon these three questions, or on two of them at any rate, because I think that if the government had wanted to deal fairly with this question they would have put it on the Order paper and let it stay there for two or three weeks, so as to let it be discussed through the newspapers. Or we should have told the people when we went before them for election that we were in favour of an increase in the indemnity of members of the Commons and Senators, pensions to ex-ministers, and increased salaries to judges. I am quite satisfied that if any gentleman appeals to my constituency on these terms he will be left at home, and I think justly. We are a rural district, we earn our money hard, the bulk of the people earn their money hard and they feel that this is being just a little too extravagant and that is my opinion and that is what I intend to stand for. I hope that this matter will be further discussed at an early date. It is very late to-night and I do not propose to say anything but just to put myself on record as against this.

Mr. JOHN BARR (Dufferin). I think it is rather to be regretted that it is the intention to close this debate at this late hour for it is quite evident that there are two questions foremost before this House which hon. members desire to discuss and so far as we know, having been told to-day that there is very little before the House, we certainly must remain here for a length of time even to earn the indemnity if the increase was taken off. Under these circumstances it seems to me we are beginning wrong by carrying on this debate to

such a late hour to-night. It is evident that there are a large number of members, particularly from the great Northwest, who desire to wash their dirty linen and to discuss the question of which no doubt they are full and which it is probably their duty to discuss. Then there are other bills which we will have an opportunity to discuss. No doubt many of these members came here desiring to place before the House their views in connection with the tariff question, and they will be shut off. Then again there is the insurance question which was to have come up. It is very well on occasions like this to bring up the views of hon. gentlemen on subjects of this kind in order that they may be fully considered and that the Government might have the advantage of the views of the members of the House on these questions.

Another burning question not only in this House but in this country, on which no doubt a number of members desire to express themselves, is the question of the increased indemnity to members and the pension to ex-ministers or what might be called, what has been called throughout the country, the salary grab. It was not my intention to discuss that here to-night, but the fact that the county of Dufferin, which I have the honour to represent in different meetings in their conventions both Reform and Conservative, condemned the Bill, places me in the position that I would feel bound either to resign or to emphasize the position which that is in at the present time.

That is the position I occupy, and I stated at a convention that was held a short time before I left home that I would oppose the increased indemnity. I also said that when the opportunity presented itself I would avail myself of it to have the legislation of last session revised, but as the hon. member for York (Mr. Maclean) has declared he will do so I may possibly leave it to his hands. I believe that we as servants of the people have the right to change our vote if necessary in order to meet the views of our constituents, or otherwise that we should cease to represent them. I believe that everything that is done should be done in the light of day, and I believe that the round-robin (which I did not sign) was the commencement of the agitation for an increase and it was all wrong. We have been told that committees were formed to find out the feeling in the different provinces, but about this I know nothing. I never signed to support any increase and I would not have done so were I asked. But I am free to admit that I was present in the House when the subject was discussed; it was only discussed on one or two days, it was hurried through the House in such a way that members could not have ascertained whether or not they were acting according to the wishes of their constituents. The increase of the indemnity by $1.000 was in my opinion unnecessary. We were elected knowing that the indemnity was $1,500. I believe that remuneration is intended, not as a salary but as an indemnity, merely enough to pay our expenses while we are here, and I do think that with a little economy there is no member of this House who cannot get through a session of four or five months or even six months, with $1,500. Under these circumstances I believe that the increase granted in the dying hours of the session when members of the House were anxious to return to their homes and did not look into it as they otherwise would do, was not what should have been done. At every election held in the province of Ontario since, the candidates have vied one with the other in declaring that it was a monstrous thing to do, and that if they were returned to this House they would repeal that legislation. We have not heard an expression of opinion from them so far, but no doubt they are prepared to carry out their pledges to the electors. And if the increased indemnity to the members was bad, the pensions to the ex-ministers was very much worse. I venture to say that the great majority of the members of this House did not understand the pension system to ex-ministers in the motherland. We are likely to some extent to copy from the legislation of the mother country, and it was said by several hon. gentlemen that the pension system as it was introduced here was similar to that in England. We had not time to examine into that, but we find now that the system is altogether different from that proposed here. In England, only ex-ministers who state they are unable to support themselves receive pensions, but here, young men, men who have grown wealthy at the public crib are to receive a pension, and it is extraordinary how some of the ex-ministers have grown wealthy in a very few years, have become millionaires if not multi-millionaires. And yet these men are to receive a pension, apparently as a reward for the way in which they have gained that wealth, and which in my opinion cannot have been too honestly acquired. Under these circumstances, I believe that the law is wrong, and that if it be necessary at all we should have it on the same basis as the English law in that respect. Five years is much too short for a minister to step out and receive a pension. As the years roll on these pensions may multiply until the aggregate sum becomes a burden on this country greater than the country is prepared to bear. We have had growing times it is true, but we cannot afford to pile up for future generations expenses of that kind. Under the laws that exist now, whether a minister of the Crown has been a success in his office or not, he may say: Just leave me in five years and I will give way to some one else. Thus the pensions may pile up until we have an army of ex-ministers throughout the length and breadth of this Dominion, entailing an expense greater than this country is prepared

to bear. Under these circumstances, I do not believe we can condemn the legislation too strongly ; we cannot condemn it as strongly as the people of Canada have done. When the legislation was passed last session there were very few members in the Chamber; no doubt many of them expected that the House would close on Saturday and that all the business was finisehd, but yet this measure was shoved through under conditions which should not have existed. We should wipe this bill out of existence, and then if it be found necessary to make any change in the law it should be done after due consideration and after the people of the country have been consulted. It is our experience in this House that it generally takes weeks and months to get important legislation through, and that is as it should be. The newspapers have an opportunity to discuss it, our constituents have a right to protest if they see fit, but in this case no opportunity was given our constituents to express their opinions and the Bill was rushed through the House. My constituents believe that this legislation should be repealed and I am bound to be guided by them.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin). I have just a few words to say in respect to the question that has been discussed by my hon. friend (Mr. Barr). Let me say to start with, that I believe the debate on the address should not be prolonged for the reason that questions embodied in the address will be discussed from time to time during the session. It is therefore in my opinion not necessary to take up the time of the House in debating matters which must afterwards be discussed fully. When I hear old parliamentarians, men who have occupied seats in this House and in the local legislature finding fault with legislation because it was introduced during the dying days of the session, I have nothing but the most utter contempt for men who attempt to place such an excuse before this House. Every honourable gentleman who occupied a seat in this House last session was fully aware that this legislation was to be introduced, and there is no excuse for any honourable gentleman who has had any parliamentary experience rising at this late date and trying to excuse himself for the course he then took. Here is one abuse that has grown up in this House. I take the Auditor General's report, and what do I find year after year, particularly in the last session? I have been present on many occasions when the right hon. leader of the government and the hon. leader of the opposition had to remain silent in their places by reason of there being no quorum to transact the business of the House, and when I look over the Auditor General's report and find the number of days that certain members are marked as having been absent and then at the amounts these same gentlemen have drawn, I am prepared to say and to prove my statement that the declaration which these gentlemen made before they received their full indemnity was a false declaration. We who regularly attend to our duties in this House have to suffer by reason of these gentlemen drawing more than they are entitled to, while those who serve receive less than they are entitled to. So it is all very well for these gentlemen to talk as they have been talking. They have accepted the money and have disposed of it in one way or another, and they have not the courage to stand up and defend their action. My majority is not very large, it is true ; it is only 21 ; but I am always prepared, either before my constituents or in this House to have the courage of my convictions, and to say what I have to say, and I am glad to know that they have always given me credit for honesty in that regard, and I have yet to suffer my first defeat for pursuing that course. But I have noticed in my parliamentary experience that the men who are eternally wobbling, who have no opinion on any question, who are like the weather-cock on the barn which turns with every wind, are the first to vacate their seats in this House. Let us be manly enough to take the responsibility of our own actions instead of trying to cloak ourselves behind somebody else. I insist that an amendment to the Indemnity Act, shall be introduced this session along the line that every hon. member of this House shall record his name when he is present in order that we may have some record of the hon. gentlemen who are absent from their duties. If we do that, I am sure that instead of occupying six or seven months, we shall be able to transact the business of this House in much less time. Hon. gentlemen sometimes come into the House after having been absent for some time, and rise in their place and discuss something that has already been discussed over and over again, whereas if they had attended to their duties regularly, they would have taken part in the discussion at the proper time. If this question is brought up again, I intend to show certain things in connection with the indemnity, in connection with our judges, and in connection with other matters. I intend to have the manliness of pursuing the course I intend to pursue honestly and openly, and not cloak myself behind the misdoings of anybody else.

Motion (Mr. Knowles) agreed to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

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

Motion agreed to.

REPORTS PRESENTED.

Report of the Auditor-General for the year ending 30th June, 1905, (Volume 1)—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Trade and Navigation tables for the year ending 30th June, 1905.—Hon. Mr. Paterson.

Report of the Department of Trade and Commerce for the year ending 30th June, 1905.—Hon. Mr. Paterson.

Report of the Department of Railways and Canals, for the year ending 30th June, 1905.—Hon. Mr. Emmerson.

Report of the Commissioners of the National Transcontinental Railway for the year ending the 30th June, 1905.—Hon. Mr. Emmerson.

SUPPLY.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved :

That this House will, on Tuesday, this day, resolve itself into a Committee to consider of a supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Motion agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved :

That this House will, on Tuesday, this day, resolve itself in a Committee to consider of the ways and means for raising a supply to be granted to His Majesty.

Motion agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR GENERAL—ESTIMATES.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER delivered messages from His Excellency the Governor General transmitting estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the nine months ending March 31, 1907, and supplementary estimates for the year ending the 30th June, 1906, which were referred to the Committee of Supply.

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the message as follows :

GREY :

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons an approved minute of Council appointing the Hon. William Stevens Fielding, Minister of Finance, and the Hon. Louis Philippe Brodeur, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Hon. Charles Smith Hyman, Minister of Public Works, and the Hon. Henry Emmerson, Minister of Railways and Canals, to act with the Speaker of the House of Commons as commissioners for the purposes and under the provisions of the 13th chapter of the Revised Statutes of Canada intituled an Act respecting the House of Commons.

Government House,
Ottawa, March 12, 1906.

DEBATES COMMITTEE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

That a select committee be appointed to supervise the official reports of the debates of this House during the present session, with power to report from time to time; to be composed of Messrs. Bureau, Ethier, Gervais, Guthrie, Clarke, Johnston, Logan, Knowles, Macpherson, Bergeron, Hughes (Victoria and Haliburton), McCarthy (Calgary), Schaffner, Roche and Taylor.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT PRESENTED

Public Accounts of Canada for the year ending June 30, 1905.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will the right hon. gentleman have the report of the Transcontinental Railway Commissioners printed ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It will be referred to the committee on printing as usual, and no doubt the printing will be ordered.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is desirable to have it printed at an early day. I would like to ask also the Minister of Agriculture whether or not the correspondence, orders of council and so forth, asked for last year in connection with the treaty with Japan will be laid upon the table at once. Last year the matter was referred to on four different occasions. The hon. gentleman will find it referred to in Vol, 4, pages 6654, 7816 and 7908; and in Vol. 5, pages 8385. What I asked last year was that we should have the copies of the orders in council referred to in these discussions, and also any correspondence which has taken place on the subject, together with a copy of the new treaty which I understood was to be laid on the table to-day but has not been brought down. If my hon. friend will have attention given to this request at an early date, I shall be much obliged.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. With regard to the treaty, we have received a cable stating it was signed the 31st January, but the treaty has not been received yet. To-morrow the Minister of Railways will make his annual statement concerning the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Is it the intention of the right hon. gentleman to continue the sittings of the special committee regarding telephones appointed last session ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, it is not the intention. The committee is exhausted.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.55 a.m., Tuesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, March 13, 1906.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

REMOVAL OF METEOROLOGICAL OBSERVATORY.

On the Orders of the Day being called :

Mr. A. E. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire from the government if the rumour, which is current, respecting the removal of the observatory from Toronto is correct?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The matter is under consideration.

SUPPLY—INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the chair, it is my——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, before the hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) goes on, I would like to say that, of course, there is no objection to his making a statement just now, although it is rather unusual to do so without more notice and I believe it is not usual to do so until an opportunity has been given to examine the report. My hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart) tells me that he endeavoured this morning to secure a copy of the report from the Minister of Railways and Canals and was unable to do so. It might perhaps facilitate business to some extent to have the hon. gentleman go on and make his statement now, but it is perfectly obvious not only to the Prime Minister, but to the Minister of Railways and Canals himself that under these circumstances it is impossible to have the usual discussion because that involves some consideration at least of the report of the minister.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I have to admit that it is rather an unusual proceeding to rush into business immediately upon the meeting of parliament as we are doing at this moment. It will be for my hon. friends opposite to decide what course they should follow. Of course, if they are not ready for discussion we shall leave it until another sitting.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not think there is any objection from this side of the House to the hon. minister going on and making his statement at once. I merely desire to point out to my right hon. friend that under the circumstances it would, of course, be absolutely impossible to expect that criticism, which, no doubt, will be made a little later on upon the statement and upon the report.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I suppose it will come some other day.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know whether my right hon. friend will object to its being postponed for a day or two but for fear that he may, I thought I would mention it. It may be impossible to make the criticism at once.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. EMMERSON. Mr. Speaker, it is my intention and certainly my desire to as briefly as I may, and as concisely as I can, give an explanation with respect to the Intercolonial Railway, and incidentally in connection with other branches of the Department of Railways and Canals. It would be natural to expect that I would claim considerable time of the House in making that explanation, in view of the fact that the Intercolonial Railway and its conditions, have been subjected to a great deal of comment and discussion during the recess. It will be borne in mind that at the last session of this parliament it was my duty, and privilege as well, to explain as best I could with respect to the operations of the railway during the fiscal year 1904-5, and also, in part, to make some explanation with respect to the operations of the railway during the then current fiscal year; that is the fiscal year ending on June 30, 1905. I, in part, discussed the reasons which led to a deficit occurring during that year, and before I sit down it will be my effort to explain more fully with respect to that deficit, and with respect to the transactions for the whole year. I had only dealt with the transactions during a portion of the year. It will be seen by the report which I had the honour of laying on the table last evening that the total mileage of railways in Canada up to June 30 last, was 20,601 miles, an increase of 990 miles during the year. In addition to this there were 3,632 miles of sidings. As indicating another phase of transportation development, it may be pointed out that there were 793 miles of electric railway in operation on June 30, 1905. I presume, Sir, that it will be my privilege and certainly it would not be considered amiss by hon. members of this House, if I were to deal at some length with the report as a whole and if I were to invite the attention of hon. members to the information contained therein. However, the task of dealing with the Intercolonial Railway is one that may perhaps command my whole time, and I fear that I would run the risk of trespassing on the indulgence and kindness of the House if I were to attempt to deal with it in any way beyond presenting the mere skeleton of a statement. The subject itself might fairly well excuse elaboration ; the statements which I shall present to this House, Sir, might fairly be referred to; they might fairly be discussed and they might very fairly be padded. But

I shall refrain and shall simply deal with the actual figures, necessarily discussing the question of the Intercolonial from a historical standpoint, with some reference to the future prospects of that great public work. The Intercolonial Railway commands a very large space in the public attention of this country, and it is with this railway that I will be expected to deal specifically this afternoon.

Referring to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, the statement of results is as follows :

Total revenue—	
1904..	$6,339,221 07
1905..	6,783,522 83

Divided as follows :

From passengers—	
1904..	$2,021,568 04
1905..	2,105,066 75
From mails—	
1904..	$ 153,285 28
1905..	161,620 36
From express—	
1904..	$ 107,268 13
1905..	128,298 42
From other sources—	
1904..	$ 15,987 14
1905..	15,358 75
From freight—	
1904..	$4,041,112 48
1905..	4,373,178 55

Thus showing that the receipts for 1905 from passenger and freight traffic, exceeded the receipts for 1904 by about $400,000.

Turning to the other side of the account the cost of operation was as follows :

Cost of operation—	
1904..	$7,239,982 04
1905..	8,508,826 75

Divided as follows :

For maintenance of way and structures—	
1904..	$1,486,074 60
1905..	1,716,262 57
Maintenance of equipment—	
1904..	$1,534,178 39
1905..	1,834,572 94

As will be seen there was a very material increase in cost of maintenance of equipment on the Intercolonial.

Conducting transportation—	
1904..	$3,904,053 11
1905..	4,602,492 36
General expenses—	
1904..	$ 200,920 24
1905..	216,537 66
Parlour, sleeping and dining car expenses—	
1904..	$ 114,755 70
1905..	138,961 22

It will be observed that there has been an increase in almost every item of expense under each of these branches, a marked increase in some instances.

I might say with respect to the cost of conducting transportation that there has been an increase of $700,000. The figures which I have thus cited to the House demonstrate the fact, the lamentable fact, that there was a difference between revenue and cost of operation during the fiscal year 1905 of $1,725,303.92. In the preceding year there was a deficit of $900,750.

The difference between the deficit of 1905 and that of 1904 is accounted for by the following items of excess in the cost of operation.

Maintenance of way department excess, $257,105.37.

Made up as follows :

Increase of wages under labour account..	$ 79,716 33
Railway ties..	30,979 48
Docks and wharfs..	27,403 23
Handling snow (labour entirely)..	132,200 00

There were slight reductions made in the cost of bridges, culverts and fences to the amount of $2,193.67.

In the maintenance of equipment there was an increase over 1904 of $296,434.73, made up as follows :

Maintenance of equipment department, excess, $296,434.73.

Made up as follows :

Locomotive repairs..	$ 84,016 36
Passenger car repairs..	32,818 79
Freight car repairs..	135,617 90
Abnormal expenditure due the snow blockades..	33,981 66

That is simply an abnormal expense incidental to the maintenance of equipment during the winter season of 1905. The cost of transportation in 1905 exceeded that in 1904 by the very large sum of $587,884 made up of the following items.

Engine and roundhouse men—wages..	$116,067 74
Fuel for locomotives..	252,991 05
Oil and tallow..	11,000 00
Other supplies..	601 00
Train service—wages..	112,172 37
Switchmen, flagmen and watchmen—wages..	9,097 84
Station service—wages..	49,348 51
Car mileage tendance..	16,605 52
Injuries to persons..	10,000 00

I could very readily explain in my own language the causes which contributed to this very large excess of expenditure in these several departments during the year 1905 over the same class of expenditures made in 1904; but I think that I cannot do better than read an extract from the very careful report made by Mr. M. J. Butler, chief engineer and general manager of government railways in regard to the special circumstances affecting the operation of the Intercolonial during the last fiscal year. Mr. Butler says :

The unprecedented severity of the winter entailed heavy dircet expense in the removal of snow and ice, besides, as is pointed out by the general manager, largely increasing the operating expenses otherwise, and, at the same time,

causing a loss of revenue from traffic. The cost is set down by the railway officials as $264,716.14, which would be an increase of over $134,000, compared with the preceding years. This, however, but faintly represents even the direct cost entailed by the winter storms, covering, as it does, merely the actual work of removal of the material. To this has to be added the concurrent cost of a snow blockade extending for over two months, throughout which, on some divisions, there was practically an absolute stoppage of all traffic, and the boats between the mainland and Prince Edward Island stopped running from the latter part of January until March, causing great congestion of cars. From details furnished me, I compute that, including wages of men actually engaged in shovelling snow and picking ice, the proportion of ordinary pay-rolls during the blockade, detention time, maintenance of equipment, water supply, wrecking train service, meals for passengers, and for the snow shovellers and others, and lastly, the heavy resulting adverse car mileage balance, the total direct cost was not less than $518,000 over the normal. Even, when, in March, there was a cessation of snow fall, the quantity of accumulated freight entailed extra cost in the endeavour to clear it.

Mr. HAGGART. Is the $134,000 included in that $518,000 ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No. The $134,000 was in the operating expenses. These are direct expenditures incidental to the snow blockade. Mr. Butler's report goes on:

By way of assistance to the farmers in the eastern part of Nova Scotia and in Prince Edward Island, who were suffering from a deficiency in the hay crops, due to the exceptional dryness of the summer of 1904, the Intercolonial, under authority of an order in council, carried, free of charge, hay to the extent of 36,609 tons for their use ; the assistance was given by way of refund of freight charges to the extent of $125,855.46.

Mr. HAGGART. Can an order in council do that ?

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend need not be surprised. The same thing was done before in respect to the carriage of coal. The report continues :

Though no revenue was derived from this service, the ordinary cost entailed on the railway was very considerable, over 3,000 cars being engaged in the work, and this cost was increased by the fact that the hay-laden cars arrived at the time of the snow blockade, when no boats were running to Prince Edward Island, the railway yards were congested, and a large number of cars were stalled for months. I estimate the cost to the railway as at least $140,000. This, of course, in no way affects the principle of aiding, a distressed population, through the gratuitous service of a government road, but it is only fair, in reviewing the financial side of the question, to see that while crediting to national generosity the cost involved, the railway's aggregate expenditure, in which it must be merged, is not debited, to that amount, at all events, with extravagant administration.

Mr. BRODER. In regard to the carriage of hay, did the railway discriminate between people who were able to pay and those who were not as well off, or was it done generally ?

Mr. EMMERSON. This aid was given by order in council, which provided that the municipalities could purchase the hay for distribution among the needy at the actual cost of the hay to the municipalities, and we would carry the hay free for those municipalities. The order in council, a copy of which was laid on the table at the last session of parliament, contains the terms and conditions of that hay transportation. It followed a precedent which was established some years ago in connection with the coal famine in Ontario and Quebec, when, by a similar order in council it was provided that coal from the Nova Scotia coal mines would be transported over the Intercolonial, the freight thereon being refunded to the municipalities bringing the coal from the east.

Now, Sir, I am very frank to admit that the deficit of last year was sufficient to appal the public mind of Canada with respect to the Intercolonial; but I have no apologies to make regarding that deficit.

The conditions which prevailed and the management of the road, are the same as they have been for the last quarter of a century. There were the same officials, the same manager, the same deputy—the same men practically operated the road—the same district superintendents, the same train despatchers, and their operation of the road during the year 1905 showed these results. I am bound to say that this deficit—which I frankly and candidly admit was a very large one—has excited very severe comment in the press of Canada. Not merely in the distant west, not merely in middle west, but in the east as well ; and no one deplored the large amount of that deficit more than myself. But, Sir, I think it is due to this House and country to call attention to the special reasons and causes which led to that deficit ; and I think, Sir, that I have the right to claim, not merely at the hands of this House but the press of this country, a little fair-play in the discussion of that deficit. I know there was a cry went abroad from one end of Canada to the other. True it is a far cry from Victoria and Vancouver, but we heard it, and we heard it echoed and re-echoed across the continent, and it was only drowned when it reached the distant shores of the Atlantic where the waves roll in from Ireland against the shores of Cape Breton. Let me refer to some of those who uttered that cry, the unfairness of which certainly does not do credit to those who sent it forth. The deficit for the fiscal year 1905 was made the subject of much comment in the newspaper press of this country and of a great deal of misrepresentation by newspapers opposed to the government and sometimes

by newspapers not wholly opposed to the government.

The criticism of the Montreal 'Gazette' is a fair sample:

> The loss on operation does not represent the only drainage of the road upon the country. There was paid during the twelve months, out of the national treasury, chargeable to capital, on improving it and fitting it to do its non-paying business a further sum of $4,755,577. The total cost of the road to the country was thus raised by the end of the fiscal year to $77,491,512. The accounts of the road should therefore stand as follows—
>
> Loss on operation.. .. ..$1,725,303
> Interest on cost not earned, say 2,250,000
> Expended on improvements.. 4,755,577
>
> Total cost over receipts.. ..$8,730,880
>
> The Intercolonial Railway is worse than bankrupt. Its management, as shown by the facts in the public accounts, is a crime against the country.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that the actual deficit as between revenue and expenditure was sufficiently large to alarm the country, I candidly admit. But when the newspaper press seek to misrepresent the conditions prevailing on the Intercolonial Railway, I have certainly the right to ask that this matter be fairly considered. This article of the 'Gazette' was copied in many newspapers of the country. It was represented that the actual deficit, without taking into consideration the interest on the capital expenditure, was upwards of $7,000,000 during the past year. And this is arrived at by including the $4,755,577 expended under the capital expenditure.

I must say that it is scarcely creditable to a journal having the commercial standing of the Montreal 'Gazette' to apply such criticism to the Intercolonial Railway, when it would be making itself ridiculous by applying the same method of argument to any other railway. Are the capital expenditures of the Canadian Pacific Railway, for example, dealt with in this way? The method on the Intercolonial Railway regarding charges against revenue and capital is precisely the same as that followed on the Canadian Pacific Railway. But as this statement may possibly be questioned in this House, in view of the discussions which have taken place during previous sessions, I have prepared myself with evidence on the subject, which I am sure will not be disputed by any hon. gentleman opposite. I propose to read a letter from Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway, to my late deputy minister, which should fully settle any controversy on the question of charges against capital. This question has been productive of much discussion in this House, namely, as to how far the betterments on the Intercolonial Railway should be charged to capital and to what extent these charges should be made against revenue. I remember that during last session an hon. gentleman sitting on the other side of the House—a director of the Canadian Pacific Railway—took exception to the procedure followed in connection with the capital expenditure proposed to be made. This letter of Mr. Shaughnessy was written, as appears by the heading, in the offices of the Canadian Pacific Railway at Montreal and is dated September 1st, 1905.

> Collingwood Schreiber, Esq., C.M.G.,
> Deputy Minister and Chief Engineer of Railways and Canals, Ottawa.
>
> Dear Sir,—
>
> Your letter of August 26, reached my office during my absence from the city, which accounts for the delay in replying to it. Below I give you our practice with reference to the charges that are made to capital and revenue accounts respectively in connection with the several classes of work about which you make inquiry.
>
> 1. When light rails are taken out of the track and replaced by heavy rails the difference in the weight of rail and weight of fastenings is charged to capital. No portion of the cost of labour, or of other expenses involved in making the change, is charged to capital account.

Mr. BARKER. That is precisely what I contended you should do.

Mr. EMMERSON. And that is precisely what I did on the Intercolonial.

> 2 and 3. When a locomotive is destroyed or put out of service permanently, we replace it with another, charging the cost to revenue, although the new engine may be very much heavier and more costly, and we pursue the same course with reference to cars.

Precisely what the Intercolonial Railway does.

Mr. BARKER. But the hon. gentleman surely does not mean to say—

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon friend (Mr. Barker) need not become impatient. If he will possess his soul in patience for a few moments I will read him a clause on the very point I know he has in mind.

> 4. When automatic drawbars are put in to replace the old style of drawbar, we charge to capital the original cost less the value of the scrap.

Precisely the course pursued by the Intercolonial.

> 5. Air brakes, when originally applied in place of the hand brake, are charged to capital account.

Precisely what we do in connection with these expenses on the Intercolonial Railway.

> 6. When an old station-house is replaced by a new and a larger one, we generally charge the difference in value to capital account, but this is not always done.
>
> 7. Our practice with reference to the replacement of old engine houses is the same as in the case of old station buildings.
>
> 8. If wooden bridges be replaced by others of the same material, the charge is against

revenue. If a wooden structure be taken out and be replaced by permanent work in the shape of steel or masonry, or embankment, the charge is against capital. If a steel structure is replaced by a heavier and stronger one, the difference in weight only would be charged to capital.

Precisely as has been done on the Intercolonial Railway.

9 and 10. Additional sidings and the lengthening of existing sidings to meet new conditions are, as a rule, charged to capital account.

11. Excepting where the work is done by regular section forces, the improvement of the line by reduction of grades and curvature is deemed to be a proper charge against capital.

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) T. G. SHAUGHNESSY,
President.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a letter justifying the course that has been pursued, and is now being pursued, in relation to the capital expenses made on the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. BARKER. Has the hon. gentleman any objection to reading the letter to which that is a reply ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not the letter to which that is a reply, let me say that emphatically. But it was an inquiry made of Mr. Shaughnessy as to the principle which guided the Canadian Pacific Railway in connection with the capital expenses on that railway. The letter I have read certainly speaks for itself. It is not ambiguous, because the letter which called it forth as an answer——

Mr. BARKER. But why not read that letter ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I say I have not got it, and I am stating what is was. It was an inquiry made in connection with a dispute which was arising between the Grand Trunk Railway, I think it was, and the Intercolonial Railway; and it was with a view to learn from Mr. Shaughnessy what would be the character of his evidence on any question at issue between those railways as to the capital expenses, or as to expenses made in connection with the betterment of the Intercolonial, or of that portion of the Intercolonial that is owned by the Grand Trunk, and the rights on which are granted by an agreement between the Grand Trunk and the government of Canada in connection with the extension of the Intercolonial from Lévis to Montreal. Now, Sir, it is well known that the Canadian Pacific Railway propose during the current year to increase their stock by the issue of $40,000,000 of new stock. If the style of reasoning adopted by the Montreal 'Gazette' in the article which I have read to the House with regard to the Intercolonial, were applied in this instance, the question of dividends by the Canadian Pacific Railway would be disposed of for several years to come. We have heard a great cry during every session of recent parliaments with respect to the items included in the capital expenses of the Intercolonial, and it has been insisted over and over again on the floor of this House that the Intercolonial was pursuing a policy that was against the interests of the people of Canada in making these charges against capital account, and that it was acting at variance with the well understood principles which govern railway companies in making these capital expenses. Sir, I have not under my hand at the moment, but I think I will have before this session is closed, the indisputable evidence that the course pursued by the Intercolonial is the one that has been adopted and is followed by every railway system in the United States. Certainly, as a precedent for the course which we have pursued we have the Canadian Pacific Railway, and if the principle which the Montreal 'Gazette' would seek to apply to the Intercolonial had been applied to the Canadian Pacific Railway in years gone by, if it had been applied from the time the Canadian Pacific Railway started out on its career of usefulness and prosperity, the stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway would not be where it is to-day, upwards of 170, the stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway would not have been where it has been during recent years. Because if these capital expenses had been taken out of revenue, as the hon. gentlemen of the opposition ask the administrators of the Intercolonial to do, there would not have been earnings, there would not have been a fund to pay dividends, and we all recognize the fact that where there are no dividends there are no premiums on the stock.

Now, Sir, I desire briefly to invite the attention of the House and the country to what the Intercolonial Railway has cost, and to show the object of its construction ; I invite the attention of the House to what in my judgment has been the success that has attended the Intercolonial in fulfilling the object for which it was built. I am sure that I shall not be considered as travelling far out of the way when I start at what I consider the inception of the Intercolonial. I consider that the Intercolonial had its birth at the conference in Charlottetown, on September 8, 1864. It will be borne in mind that there had been discussion in every province of British North America during the preceding months —yes during the preceding years—as to the destiny of these provinces. There had been an agitation here in what are now the provinces of Ontario and Quebec; the public men of these provinces had been discussing the prospects for the future and the possible means of removing the difficulties that seemed then to trouble them. As to the maritime provinces, without recounting the steps that had been taken or the correspondence that had passed between the provinces, I will simply say that the representatives of the people there had met in con-

vention at Charlottetown with the object of consummating a maritime union. That convention was composed of delegates from Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. While in session, this convention was approached by gentlemen from the provinces of Upper and Lower Canada. It was a bright September day when Sir John Macdonald, Hon. Geo. Brown and Sir Geo. Etienne Cartier and their co-delegates sailed into Charlottetown harbour. At that conference was discussed, so far as the provinces were concerned, the construction of an Intercolonial railway to bind together the several provinces forming the proposed confederacy. We know the outcome. We know that that convention adjourned to the city of Halifax. In that city no business sessions were held, but other sessions were held and public addresses were given. To show what the Intercolonial was intended to be, and to show the object that the fathers of confederation had with respect to it, I venture to invite the attention of the House to the remarks in the first place, of Hon. Geo. E. Cartier, afterwards Sir George Cartier. In addressing a public meeting at Halifax, he said :

I need hardly bring to your notice, gentlemen, that we in Canada have those two great elements of nationality, the personal and the territorial elements. But we know our shortcomings. Though great in territory and population, we want the other element which is absolutely necesary to make a nation, that is the maritime element. What nation on earth has obtained any amount of magnificence unless it has been united with the maritime element.

And Hon. John A. Macdonald afterwards Sir John Macdonald addressed a great gathering in Halifax on that occasion. I quote his words as follows :

I do not hesitate to say that with respect to the Intercolonial, it is understood by the people of Canada that it can only be built as a means of political union for the colonies. It cannot be denied that the railway as a commercial enterprise would be of comparatively little commercial advantage to the people of Canada. Whilst we have the St. Lawrence in summer and the American ports in time of peace, we have all that is requisite for our purposes. We recognize, however, the fact that peace may not always exist, and that we must have some other means of outlet, if we do not wish to be cut off from the ocean for some months in the year. We wish to feel greater security, to know that we can have assistance readily in the hour of danger. In the case of union, this railway must be a national work, and Canada will cheerfully contribute to the utmost extent in order to make that important link without which no political connection can be complete.

These remarks of Sir John A. Macdonald, indictate very clearly the nature of the discussion that had taken place among the delegates who met in Charlottetown. But these delegates from Canada came down with wider ideas. The maritime delegates were discussing the more restricted question of maritime union, and the Canadian delegates presented a grander vista, a prospect of broader union, a union that was to involve a railway which would be a connecting link between the several provinces afterwards to become the Dominion of Canada. And the words which I have just quoted show the object then in view. But other expressions which I will quote, more clearly indictate the details of the discussion that had taken place with respect to the advantages that were to accrue by the construction of the Intercolonial railway. Advantages that were to accrue not merely to the people of the maritime provinces but to the people of Ontario and Quebec as well. Sir Geo. Cartier afterwards addressed a meeting in St. John, N.B. He said :

Prosperity such as this great country was capable of attaining to would never be enjoyed until the several sectional parts of it were united under the same political and commercial system, their respective policies brought into relation with each other and all maritime facilities equally afforded to all which nature had so bountifully bestowed upon some of the parts. This was what confederation proposed to accomplish. Canada has population sufficient to make a great nation in course of time, but she wants what the lower provinces possess, an outlet to the sea. As the lower provinces now stand they are comparatively weak and powerless and the wealth, labour and industry which Canada possesses go in great measure, to enrich such cities as New York, Boston and Portland. This must continue to be the case until the Intercolonial, of which he had never been an advocate, should be built, and, as soon as the colonies were confederated, the construction of that work would undoubtedly commence.

Now, there was a clear and distinct statement by that very eminent and distinguished statesman Sir Geo. Cartier as regards the object that was to be obtained by the construction of the Intercolonial Railway. It was to bring the peoples of the several provinces together. It was to stimulate inter-communication social, political and business. It was practically to bring the products of the east to the markets of the west; it was to take the manufactured products of the western provinces to the fishermen on the shores of Nova Scotia, or Prince Edward Island, and to the lumbermen in the woods of New Brunswick. In that connection the Hon. Geo. Brown, speaking of the advantages of confederation and of the construction of the Intercolonial Railway, used the following language :

But far in advance of all other advantages would be this, that union of all the provinces would break down all trade barriers between us, and throw open at once to all a combined market of four millions of people. You in the east would send us your fish and your coals and your West India produce, while we would send you in return the flour and the grain and the meats you now buy in Boston and New York. Our merchants and manufacturers would have a new field before them.

And so on. He goes on to speak of the advantages that must necessarily accrue by the construction of that railway and by the confederation of these widely separated provinces.

The Hon. A. T. Galt then Minister of Finance of Canada, said :

In answer to the objection that Canada sought the union to be relieved of her burdens, spoke of the Intercolonial Railway, of the benefit it would confer upon the maritime provinces, whilst the expense under the proposed union must be borne principally by Canada, an arrangement entirely different from that which had been contemplated while the provinces were separate.

I have not referred to these statements as in any way extenuating the deficit which has occurred on the Intercolonial Railway during the past year, nor as a justification of the deficits which have been occasioned by the operation of the railway since its construction and completion as an Intercolonial Railway, but I do not want this House to forget, and I do not want this country to forget, the object, the main purpose, of the construction of the Intercolonial. The success, or non-success, which has attended that construction has certainly been before the country, but the object for which the Intercolonial Railway has been constructed has not always been borne in mind. There always has been a discussion about the expenditures on the Intercolonial Railway. There has always been comment, severe—very severe—with respect to the deficits on that road, but as a gentleman said in my hearing at a public meeting in the province of Ontario not many months ago, the Intercolonial Railway, from the very day of its construction, has been productive of surpluses, but the surpluses, instead of being in the shape of dividends distributed amongst the shareholders, as is the case with the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway, have been left in the pockets of the people of the country by reason of the very low rates of freight which have been charged with respect to the traffic between the east and the west. With respect to that traffic we know what object the fathers of confederation had in view in constructing that road. It was to bring these peoples together, it was to divert the traffic which went to the New England States from the maritime provinces in this direction, and to have communication between Ontario and Nova Scotia. Three-fourths of the traffic—certainly of the through traffic—has been in the easterly direction; one fourth of the traffic has been in the westerly direction. That is to say, if there is a benefit to be derived by low rates of freight, if trade is to be promoted, if markets are to be secured, if there is to be a diversion of trade from the manufacturers of the New England States to the manufacturers of Ontario and Quebec, that can only be accomplished by making such freight rates as will make possible an interchange of traffic; and if three-quarters of that traffic is in an easterly direction, surely three-quarters of the benefit must accrue to the Ontario and Quebec manufacturers. How else would the markets of the fishermen along the shores of Nova Scotia have been secured by Toronto, Montreal and other manufacturers, and the manufacturing towns of Ontario and Quebec ? They certainly could not have been, had not these rates been abnormally and exceptionally low. The result was apparent in a very few years. The trade was diverted. Good did come of it. The very objects which the gentlemen who conceived the scheme had in view were accomplished, and the result is that the Intercolonial Railway has been operated with freight and passenger rates which are exceptionally low, and that the people east and west have enjoyed the advantage, that the country has prospered and that we know each other as we did not know each other previous to that date.

Now, all this is germane to the question at issue, because I will make the statement with a knowledge of the facts : That if we had applied on the Intercolonial Railway, during these years, in the matter of freight traffic, the rates which have been applied on the Grand Trunk Railway and Canadian Pacific Railway, there would never have been a deficit in the history of that road. It is simply a question of freight rates and passenger rates. I am always assuming that the traffic would have followed these channels without these exceptionally low rates. If it would have done so, then, certainly, there has been wrong doing in not increasing the rates equal to the rates charged by the other railways of Canada. But, if the traffic could not have been secured without the application of these special rates, then, I say that the action of those who have been responsible for the application of these rates has been justified by the results.

What has the Intercolonial Railway cost ? and this is a matter of interest, I am sure, to the people of the country. This expenditure, it will be admitted, was for the benefit of trade and transportation. That was the object in view, and it is no startling proposition to say that the parliament of Canada shall appropriate moneys for such a purpose. Parliament has been doing that ever since it was a parliament, and while I shall first invite your attention to the cost of the Intercolonial Railway, I shall as well venture to invite your attention to the question of the amount of money that has been expended by Canada since we became a confederation in connection with other means of promoting trade and transportation in Canada. You know that we have our canals. These are deficit creators, and recognized as such. You know that we have our other railways in Canada which have

been, and which are, being subsidized by the parliament of Canada, and you know that we have these railways whose bonds have been guaranteed by the government, by the country, all in the interest of trade and transportation. You know that we practically built the Canadian Pacific Railway and you know that we advanced very large sums of money to the old Grand Trunk, which stands as an asset of Canada to-day on the books in the Finance Department of Canada, representing millions that have been paid out. I hear no cry with respect to that. You know that we have expended large sums of money annually for the purpose of promoting our export trade in the way of subsidies to steamships. You know that with a view to promoting our internal traffic, our interprovincial and provincial traffic, we have been subsidizing steamships which ply on our inland waters and along our coasts.

Mr. HAGGART. Will the hon. gentleman state the amount paid to the Grand Trunk since confederation ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am sorry I cannot anticipate every question that is in my hon. friend's mind, but if he will bear with me for a little I will come to the very question he has propounded.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman has stated that the Grand Trunk has got a certain amount since confederation. I want to know what it is.

Mr. EMMERSON. I did not say since confederation ; if my hon. friend understood me to say since confederation, I wish to correct him. I did not intend to make any such statement, but it was an amount that the people of this country expended, and it is an amount that is taken into the calculation of the financial conditions of the country, the amount that was contributed to the Grand Trunk anterior to the confederation. My hon. friend knows that, and no mere quibble can alter or wipe away the actual results with respect to the expenditure of the money. We have also expended very large sums of money in endeavouring to promote trade and transportation in connection with the Montreal harbour, in connection with the Quebec harbour, and in many other ways. I do not invite the attention of this House with any idea that these matters should be objected to. I think rather that they are to be justified. I think rather that they are to be defended; but do not let us pick out from among this mass of expenditures the money laid out on the Intercolonial and hold the matter up for public censure; do not subject these expenditures to the most extreme criticism and be silent with respect to the large sums of money which you have been paying in the past, and which you are yearly paying out, with a view to promoting the trade and transportation interests of Canada.

The expenditure on the Intercolonial charged—not chargeable but charged—to capital account, and I say according to the principles followed chargeable properly to capital account, amounted to $77,473,557. There was charged to consolidated fund, as the difference between deficits and surpluses, $7,888,517—leaving a grand total which the Intercolonial has cost Canada since 1867 of $85,362,074.

This is a large sum of money, it represents a great deal to the people of Canada, and it is a matter of fair comment as to whether Canada has received a proportionate benefit from that expenditure. I claim that it has.

The net deficits on the Intercolonial Railway during the period of its operation by Canada have amounted to $7,888,517. Hon. gentlemen will say : a very large sum indeed, but we might add if you will to this the cost of the Prince Edward Island Railway, which as you know, Sir, is a part of the government railway system of Canada. The amount charged to capital account of the Prince Edward Island Railway is $6,719,529. There has been charged to the consolidated fund during the several years a total of $7,272,337, making a grand total of $13,991,866. But from this sum which I have last named there is to be deducted for revenue $4,830,599, showing a net cost of the Prince Edward Island Railway down to date of $9,161,265.

Now, if you will, you can add these two sums together and take them as the expenditures in the interest of the Intercolonial Railway, and the two sums amount in round numbers to ninety-four and one half million dollars. It is easy to get the exact dollars; but I am near enough in stating ninety-four and a half millions. It is slightly under that amount.

As I have mentioned, there are other directions in which we have expended moneys; and first let me invite your attention to the canals of Canada: As I stated a few moments ago, the canals are nothing but deficit creators. There was a time when a charge was made for the traffic which passed through these canals. The tolls amounted to a very considerable sum, as I understand, but it was immaterial as to whether there was any return or not. Within the last few years, in the interest of trade and transportation, the government of this country, with the approval of parliament, abolished the canal tolls, and there is charged to the capital account of the canals of Canada the sum of $89,294,758. In addition to that there has been charged in the consolidated fund of Canada $8,936,985, making a total of $98,231,743, some $5,000,000 more than has been expended in

connection with the Intercolonial and the Prince Edward Island Railway. Now, Sir, I do not hear any complaint with respect to this. Down by the sea there are no murmurings, although these canals and the traffic which goes over them in no way find an outlet in the ports of the maritime provinces. There is no complaint anywhere in Canada with respect to that expenditure, but there is a complaint and a very loud complaint with respect to the expenditures on the Intercolonial Railway. The annual deficit of the Intercolonal excites a discussion, and a long discussion, at every session of this parliament. Even when the amount is only $100,000 or $150,000 it is spoken of in extravagant terms and when the amount reaches to $1,725,000 the din is such that it would almost destroy your hearing. And yet there is in the annual cost of operation an annual deficit on the canals of $1,174,000.

Do we hear anything about it? In what other direction have we appropriated moneys? To miscellaneous railways the subsidies paid by the government amount to $32,617,560; to the Canadian Pacific alone there was paid $62,785,319; to the Grand Trunk there was paid—and it stands as an asset unpaid, as a part of the book-keeping of Canada—$25,607,393; a total of $121,010,272. These figures do not include the land subsidies which are admittedly of enormous value. In all 56,000,000 acres were voted to aid railway construction. You can compute the amount invested in railways by way of land subsidies by multiplying 56,000,000 by any sum that you choose. If you value the land at a dollar an acre, it means $56,000,000; if at two dollars an acre it means double that sum; if at three dollars an acre it means treble that sum; and so on. Lands which to-day are being sold, as I understand, at from $7 to $10 an acre were contributed by the government of Canada towards the construction of these railways. Add these sums together and consider the enormous amount which Canada has invested in railways, or for the purpose of promoting and stimulating trade and transportation. The Dominion government has also guaranteed the bonds of the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company—for the principal of $6,678,200, and for interest thereon at the rate of three per cent per annum for fifty years. That is surely in the interest of trade and in the interest of transportation. It is a necessity, and I hear no complaint in regard to it. It is true that oftentimes exception is taken to the acts which authorize these expenditures or these guarantees, but that is more in a political sense than from a business standpoint. From a business standpoint it is recognized by the people of Canada, with our sparse population and our large and extended area, it is necessary that assistance should be given to the construction of railways, the promotion of transportation companies and the advancement of the general trade interests of the country. Without that assistance there is not private capital to make the investment, and therefore it is a public necessity in our endeavour to make of Canada what we hope her to be. The bonds of the Canadian Northern Railway are guaranteed on a principal of £1,923,287 sterling, and interest thereon at the rate of three per cent per annum for fifty years. The guarantee to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company is for a sum equal to seventy-five per cent of the cost of the construction of the western division of the National Transcontinental Railway, but not exceeding $13,000 per mile in respect of the prairie section of that railway. To steamships for a considerable period of years subsidies have been paid by the Dominion government. The amount paid last year to steamers plying between Canadian ports and foreign ports was $795,000, and to steamers plying between Canadian ports, $113,000. The total of both classes of subsidies already paid is $10,539,102. Who will say that that was an unwise expenditure, or who will dare to criticise it? We hear no murmuring in respect to that; but it is to be added to the grand total which includes the Intercolonial, the Canadian Pacific, the Grand Trunk, the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Canadian Northern, and all the other railways big and little which have been aided by votes of the parliament of Canada. We have another object of our solicitude in the way of the promotion of trade and transportation in the aid granted to harbours and navigation. In the Montreal harbour alone we have expended $5,186,834, in the Quebec harbour $3,835,697, and in the St. Lawrence channel $3,641,364, a total of $12,663,895. If all these sums which have been expended in aid of the trade and transportation of the Dominion are added together, they will be found to aggregate a very large sum.

Now, it is a very pertinent question, as to why the Intercolonial does not pay. We are confronted year by year with these deficits, enormous in some instances—surely there must be a cause for them. Some of the newspapers of the country have given reasons and have suggested remedies. Some of them have said that political influence is the cause; others have said that it is the absence of expert management. They travel in many directions to find out reasons why the Intercolonial does not pay. I think I can mention three causes which give the explanation in a nut-shell. The first is the long route. I am not going to weary this House by repeating the discussion which occurred at the time of the location of the road. I am not going to give the reasons which were advanced why the long route along the shores of the St. Lawrence was selected. Enough for me to

say that those reasons were not commercial; they were political, imperial and military, admitted to be so by the fathers of confederation, and not since that day disputed. Another reason is the water competition. There is the water competition along the coast of Maine, along the shores of the Bay of Fundy and across to the Nova Scotia coast. There is the water competition down the St. Lawrence river and along the gulf to the Straits of Northumberland. Every point touched by the Intercolonial is subject to competition from water transportation. But aside from this, there is the third reason—and perhaps one at least of the other reasons I have stated has contributed in a measure to the creation of this—low rates.

I do not know that I should at this moment speak of the reasons which have been assigned by others or go out of my way to attempt to rebut those reasons. It would be perhaps well for me at this moment not to do so. I may have an opportunity later to invite the attention of the House to the reasons which have been assigned in the newspaper press of this country and by public speakers. But for a moment let me deal with the three causes which I assign for these annual deficits. First, there is the long route. I need not dwell on that, but as incidentally arising out of that, we have a remarkable condition of things, and in order to bring it to your notice more concisely and without any unnecessary use of words, let me just say this: That in the interest of the developments of the coal mines of Nova Scotia and the steel industry in that province, extraordinary low rates on freight have been granted from Sydney and other points to Montreal. You will recognize this fact, that there is direct water communication between Sydney and Montreal for six months of the year, and you must bear in mind that the Intercolonial Railway is extended to Sydney. It is true that we could decline to take this traffic in the summer season, or rather we could decline to take it at a rate so exceptionally low; but were we to do so we would be running our cars to and from Sydney during the summer season empty, if we ran them at all. During the winter of course we would have the steel and the coal industry at our mercy as regards freight rates, but it has been deemed wise in the past—and I have not changed the system—to give them special consideration in order to have the traffic in the summer. This rate of freight is believed to be the lowest in the known world. It is ·22 cents per ton mile. All railway experts will endorse my statement that there is certainly no such low rate on this continent. Then there is the other side of the account and that is with respect to east bound freight—the products of the west and of Ontario—which find a very large market down by the sea. We have to compete with water competition from Montreal during the summer. During the winter we have to compete with the American ports and the water transportation from Boston and Portland. There seems to be a very great desire on the part of the hon. members and the press and the people of all Canada that our traffic with the West Indies and Newfoundland shall be stimulated and increased, and as far as possible done through Canadian ports—that it should in no wise be allowed to be diverted to American ports. Well, in order to secure command of that traffic to Jamaica and the other West India Islands and also to Newfoundland, it has been necessary for the Intercolonial Railway to give an exceptionally low rate on flour east bound for export. That low rate is given for the purpose of retaining these markets for the Canadian producers. A very low rate of one-quarter of a cent per ton per mile is granted on carload lots, thus securing to the Ontario millers the market of the maritime provinces. Is that, Mr. Speaker, not in the interests of interprovincial trade and transportation and the building up of our Canadian seaports ? That may not be business, but it appeals strongly to national sentiment. We recognize the fact that we have to wrestle with geography every time we attempt to stimulate this trade, and the Intercolonial Railway is looked upon as a government railroad and recognized as the pack horse which must bear the burden of this business.

In the past hon. members complained about deficits. These deficits have not merely occurred since the Liberals took office. True, when the Conservative government was in power, if there was anything of national importance requiring the use of railways the Intercolonial Railway was used. But was there ever any credit given for it ? Never, it was charged up to operating expenses. It is included in these deficits amounting to nearly eight million dollars, which have been rolled up from year to year against the Intercolonial Railway. And the Intercolonial Railway is condemned because of that contributing cause.

Reference has been made by me already to the fact that the transportation of hay during the last year free of charge and the transportation of coal in previous years free of charge, involved a very large expense on our railroad. No doubt it did, and I am not going to argue that the Intercolonial Railway should have done this. I hold that the government of Canada should have done it, if it should have been done at all. What was the object? It was that the dairy industries and agricultural interests of eastern Canada should not be allowed to go into utter decay. Here was a whole stretch of country practically barren of every vestige of vegetation. There was no fodder in eastern Nova Scotia. There was nothing to feed the stock cattle, and the people were killing their dairy cows, killing off their stock—stock which had been accumulated by reason of

the assistance which had been given by the Canadian government to the agricultural interests. Was it wise to allow this to be done? It is true that years afterwards, it might be replaced; but in the meantime, what would be the result to the dairying interests of the country? Are those interests of importance? Why, their importance is recognized by every hon. member of this House; they have been recognized by every parliament that was ever convened in session here; for, year after year and session after session, votes have been given in favour of that industry. The Intercolonial Railway, again the pack-horse, took that burden upon itself, and it is charged up as another item in the deficits of the road.

Now, I have referred to the long route, to the water competition and to the low rates. Let me take you a little further and emphasize a little these particularly low rates. In comparing the long haul on the Intercolonial we are guided by the mileage to St. John of the Canadian Pacific Railway; that is to say, while we have to go hundreds of miles further, while the wheels of our cars must revolve many times more, yet, in the distribution of our portion of the through traffic we are governed by what is known as the short haul by way of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Let me invite the attention of the House, at this moment, to the reason why this was done. You had built your Intercolonial to Rivière du Loup; you had extended it from Rivière du Loup to Levis, and, in addition, you had constructed what is known as the St. Charles branch, and had spent hundreds of thousands of dollars in doing it. Subsequently you extended the road from Levis to Montreal, by what is known as the Drummond county route. But, while all this was going on, what else were you doing? This House and this country, in order to have a short line from Sherbrooke across the state of Maine to the city of St. John, gave assistance to the Canadian Pacific Railway for the construction of that line. This was in addition to the assistance given to the Canadian Pacific Railway in other directions. Therefore, for the last twenty years, you have been paying $186,000 a year in order to have that railway in competition with the Intercolonial. I am not taking exception to that; but it was done, and it is a contributing cause to the low rates which we are compelled to accept on the Intercolonial for carrying our traffic from the west to the east. I think it was a very worthy expenditure; certainly it was an expenditure having for its object the stimulating of the trade in Canadian products by way of Canadian ports—if not all the way over Canadian soil, certainly by Canadian ports. Now, I do not know how long you have continued that in order to stimulate traffic by way of St. John. Under the Act of parliament which authorized that expenditure it was to continue for twenty years, which period has not yet expired. But the fact that we have that line makes it necessary for the Intercolonial, in computing its freight rates, to be governed by what is known as the short haul, though it hauls the traffic very many miles in addition. Our longest haul therefore, is approximately 800 miles. The great bulk of the way traffic on the railway—which gives profitable earnings—is limited to about 400 miles. That is true of all railways, as I understand it, and is not exceptional in the case of the Intercolonial. On the basis of the haul of 400 miles, our earnings from way freight are about 63 per cent of those of all other railways in Canada. That is to say, that where the other railways in hauling 400 miles are entitled to, and do receive $1 we receive only 63c. On our long haul mileage basis, our rates are not quite 50 per cent of theirs, on the average. That is, where the other railways would receive $1, the Intercolonial receives in one case 63c. and in the other case 50c. Is it any wonder that there are deficits on the Intercolonial?

Mr. HAGGART. Oh, oh.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) recognizes the fact as we do. He recognizes also the necessity of it. He contributed to the conditions which made it necessary, and during his regime as Minister of Railways he certainly made no effort to change the conditions.

Now, as to the passenger rates: The comparison of fares on distance basis, between the Intercolonial and the Grand Trunk Railway in the district west of Toronto and on lines north of the main line, where a rate of 3 cents per mile is in force for 400 miles, shows that we collect about two-thirds as much as they do for a first-class fare; we issue second-class fare where they issue none, and our return fare is 60 per cent of theirs. Comparing the Intercolonial passenger traffic with the Grand Trunk traffic on the basis of 200 miles—that is from Montreal to Berlin, New Hampshire where a 3⅓ cent rate is in force—we find first-class fares on the Intercolonial 76 per cent of those on the Grand Trunk; our second-class fare is about 50 per cent of theirs, and our return fare is about 58 per cent of theirs. On the basis of 108 miles on the Canadian Pacific Railway from Montreal to Kemptville, where a 3⅓ cents per mile fare first class, and 2½ cents per mile second class is in force—our fares are, for first class $3 against their $3.50, for second class $2 against their $2.50 for return fares, $4.50 against their $5.85.

It is obvious that if the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk were compelled to reduce their freight and passenger rates to the Intercolonial basis, it would not be long before these railways would be in the hands of a receiver; it would not be

long before their deficits would be quite in harmony with and proportionate to the deficits which have occurred on the Intercolonial. I think, Mr. Speaker, I have explained why it is that the Intercolonial, though not in the same class as the canals, has been a very good second as a deficit creator, and I have demonstrated to this House and this country the reasons therefor.

Now, let me take into consideration the current year. I am pleased to announce that as the result of more favourable conditions and of the reforms which have been applied to the Intercolonial, our showing for the first six months of the current fiscal year ending December 31 last, is exceedingly encouraging. Here are the figures :

Working expenses for 1905.. ..	$4,104,018
Working expenses for 1906.. ..	3,925,219
Revenue for 1905..	3,621.263
Revenue for 1906..	3,853,960

Demonstrating the fact that during the first six months of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, our deficit was $482,755; while for the six months of 1906, that is for the period between the 1st of last July and the 1st day of January, 1906, our deficit was $71,259.

Mr. BARKER. Is that due to the difference in the snow fall?

Mr. EMMERSON. We did not have any snow last year up to the 1st day of January. Our snow difficulties last year, up to February and March, and up to January 1st, 1906, were precisely the same as they were in 1904 up to the 1st of January, 1905. Now there was a decrease in working expenses of $178,797 in that period, and there was an increase in revenue of $232,696 ; that is to say, the improvement for that period of six months was $411,495. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to claim any special credit personally for these results, but I am going to ask the House to indulge me for a few moments in calling their attention to one fact, and in so far as it is personal, I apologize to the House here and now. I was sworn in office on the 15th of January, 1904. Immediately thereafter I naturally visited my own constituency, and there was held an election which was somewhat gratifying to myself personally. There was another election the results of which were not so gratifying, as my hon. friend from St. John can testify. These occupied time. The session came on. I was new to the preparation of the estimates. My whole time was devoted to that session, and you will remember it was the long session which lasted until the snow fell in the autumn. Then came on the general elections. Following the general elections came the succeeding session, and with the sessional duties and my departmental burdens, I found it impossible to give any personal attention to an examination of the affairs of the Intercolonial. It was not until the 29th day of July last that I was able to start from Ottawa with a view of inquiring into matters affecting that railway. During that month, or about that time, I succeeded in securing the very able assistance of Mr. M. J. Butler as deputy minister and chief engineer, and with him, commencing about the 1st of August, I started over the Intercolonial. I am bound to say that we discovered many things. I do not speak as an expert, I only state the result of the information that was given me when I say that we found many things that would not meet with the approval of railway experts. Certain reforms were considered necessary and these have been applied. You will remember that we did not go over the system until August. It took us some six weeks to travel over the Intercolonial and the Prince Edward Island Railway. Certain reforms were inaugurated and applied then, and some are being applied now. Naturally we could not expect great results in so short a period. Naturally it would be impossible for any man to go on a railway, diagnose the case as he might, recognize the difficulties as he might, and in so short a time apply a remedy calculated to accomplish better results.

The same effort was made in the way of cutting down unnecessary expense, and in the way of inviting the consideration of the officials of the road. It was my pleasure and privilege to ask the representatives of the several departments to meet me in conference in regard to the conditions affecting the Intercolonial Railway. I did not merely consult with the head officials, the managers, superintendents and the other officials holding the higher positions in the employ of the railway, but I consulted with the representatives of the trackmen, the mechanics, the car men, the machinists, the telegraphers and the train dispatchers; each in their turn came and met us in Moncton, representatives, I say, of the several bodies, the trainmen, the conductors, the engine men, the locomotive engineers, the trackmen, and the firemen. We took into consideration and discussed with them the question which affect them in their employment, which affect the success of the railway, and I am bound to say that these men contributed in a very marked degree in assisting us in locating leaks, in locating difficulties and in remedying what were considered as errors. Now, as a result of this conference I think we succeeded in at least making these men recognize that there was some responsibility resting upon them for the successful operation of the Intercolonial Railway. It will be recognized that no Minister, no deputy minister, no general manager, can successfully apply remedies or making a success of the operation of the road unless he has the whole-souled and sympathetic co-operation of the employees thereof.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. If he does not get it he should be in a position to remove them and then he will get it.

Mr. EMMERSON. Many men do not get it; but we are not in a position to remove them.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I know.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is not always easy to locate want of sympathy. My hon. friend locates it perhaps too often, but there are those who find it difficult to locate want of sympathy, and I am bound to say that in my consultation with the employees of the Intercolonial Railway, the representatives of the different brotherhoods, I found the men eager and anxious to do their part to make the Intercolonial Railway a success; and I have this to say in respect of the employees of the Intercolonial Railway and the patrons along this line, that they are all as sincerely desirous that this Intercolonial Railway shall be a success financially as any man in this House. I can testify to the assistance which I am daily receiving from the employees and from those who are the patrons of the railway. I can also include in that members of parliament, one and all. I want to acknowledge the assistance which has been rendered by the deputy minister. They talk about railway experts and expert commissioners. I want no better expert commissioner than the deputy minister who is aiding me and who has been aiding me during the past six months in the remedies that are being applied to the road. These reforms which are being applied are :

First—The car service department is under process of reorganization to bring about a better service.

Second—Steps are under way to provide for the economical purchase and handling of coal, which will in the aggregate make large savings.

Third—The accounting system on the road is very old and has not kept pace with modern methods. An entirely new system is now being installed which is practically identical with that in use on the Grand Trunk and other Canadian and leading American railways.

Fourth—Passes are being restricted to the minimum.

Fifth—Passenger rates are being advanced.

Sixth—Authority is being taken for an increase in the freight rates.

Seventh—The block system which entails the employment of an excessive number of station agents and telegraph operators is to be modified so far as freight trains are concerned.

Eighth—The staff is being reorganized to bring about a closer supervision of all the details of operation.

Ninth—Shop equipment and arrangements are being improved.

Tenth—The passenger train service is being adjusted to meet the actual business requirements of the maritime provinces, of all the provinces and of the patrons of the railway.

I know that there have been very many suggestions made with respect to the Intercolonial Railway. I am in receipt of a great deal of advice as to how it should be run, but let me for a moment call your attention to the two principal remedies that are suggested; first, with respect to the railway, that it should be sold and disposed of to the great corporations in the country, or, as an alternative proposition, that it should be controlled by a commission. There is a very general impression abroad that the Intercolonial Railway is subjected and very much subjected to political influences. That is not the case. It is true that there is to a certain extent, in connection with the Intercolonial Railway, political influence, but there is to a similar extent with respect to every railway in Canada. I venture to say that the management of the Canadian Pacific Railway is just as much subject to the influence of members of parliament in the management of that railway as I am with respect to the management of the Intercolonial Railway.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Nonsense ; no, no.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friends may say 'no, no', but we all know, and every member of this House must recognize, that there is such influence, and that applications are being constantly made to the managers of these roads. The same is true with respect to the Grand Trunk Railway.

Mr. BRODER. Yes.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, my hon. friend (Mr. Broder) will assent to that, I suppose. That is where the shoe is not as comfortable for my hon. friend, but the statement is true nevertheless. And, there is another thing that I want to say, and it is that in so far as passes are concerned the Intercolonial Railway does not indulge in them to anything like the extent that they are indulged in by the other railways of the country.

Mr. HAGGART. The law prohibits the issue of passes.

Mr. EMMERSON. The law prohibits it, but there are ways and ways as my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) knows. Political influence was very rife on the Intercolonial Railway—I grant it—some few years ago, and my hon. friends may have a lingering idea that the condition of things has not been remedied that existed when passes were doled out as bales of shingles and when men during elections, whether general or by-elections, were passed over the road in train loads. Those days have gone.

Mr. COCHRANE. Oh.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend (Mr. Cochrane) says 'no'. I am not talking about canals; I am talking about railways.

Mr. COCHRANE. I did not say what the hon. Minister attributed to me at all. I said 'oh'.

Mr. EMMERSON. If my hon. friend said: 'Oh,' I am not surprised, because it must be a matter of surprise, associated as he is and as he was in years gone by.

Mr. COCHRANE. We hear a good deal about that and you have not remedied it much.

Mr. EMMERSON. I say that has been remedied to a very great extent, and I want to call attention to this fact that in the last six months I have not been interfered with by members of parliament in the maritime provinces, or anywhere, in my efforts to establish reforms, in my efforts to cause retrenchment. It is a pretty difficult thing, I admit, to execute a policy of retrenchment. It is not easy in any direction, and it is particularly difficult where things have got a swing, where, during the years that have gone by, the people were led to expect this thing and that, and if these things do not come they are greatly disappointed. When people are brought to the very point of an absolute refusal, and are confronted with the absolute denial of their wishes, then you would naturally expect there would be a great deal of disappointment, a great deal of cavilling and criticism. But I am happy to say that in the efforts I have been endeavouring to put forth I have been loyally supported by hon. members sitting in this House and representing constituencies along the line of that railway. Now, I do not think that in my efforts to bring about these reforms I have had very much assistance from the railway corporations of the country. I see rumours daily in the newspaper press with respect to the sale of the Intercolonial, that certain sums have been offered, that the Minister of Railways in addition to the rebuilding of the shops at Moncton, is recommending to his colleagues and intending to invite consideration by parliament of a proposition to expend $9,000,000 or $9,500,000 on the Intercolonial Railway. With what object are these rumours set afloat? Are there any great railway systems in Canada to-day which are solicitous with respect to the Intercolonial? Why is it that they are excited with reference to the expenditures on the railway and as to its future? Have they eager eyes towards the Intercolonial? If so, it must be recognized that there is truth in the remark which I ventured to make last year, that the Intercolonial is the very best asset that Canada has. If they want the railway I could quite understand where such rumours come from. These obstacles do interfere with the proper management of the road. These rumours that are set afloat with respect to the Intercolonial are calculated to embarrass, and do embarrass. I am not in a position to assert, and perhaps should not assert, that many of these rumours emanate from such a source. But I can say this, that if I were interested in a syndicate or company anxious to secure the Intercolonial, one of the things I would do would be to have coming out daily in the public press of the country, rumours such as we have seen in the public press during the past month.

It is said that we propose to sell the Intercolonial. I want to say that the government of Canada as now constituted, have no intention of disposing of the Intercolonial Railway, and they are determined to maintain it in its entirety as a portion of the transportation system of Canada, in its present status, but in so doing, they are equally determined that it shall be a paying asset of Canada, even though it was not located as a commercial railway and even though it was constructed with regard to the interests of the empire and to political exigencies. It was a military road; we have been endeavouring to make it a commercial, a business road. We are reasonably successful in that and I venture to say that the time is near at hand when the Intercolonial Railway will demonstrate itself to be not merely a surplus gathering work for the profit of the pockets of the people, but that in its book-keeping and in the excess of receipts over expenditure, it will show a balance on the right side of the account. I know how some hon. gentlemen would deplore that fact; I know that their ammunition would run out; but nevertheless it can be made a paying proposition, is being made a paying proposition and it will, as the months pass, prove itself to be a splendid paying proposition for the people of Canada. I want to say that while the earnings have not been banked, nor shown in book-keeping, that there have been earnings and that it has been of great benefit to Canada; that it has contributed to the solidarity of this confederation, that it has brought our peoples together, that it has promoted trade and intercommunication between the several provinces. I want to say in addition to all that, that it has now reached a point where it can lay up month by month, or where it will in the near future lay up month by month, money to its credit. It is all very well to say: Oh, no, you cannot do this, but if you put it into the hands of a commission then this could be done. Well, we have had commissions. There is one thing that is beyond dispute, that is that no government can ever hope to escape responsibility for the operation of a railway, or for its success, by putting that railway into the hands of a commission. I suppose hon. gentlemen, some of them at least, will refer to the Temiskaming Railway.

An hon. MEMBER. It is all right.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, that is a railway that has shown a splendid surplus, but that is a railway that is being constructed under exceptional circumstances. But will you tell me that political influence has not been exercised ? If political influence has in any way obstructed the proper management of the Intercolonil Railway, has it not been in evidence in connection with the Temiskaming Railway ? The government that created the first commission that constructed that road was held responsible for every thing that commission did, and when that government went out of power and friends of hon. gentlemen opposite came into power in Ontario, what did they do? They dismissed every man——

Mr. LANCASTER. They put in good men.

Mr. EMMERSON. Does my hon. friend say they were not good men before?

Mr. LANCASTER. They did not show their goodness by their acts.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend now is just giving evidence of the very thing of which I spoke. They turned out the commissioners, then why did they turn out every engineer?

Mr. LANCASTER. No, they did not.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend says no. There may be level men and chain men and underlings in the engineering staff of that railway who were not disturbed; but every commissioner was made to resign and it was made a political commission, even if it had not been before, so that this talk, this rot I may say, about putting it into the hands of a commission in order to escape politics is simply a spurious argument and one that certainly does not answer the question relating to the Intercolonial. If you are to have a commission that is absolutely free from any influence, political, personal or otherwise, you have to make it practically autocratic. The people own the road, the people have built it, and you propose to transfer it into the hands of one man, two men, or three men, as the case may be, to whom you give autocratic powers and complete control for a period of time. That is alien to the very spirit of responsible government. If you cannot manage public works without commissions, then the Post Office Department, the Militia Department, the Public Works Department, any one of these departments should for the very same reason be placed in commission. To-day the responsibility for the management of the Intercolonial Railway is upon the government, indirectly—directly upon the department of Railways and Canals ; and that is in accordance with the theory of responsible government. If a government fails in its duty—and governments have in the past, and may in the future, fail in their duty with respect to the administration of departments—the remedy is in the hands of the people. But you construct a railway, and then you create a commission and place it in charge of that railway for a period of years, and it must necessarily be taken out of the hands of the people's representatives and be placed under the authority of one man, whose powers must be autocratic. Even private corporations do not do that. Would the shareholders or directors of a railway company place their railway under the autocratic control of a manager for a period of time ? Perish the thought, they would say. They would not entertain the idea for an instant. While men may argue, and very properly so, whether the government operation of railways can be made a success or not, while they may very properly argue that no government should own a railway, that the Intercolonial should be disposed of, let them not suppose that you can remove political influence and all other difficulties by creating a commission, which must of necessity be appointed by a political party, and receive its compensation from a political party, and the members of which would necessarily wish to harmonize their actions with the desires and will of the government of the day. There is no use of our being hypocritical in respect to these matters. Let us look them squarely in the face. I am not going to say that under my management, or under the ministry of railways as now constituted, the Intercolonial Railway can be made a success. I can only say that I am determined that it shall be made a success if that is possible and within my reach ; but if I fail, I want to say this, that the fact that it is not done does not prove that it cannot be done. I believe the Department of Railways can manage the affairs of the Intercolonial Railway successfully. I may be indulging in prophecy, and perhaps there are those listening to me who do not attach much importance to my forecast ; but I do hope to live to see the day when I can stand on the floor of this House and say not that these things can be, but that these things have been, and I shall not die happy unless I can say that.

I think I have covered the ground of the Intercolonial Railway very fully, perhaps not exhaustively. Indeed, I have felt the embarrassment of the materials at my disposal ; but I am sure that I have made some suggestions that will receive the consideration of this country ; I have at least given some food for thought. I have presented to the people of Canada in detail the amount of money they have expended in connection with the great object we all have in view, in promoting the trade and transportation of Canada. That promotion would never succeed if we did not expend the money, and I can only say that whatever funds may be voted by this parliament

at this session for the administration and operation of the Intercolonial during the fiscal year which is to commence on the 1st of July next, the efforts of the Department of Railways will be to see that that money is expended so as to secure the best possible returns, so that the results which we hope for will be accomplished and will redound to the honour of Canada and to the advantage of the trade of the country. The Intercolonial Railway is a safeguard and a regulator of the transportation charges of the country, and in that way alone it is contributing very materially to the advancement of Canada.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) has shown wonderful alacrity in making his budget speech at this early period of the session. We on this side of the House have usually had two or three days notice at least when this important question of transportation and the management of the Intercolonial Railway was to be discussed. It was only at two o'clock to-day that I heard that the hon. gentleman was going to make his speech to-day. I had not the honour of a communication from him that he intended to do so.

Mr. EMMERSON. It was announced last evening in the House.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, when we adjourned at one o'clock in the morning, the hon. gentleman placed his report on the table of the House and announced that he intended to make his budget speech at three o'clock to-day. I went to the post office and found that his report was not even distributed. However, the postmaster came to me about half an hour before the meeting of the House and handed me a copy of the report. It is perhaps just as well that the hon. gentleman has had his speech now. It has been confined solely to the deficits on the Intercolonial Railway. We have not had a word about the canals of the country, the question of transportation, or the question of the Transcontinental Railway, questions in which the people of the country are as much interested as they are in the Intercolonial Railway. However, I will deal with the question which the hon. gentleman has presented to the House. It is the same old, sad story of deficits and a bright future for the Intercolonial Railway. Let us look at the position of it. Let us see what was the condition of the annual receipts and expenditures of the road at the time it came into the possession of the hon. gentlemen opposite and for some years preceding. From 1896 to 1892, looking backwards, there was no deficit whatever on the Intercolonial under my management. The receipts of the road were in the neighbourhood of three million dollars and the expenditure three million dollars. What a change has come over the management since. Look at the road now—the only road we had between 1896 and 1905. Let me show its financial position in 1896 :

The amount of capital expended on Intercolonial Railway in 1896 was..	$48,434,492
On the Cape Breton Railway.. ..	3,860,679
The Oxford and New Glasgow..	1,949,063
Eastern Extension..	1,324,042
The Montreal and European Railway—amount that was paid, I believe, to the province of New Brunswick for a claim they had	33,942
Total..	$55,902,220

Less transfers. I am taking this from the reports that my hon. friend laid on the table this afternoon. See page 33.

Mr. EMMERSON. It was on the table last evening.

An hon. MEMBER. This morning at 1 o'clock.

Mr. HAGGART. It may have been on the table this morning at one o'clock—that is the copy of which the minister has possession—but the time we count is when it is distributed in the post office and members are able to get it. The total expenditure then was $55,902,220, less transfers, $296,872. Or the total expenditure to 1896, less transfers, was $55,605,347. To be added to that we must take the deficits from 1867 to 1896 which the hon. minister has stated to be altogether in the neighbourhood of $8,000,000. That is up to the present time. The amount of deficit on consolidated account from 1896 up to the present day is $2,447,840. Deduct that from the amount which the minister gave us as the total deficits, according to the consolidated accounts, and that has to be added to the $55,605,000.

What is the amount these gentlemen have spent on capital account since then ? They have spent from 1896 to 1905 $21,868,216 plus the deficit of $2,447,840.

But to make a comparison between the earnings on the Intercolonial Railway today and what they were in 1896, you have to add the interest of $24,000,000 which these gentlemen have expended from 1896 to the present. You have to charge about one million dollars before you can count any earnings. Yet the hon. gentleman is hopeful ! That is the financial position of the road which he presents to us. He makes the statement to the House that the deficit on current account was $1,800,000 and the expenditures on capital account last year was $4,400,000. No wonder he wants to divert the attention of the country from this enormous expenditure to other things which he pretends justify it. Well, the Intercolonial Railway runs through a fairly good section of country for commercial, agricultural and all other purposes. Why

does it not pay ? The hon. gentleman tries to explain the reason. The road, he says, was built for military purposes. It was built in a round-about way for the purpose of running between Quebec and Halifax. Then he says it was built for the purpose of defence. Then it has to compete with waterways, and in order to encourage the business of the west in flour to the eastern provinces and in order to encourage the coal miners of the east, the rates on flour and coal are ridiculously low. One of the reasons given by him for the extraordinary low rate charged on coal is that it was for the benefit of the people of the west. But if he will look through his annual report he will find that only 6,000 tons passed last year over the Intercolonial Railway altogether to the west. In 1886, the amount was 286,000 tons, but that has almost entirely disappeared, and with it has disappeared this reason which the hon. gentleman has given us. Another reason he gave us was that he only charged 60 per cent of the passenger rates charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway and Grand Trunk Railway. Why does he not charge enough ? Why does he not charge the ordinary rates when he finds himself confronted with this deficit of nearly $6,000,000. But instead of doing this, he tells us that as the canals were built by the people's money and have never paid any interest on their cost, we should not expect any better result on the Intercolonial Railway. There is an amount due the government by the Grand Trunk Railway of $35,000,000 and we are expending a large sum for the purpose of building a bridge to connect the old city of Quebec with the south shore. We are also spending large sums deepening the harbour at Quebec and the channel at Montreal—and all this expenditure should be a justification for the enormous deficits on the Intercolonial Railway, and the extravagant management of that road. Is it possible to imagine any practical business man advancing such an argument ? But he also goes on to drag in the expenditure on the Canadian Pacific Railway. Because we gave a large amount of land to the Canadian Pacific Railway and other railways in the Territories, amounting at $1 per acre to $50,000,000, and because the Canadian Pacific Railway and the other railways are selling this land at from $2 to $5 per acre, that is another justification for squandering the public money on the Intercolonial Railway. He was a little nervous when I asked him a question—he tried to avoid it and said he would give an explanation later—as to the amount which the people of old Canada spent for the purpose of having the Grand Trunk Railway, and which amounts to $35,000,000. That is a debt we have against the Grand Trunk Railway, but by legislation we gave it rank it after all other securities which the Grand Trunk Railway has given. However we settled all these things at confederation. We of the upper provinces stated our public debts, and the provinces down by the sea stated theirs; and it was upon a comparison of the debts of the provinces that terms were fixed upon establishing the union. This included the case of the canals to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) has referred. A great portion of the canals had already been built. But, even supposing that $83,000,000 has been spent on the canals as the hon. gentleman said and supposing that we receive no return upon this besides expending money for the working of the canals, what basis of comparison does that afford with the $1,800,000 lost on the Intercolonial, plus $4,000,000 expended upon capital account in one year ? There is no comparison whatever. But, every time the hon. gentleman has discussed this question in the House he refers to this point, and charges the members of the opposition, especially those from the older provinces of Canada, with criticising in a way they have no right to do the enormous sums which are spent in the operation of the Intercolonial. He speaks of the expenditure on the canals. But I notice that, in all his comparisons, he has not said a word about the money expended in St. John and Halifax harbours, or the sums that go to provide wharfs and breakwaters around the shores of the maritime provinces. Sir, it is little short of childish for the hon. minister to attempt thus to justify in this parliament the public scandal of the management of the Intercolonial under his direction. A public scandal such as this is not to be met by such silly comparisons and such silly reasons as the hon. gentleman has given.

Why cannot the Intercolonial be managed in the same way that railways in every other part and portion of the Dominion are managed ? There have been prosperous times in this country for the last ten years. Every other railway but the Intercolonial has prospered and flourished. The receipts of the Intercolonial itself show that in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick the people are flourishing, because those receipts have been increased from something like $3,000,000 almost to $7,000,000. Why is it that, when every other railway is prosperous and flourishing, this particular railway shows a yearly deficit ? As I have said before, the people pay fair freight rates on the Intercolonial. As to the passenger rates, assuming, as I am bound to assume, that the hon. gentleman is right, and that the passenger rates are about 78 per cent of those on the Canadian Pacific Railway and about 60 per cent of those on other roads, why should not increase be made in the Intercolonial rates ? Why should not the people be plainly told that, if they intend to retain this as their most valuable asset for commercial purposes for the section of country it serves, if they intend to keep it from being hand-

ed over to a commission or leased or sold to some railway company, the condition of affairs must be changed ? If this cannot be done and if none of the plans that I have suggested are to be adopted, perhaps the whole system might be treated as the Windsor branch has been treated. That has been handed over to others to operate, and we received 23 per cent from it. If the Intercolonial is to be kept in the hands of the government and under government management, then that management must be placed upon a sound and economical basis. Why, the Intercolonial is a laughing stock among railway men. As the hon. gentleman says, they like to see it not prosperous. Let us make a comparison. Two passenger trains a day start from Montreal or Halifax—at least this was the arrangement at one time. Two trains leave Montreal by the Canadian Pacific Railway for St. John, which is on the way to Halifax. And look at the hon. gentleman's statement as to the passengers carried by these roads respectively. Of the nearly 18,000 passengers carried only 1,500 were carried by the Intercolonial Why is it that the Intercolonial cannot get its fair share of the traffic between Halifax and Montreal ? Is it because the men looking after this business are not as capable as those of the Canadian Pacific Railway ? A somewhat similar comparison could be made in every business arrangement to which the Intercolonial is a party. We in this portion of this country most certainly do not object to the Intercolonial being prosperous. Proper management of the Intercolonial would contribute to the prosperity of this part of the Dominion. It was true that the Intercolonial was built in the interest of confederation; it was one of the means designed to bind the provinces of confederation together. The hon. minister has quoted from speeches by Sir Geo. E. Cartier and Sir John Macdonald in 1864. Those speeches show precisely what the object was in building the Intercolonial—to make closer connection between the different parts of the Dominion. I am glad that the hon. gentleman has quoted from these speeches. Evidently the hon. gentleman differs with Sir Richard Cartwright, who states that Sir John Macdonald had nothing to do with confederation, but virtually opposed it. I am glad to have the confirmation afforded by these quotations made by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) that Sir John Macdonald was favourable to confederation. The people of this portion of the country were perfectly willing to contribute their share toward the building of the Intercolonial. And, as I have said, and as has been stated again and again by hon. members on this side, the people here were perfectly willing that that expenditure should not be regarded in Jew fashion, insisting that we should receive a certain percentage on the money. What we wanted was and is a fair and equitable balance between the expenditure and the receipts of that road. It is true, as the hon. gentleman stated, that there are other benefits to the country from the Intercolonial than the receipts from the road. But what the people of this country want is an economical management of the road, so that the receipts and expenditures may at least balance.

He reads a letter from Sir Thomas Shaughnessy which he says justifies his charges on capital account on the Intercolonial. Sir, the letter read by him is a complete vindication of the course of the opposition, and justifies our criticism. The hon. gentleman says that the accounts of the Intercolonial are kept according to the rule stated in that letter. Perhaps they are at the present day, but in the past they never were.

I move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. LENNOX. Before the House adjourns, I wish to call the attention of the Postmaster General to the fact that on March 6 last, more than a year ago, an Order of the House was passed for a return of certain correspondence and documents relating to free rural mail delivery, particularly as it exists in the United States. I find that the return has not been brought down, and I now ask that it be brought down.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I might renew my suggestion to the Prime Minister, in view of what has just been stated, that the Secretary of State's Department should prepare a memorandum showing what returns ordered during the past session have not yet been brought down. It would be a great convenience to us, and would prevent some matters being overlooked.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 6 o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, March 14, 1906.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF THE DEBATES.

Mr. HONORE GERVAIS (Montreal, St. James) presented the first report of the Select Standing Committee to supervise the official report of debates of the House during the present session as follows :

Your committee recommend that their quorum be reduced from eight to five members, all of which is respectfully submitted.

H. GERVAIS,
Chairman.

On the motion of Mr. Gervais, the report was confirmed.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I have the honour to present the report of the special committee appointed to prepare and report with all convenient speed, lists of members to compose the Select Standing Committees, as follows :

No. 1.—ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

Messieurs :

Alcorn,
Aylesworth,
Barker,
Belcourt,
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Borden (Carleton),
Boyce,
Bristol,
Brodeur,
Bureau,
Carvell,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Clarke,
Dubeau,
Dugas,
Emmerson,
Fitzpatrick,
Geoffrion,
German,
Gervais,
Grant,
Guthrie,
Haggart,
Hall,
Lancaster,
Lapointe,
Laurence,
Lavergne (Montmagny)
Lemieux,
Lennox,
Lewis,
Logan,
Macdonald,
McCarthy (Simcoe),
McColl,
Monk,
Northrup,
Piche,
Porter,
Pringle,
Rivet,
Sifton,
Stockton,
Tisdale,
Ward.—46.

No. 2.—ON EXPIRING LAWS.

Messieurs :

Archambault,
Avery,
Barr,
Black,
Bland,
Bourbonnais,
Boyer,
Carney,
Chisholm (Huron),
Copp,
Dubeau,
Ethier,
Finlayson,
Gauvreau,
Herron,
Jackson (Elgin),
McCool,
McCraney,
Martin (Queen's,P.E.I.),
Mayrand,
Morin,
Paquet,
Parent,
Seagram,
Talbot,
Turgeon,
Wilson (Russell).—27.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Seven Members.

No. 3.—ON RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES.

Messieurs :

Adamson,
Alcorn,
Ames,
Archambault,
Armstrong,
Avery,
Aylesworth,
Barker,
Barr,
Beauparlant,
Béland,
Belcourt,
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Bickerdike,
Blain,
Bland,
Bole,
Borden,
(Sir Frederick),
Bourassa,
Bourbonnais,
Boyce,
Boyer,
Brabazon,
Bristol,
Broder,
Brodeur,
Brown,
Bruneau,
Bureau,
Burrows,
Caldwell,
Calvert,
Campbell,
Carrier,
Carvell,
Cash,
Chisholm
(Antigonish),
Chisholm (Huron),
Christie,
Clare,
Clarke,
Clements,
Cochrane,
Cockshutt,
Conmee,
Copp,
Costigan,
Crawford,
Crocket,
Daniel,
Delisle,
Demers,
Derbyshire,
Desjardins,
Devlin,
Dubeau,
Dugas,
Dyment,
Elson,
Emmerson,
Ethier,
Fielding,
Finlay,
Finlayson,
Fitzpatrick,
Forget,
Fortier,
Foster,
Fowler,
Galliher,
Ganong,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
German,
Gervais,
Girard,
Gladu,
Gordon,
Grant,
Greenway,
Lancaster,
Lanctôt,
Lapointe,
Laurence,
Laurier,
(L'Assomption),
Lavergne,
(Drum. & Arth.),
Lavergne
(Montmagny),
Law,
Lefurgey,
Lemieux,
Lennox,
Léonard,
Lewis,
Logan,
Loggie,
Macdonald,
Macdonell,
MacLaren,
Maclean,
(Lunenburg),
Maclean (York, S.),
Macpherson,
McCarthy
(Calgary),
McCarthy
(Simcoe),
McColl,
McCraney,
McCool,
McIntyre,
McKenzie,
McLean,
(Queen's P.E.I.).
McLennan,
Marcil,
(Bonaventure),
Marcile (Bagot),
Martin,
(Queen's, P.E.I.),
Martin
(Wellington),
Mayrand,
Miller,
Monk,
Morin,
Northrup,
Oliver,
Osler,
Pardee,
Parmelee,
Paquet,
Parent,
Perley,
Piché,
Pickup,
Porter,
Power,
Pringle,
Proulx,
Ratz,
Reid (Grenville),
Rivet,
Roche (Halifax),
Roche (Marquette),
Ross Rimouski),
Ross
(Yale-Cariboo),
Rousseau,
Savoie,
Schnaffer,
Schell (Glengarry),
Schell (Oxford),
Sifton,
Sinclair,
Sloan,
Smith (Nanaimo),
Sproule,
Staples,
Stewart,
Stockton,

Gunn,
Guthrie,
Haggart,
Hall,
Harty,
Henderson,
Herron,
Hughes,
(King's, P.E.I.),
Hughes (Victoria),
Hunt,
Hyman,
Ingram,
Jackson (Elgin),
Jackson (Selkirk),
Johnston,
Kemp,
Kennedy,
Knowles,
Lachance,
Lake,
Lalor,
Talbot,
Telford,
Templeman,
Thompson,
Tisdale,
Tobin,
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Verville,
Walsh,
Ward,
Watson,
White,
Wilmot,
Wilson
(Len'x & Addin.),
Wilson (Russell),
Worthington,
Wright (Muskoka),
Wright (Renfrew),
Zimmerman.—194.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Twenty-five Members.

No. 4.—ON MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS.

Messieurs :

Alcorn,
Ames,
Avery,
Aylesworth,
Béland,
Belcourt,
Bennett,
Black,
Bole,
Boyce,
Brabazon,
Broder,
Brodeur,
Bruneau,
Caldwell,
Calvert,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Chisholm (Huron),
Christie,
Clements,
Cochrane,
Conmee,
Crawford,
Crocket,
Cyr,
Daniel,
Demers,
Desjardins,
Devlin,
Dugas,
Dyment,
Elson,
Ethier,
Fitzpatrick,
Galliher,
Gauvreau,
Girard,
Gladu,
Gordon,
Greenway,
Gunn,
Guthrie,
Harty,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),
Hunt,
Jackson (Elgin),
Jackson (Selkirk),
Kennedy,
Lachance,
Lake,
Lalor,
Lavergne
(Drum. & Arth.),
LeBlanc,
Lemieux,
Logan,
Macdonell,
Maclean (Lunenburg),
Maclean (York S.),
McCool,
McLean,
(Queen's, P.E.I.),
Martin (Queen's,P.E.I.),
Martin (Wellington),
Meigs,
Monk,
Morin,
Parent,
Power,
Pringle,
Proulx,
Ross (Yale-Cariboo),
Schaffner,
Schell (Glengarry),
Sloan,
Talbot,
Thompson,
Tobin,
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Walsh,
White,
Worthington.—81.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of ten members.

No. 5.—ON STANDING ORDERS.

Messieurs :

Black,
Bourbonnais,
Brabazon,
Brown,
Calvert,
Chisholm (Huron),
Clare,
Clements,
Copp,
Finlay,
Finlayson,
Fortier,
Galliher,
Ganong,
Grant,
Guthrie,
Hall,
Hughes (Victoria),
Ingram,
Knowles,
Lake,
Lancaster,
Laurier (L'Assomption)
Lavergne
(Drummond & Arth.),
Lavergne (Montmagny,
Law,
Lefurgey,
Maclean (Lunenburg),
Macpherson,
McCarthy (Calgary),
McIntyre,
Marcile (Bagot),
Martin (Wellington),
Meigs,
Morin,
Reid (Restigouche),
Roche (Halifax),
Ross (Rimouski),
Smith (Nanaimo),
Smith (Oxford),
Staples,
Stewart,
Thompson,
Turgeon,
Verville,
White,
Wilmot,
Wilson
(Lennox & Addington).
Wright (Muskoka),
Wright (Renfrew)—50.

And that the Quorum of the said committee do consist of seven members.

No.6.—JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING.

Messieurs ·

Bergeron,
Bristol,
Cyr,
Dyment,
Gervais,
Henderson,
Hughes (Victoria),
Johnston,
Lavergne (Drummond & Arth.),
Logan,
Maclean (York, South),
Macpherson,
McColl,
Oliver,
Pardee,
Parmelee,
Piché,
Roche (Marquette),
Ross (Yale-Cariboo),
Smith (Oxford),
Smith (Wentworth),
Taylor,
Tisdale,
Verville—24.

(Members to act on the part of the Commons.)

No. 7.—ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Adamson,
Alcorn,
Ames,
Aylesworth,
Barker,
Belcourt,
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Bickerdike,
Blain,
Borden (Sir Frederick),
Burrows,
Campbell,
Carney,
Cash,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Clare,
Clarke,
Cochrane,
Cockshutt,
Costigan,
Daniel,
Demers,
Desjardins,
Emmerson,
Fielding,
Fitzpatrick,
Foster,
Geoffrion,
German,
Gervais,
Kemp,
Kennedy,
Knowles,
Lake,
Lancaster,
Lapointe,
Laurence,
Law,
LeBlanc,
Lennox,
Léonard,
Loggie,
Macdonald,
McCarthy (Calgary),
McColl,
McKenzie,
McLean
(Queen's, P.E.I.),
Northrup,
Oliver,
Pardee,
Piché,
Pickup,
Reid (Restigouche),
Rivet,
Roche (Halifax),
Roche (Marquette),
Savoie,
Sifton,
Sinclair,
Sloan,

Greenway,
Haggart,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),
Hughes (Victoria),
Hyman,
Ingram,
Jackson (Selkirk),
Smith (Wentworth),
Sproule,
Stewart,
Stockton,
Taylor,
Ward,
Zimmerman.—75.

And that the Quorum of the said committee do consist of twenty-one members.

No. 8.—ON BANKING AND COMMERCE.

Messieurs :

Adamson,
Ames,
Archambault,
Armstrong,
Avery,
Barker,
Barr,
Beauparlant,
Béland,
Belcourt,
Bennett,
Bergeron,
Bickerdike,
Blain,
Bole,
Borden (Sir Frederick),
Borden (Carleton),
Bourassa,
Boyce,
Bristol,
Brown,
Bruneau,
Bureau,
Burrows,
Caldwell,
Calvert,
Campbell,
Carney,
Carrier,
Cash,
Clarke,
Clements,
Cochrane,
Cockshutt,
Conmee,
Copp,
Costigan,
Delisle,
Demers,
Derbyshire,
Dubeau,
Emmerson,
Fielding,
Finlay,
Forget,
Fortier,
Foster,
Fowler,
Galliher,
Ganong,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
Gervais,
Gladu,
Gordon,
Grant,
Gunn,
Guthrie,
Haggart,
Hall,
Harty,
Henderson,
Herron,
Hyman,
Ingram,
Johnston,
Kemp,
Lake,
Lalor,
Lanctôt,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Lavergne (Drummond & Arth),
Law,
Lefurgey,
Lemieux,
Lewis,
Logan,
Loggie,
Lovell,
Macdonell,
Maclean (York, O.)
McCarthy (Calgary),
McCarthy (Simcoe),
McIntyre,
McKenzie,
McLennan,
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Mayrand,
Miller,
Monk,
Morin,
Osler,
Pardee,
Parmelee,
Paterson,
Perley,
Pickup,
Porter,
Power,
Ratz,
Reid (Grenville),
Reid (Restigouche),
Roche (Halifax),
Ross (Rimouski),
Rousseau,
Savoie,
Schell (Glengarry),
Sifton,
Sinclair,
Smith (Wentworth),
Sproule,
Stewart,
Stockton,
Talbot,
Taylor,
Telford,
Thompson,
Tisdale,
Tobin,
Verville,
Ward,
Wilmot,
Wilson,
(Lennox & Addington),
Worthingham,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.),
Hughes (Victoria),
Wright (Renfrew),
Zimmerman.—128.

And that the Quorum of the said committee do consist of twenty-one members.

No. 9.—AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION.

Messieurs :

Adamson,
Archambault,
Armstrong,
Barr,
Beauparlant,
Béland,
Black,
Blain,
Bland,
Bourassa,
Bourbonnais,
Boyer,
Brabazon,
Broder,
Brown,
Bureau,
Burrows,
Caldwell,
Calvert,
Carrier,
Carvell,
Cash,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Chisholm (Huron),
Christie,
Clare,
Clarke,
Clements,
Cochrane,
Conmee,
Copp,
Crawford,
Crocket,
Cyr,
Delisle,
Derbyshire,
Desjardins,
Devlin,
Dugas,
Elson,
Ethier,
Finlay,
Fisher,
Gauvreau,
Girard,
Gordon,
Greenway,
Gunn,
Henderson,
Herron,
Hughes (King's, P.E.I.)
Hughes (Victoria)
Hunt,
Ingram,
Jackson (Elgin)
Jackson (Selkirk)
Kennedy,
Knowles,
Lachance,
Lake,
Lalor,
Lanctôt,
Laurence,
Laurier (L'Assomption)
Lavergne (Drummond & Arth.)
LeBlanc,
Lennox,
Léonard,
Lewis,
Lovell,
Macdonald,
MacLaren,
McColl,
McCool,
McCraney,
McIntyre,
McKenzie,
McLean (Queen's, P.E.I.),
McLennan,
Marcile (Bagot),
Martin (Queen's, P.E.I.),
Martin (Wellington),
Meigs,
Miller,
Monk,
Morin,
Oliver,
Paquet,
Parent,
Pickup,
Proulx,
Ratz,
Reid (Grenville),
Roche (Marquette),
Ross (Rimouski),
Ross (Yale-Cariboo),
Rousseau,
Savoie,
Schaffner,
Schell (Glengarry),
Schell (Oxford),
Seagram,
Sinclair,
Smith (Nanaimo),
Smith (Oxford),
Smith (Wentworth),
Sproule,
Staples,
Talbot,
Taylor,
Telford,
Thompson,
Turgeon,
Turiff,
Walsh,
Watson,
Wilmot,
Wilson,
(Lennox & Addington),
Wilson (Russell),
Worthington,
Wright (Muskoka),
Wright (Renfrew).—122.

And that the Quorum of the said committee do consist of eight members.

LIBRARY COMMITTEE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved :

That a select committee composed of Messrs. Bourassa, Bristol, Brodeur, Calvert, Demers, Pardee, Hyman, Laurier (Sir Wilfrid), Knowles, Grant, Smith (Nanaimo), Foster, Bergeron, Stockton and Monk, be appointed to assist Mr. Speaker in the direction of the library of parliament so far as the interests of this House are concerned and to act as members of a joint committee of both Houses on the library ; and that a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their honours herewith.

Motion agreed to.

PRINTING COMMITTEE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved :

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their honours that this House will unite with them in the formation of a joint committee of both Houses on the subject of the Printing of Parliament, and that the members of the select standing committee, viz.: Messrs. Bergeron, Bristol, Cyr, Dyment, Gervais, Henderson, Hughes (Victoria), Johnston, Lavergne (Drummond and Arthabaska), Logan, Maclean (York, South), McColl, Macpherson, Oliver, Pardee, Parmelee, Piché, Roche (Marquette), Ross (Yale-Cariboo), Smith (Oxford), Smith (Wentworth), Taylor, Tisdale and Verville will act as members, on the part of this House, on the said Joint Committee on the Printing of Parliament.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Auditor General's Report, for the year ending June 30, 1905. Volume 3.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 14) to amend the Weights and Measures Act.—Mr. Campbell.

QUESTIONS.

QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RAILROAD CO.—LAND GRANT.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN asked :

1. Did the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company become entitled to receive or select any public lands under any and what statute, or under and what contract with the government?

2. To what quantity did it become entitled?

3. What area of land was reserved in the first instance out of which the company was to select its grant?

4. What were the boundaries of such area?

5. Did the company dispose of its land grant or any and what portion thereof to any corporation person or persons? If so, when and to whom and upon what terms and under what agreement ?

6. If the company's land grant, or some portion thereof, was so disposed of, did the company in making such disposition assign or convey to the purchaser any particular area of land or land to be selected within some particular area, or did it assign or convey to the purchaser simply its claim against the government in respect of the whole or some portion of its land grant ; or how otherwise did it make the said disposition ?

7. Was the area for the selection of any and what portion of the company's land grant afterwards altered, changed or enlarged in any way?

8. Was the area for the selection of the land so disposed of by the company altered, changed or enlarged by order in council or otherwise ?

9. If so, at what date, by what instrument, to what extent and in what respect was any such change, enlargement or alteration made?

10. How long was this after the company had made the disposition of its land grant above referred to?

11. If any such change, enlargement or alteration in the area aforesaid was made by order in council passed in August, 1902, or thereabouts, on whose recommendation and at whose request, for what reason and upon what grounds was the said order in council passed ?

12. When was the passing of such order in council first communicated to the said company?

13. Is the said company indebted to the government? If so, in what sums for principal and of interest respectively, and under what instrument or authority was such indebtedness created ?

14. Does the government hold any and what security for such indebtedness? If so, what is the nature of the security, and what its estimated value?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). As the question involves a great deal of labour, I would like to have it stand.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman will remember that I gave notice of this question some time before the House opened in order that there might not be any delay in obtaining the answer. I trust that some diligence will be exercised.

Mr. OLIVER. I assure the hon. gentleman that there will be no serious delay.

WRECKS ON THE ST. LAWRENCE.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN asked :

1. How many wrecks occurred in the River and Gulf of St. Lawrence during the season of 1905 ?

2. How many of said wrecks resulted in total loss of ship and cargo, or either ?

3. To what cause was each of the said wrecks due ?

4. What is the value of the property lost or destroyed by reason of said wrecks ?

Hon. SIDNEY FISHER (for the Minister of Marine) :

1. 18.
2. 1.
3. (a) stranding, 13 ; (b) collision, 5.
4. Reported value according to wreck returns received in Department of Marine and Fisheries for 4 wrecks, $47,000. In the other cases the value is not given in the returns received.

TEMPORARY GOVERNMENT LOANS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN asked :

1. What amount of temporary loans contracted by the government was outstanding on March 1, 1896 ?
2. What is the average rate of interest payable thereon ?

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

1. The amount of temporary loans outstanding March 1, 1906, was £1,400,000. Of this amount £600,000 was borrowed September 28 and bears interest at the rate of 3½ per cent per annum, £800,000 was borrowed on November 1, 1905 for the purpose of redeeming debt then falling due.
2. The rate of interest was 3⅞ per cent per annum. The average rate of interest on the two transactions is 3·52.

CUSTOMS RECEIPTS PORT STANLEY, PORT BRUCE AND PORT BURWELL.

Mr. INGRAM asked :

1. What were the receipts from customs collected at Port Stanley for each year since June 30, 1896 ?
2. What were the receipts from customs collected at Port Bruce for each year since June 30, 1896 ?
3. What were the receipts from customs collected at Port Burwell for each year since 1896?

Hon. WILLIAM PATTERSON (Minister of Customs). The following were the Customs receipts at these ports during the periods stated, viz. :

—	Port Stanley.	Port Bruce.	Port Burwell.
	$ cts.		$ cts.
1896-97	1,886 55	Nil.	304 73
1897-98	4,496 87	Nil.	393 70
1898-99	6,236 63	Nil.	688 30
1899-1900	8,095 22	Nil.	1,003 30
1900-01	9,038 65	Nil.	1,878 46
1901-02	2,230 99	Nil.	1,442 88
1902-03	39,178 03	Nil.	1,813 14
1903-04	36,326 24	Nil.	2,533 75
1904-05	25,669 93	Office closed Feb. 1905.	1,395 35

PORT STANLEY HARBOUR WORKS.

Mr. INGRAM asked :

1. Have all persons employed on the harbour works at Port Stanley been paid ? If not, why not?
2. If any unpaid balance is due any of them, how long since has said unpaid balance been due ?
3. What are the names and the respective amounts ?

Hon. CHARLES S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works). So far as the department is aware, all pay sheets for services have been paid, the cheque for the last one having been sent on the 15th ultimo.

MR. W. T. R. PRESTON.

Mr. URIAH WILSON asked :

1. Did W. T. R. Preston, Dominion Commissioner of Immigration at London, England, visit Canada late in December, 1905, or early in January, 1906, on official business ?
2. Did the government send for Mr. Preston?
3. Did Mr. Preston ask leave to visit Canada?
4. Is Mr. W. T. R. Preston, Dominion Commissioner of Immigration at London, England, an official subordinate to the Canadian High Commissioner in London, England, or not ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. No.
4. Yes.

OIL SUPPLIED INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY BY NEW BRUNSWICK PETROLEUM COMPANY.

Mr. BARKER asked:

1. How many carloads of oil were sold in 1905 by the New Brunswick Petroleum Company to the government for the government railways?
2. What was the total quantity of oil, if any, sold in 1905 by the said company to the government for the said railways, and what was the price ?
3. What quantity of oil, if any, was shipped by the said company to the government from Memramcook to Moncton or elsewhere in each month of the year 1905 ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. Six carloads and 168 barrels of crude oil were purchased from New Brunswick Petroleum Company during the year 1905 for the Intercolonial Railway.
2. 43,824 gallons, and the price paid was ten cents per gallon delivered at Memramcook.
3. January, nil; February, 7,926 gallons; March, Nil; April, 6,996 gallons; May, 889 gallons; June, 7,075 gallons; July, 6,129 gallons; August, 949 gallons; September, 6,129 gallons; October, 953 gallons; November, 6,338 gallons; December, 440 gallons.

No business was done by the Prince Edward Island Railway with the above company.

EASTERN RAILWAY SUPPLY COMPANY.

Mr. BARKER asked:

1. What, if any, contracts or dealings has the Eastern Railway Supply Company, as principal or otherwise, had with the government since the first day of July, 1902, for sale or supply to the government railways, of belting, water hose, hardware, varnish, fencing wire, or other railway supplies; and has said company, as commission agent or otherwise, supplied any such stores or supplies to such railways since said date?

2. What were the dates and values of such contracts, dealings or arrangements, if any, and for what periods were they made?

3. What sums, if any, have been paid to said company or their principals by the government for the several years from the date aforesaid till the 31st December, 1905?

4. Is said company incorporated? If so, how and where?

5. If not incorporated, what are the names, residence and occupations of the persons forming the company?

6. Where is the principal office of said company?

7. What are the names, residence and occupation of its president and secretary, respectively?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals):

As to questions 1, 2 and 3, the information is too voluminous to answer in the form of an inquiry, and as the hon. gentleman has moved for an Order covering it, there will be no unnecessary delay in bringing the papers down.

4. The department is informed; but not officially, that the company is incorporated under the laws of the Colony of Newfoundland.

5. No. 4 answers this.

6. Halifax, Nova Scotia, so far as the department can ascertain.

7. The name of the president is to the department unknown, but reference to tenders shows that F. Fred. Pearson, of Halifax, signs on behalf of company as secretary.

HOG PLAGUE.

Mr. CLEMENTS asked:

1. What townships in West Kent and East Kent are under quarantine in respect to the hog plague?

2. How long has each of said townships been so quarantined, and how many cases of said disease have been reported in each of said townships during the past year, and what is the name of the township and place in each instance?

3. What government officials or veterinary surgeons are employed in each of said townships at the present time, and what is the salary and detailed expense of each of said officials or veterinary surgeons employed in respect of the said plague?

4. What amount has been paid by the government for the past year in respect of said quarantine?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture):

1. Tilbury East, Raleigh, East Dover, West Dover, Chatham, Harwich, Camden, Howard.

2. Tilbury East, Raleigh, East Dover, West Dover, Chatham and Harwich were quarantined on October 22, 1902, Camden and Howard being added on May 1, 1905.

Camden was originally quarantined with the other townships on October 22, 1902, but had been released on November 25 of the same year.

141 hogs were reported and killed in Harwich and 13 distributed as follows:

Harwich:

April 7, lot 24, con. 3	36
April 6, lot 20, con. 2	45
October 24, lot 20, con. 2	60

Chatham:

Sept. 25, lot 20, con. 3	13
	154

3. There are no government officers or veterinary surgeons employed in any of the said townships solely. There are four inpectors employed for a larger area, in which said townships are included, who inspect carloads of hogs going out for immediate slaughter. Their names, and the amounts paid them during the past calendar year, are as follows:

W. Clapp, services and expenses from May to Dec.	$ 77 85
H. W. Fry, inspection fees, May 16 to Dec. 31	175 00
R. C. Coates, inspection fees, May 13 to Dec. 31	294 24
Henry Boyd, inspection fees, May 22 to Dec. 31	390 55

There are also four veterinary inspectors appointed under the Animal Contagious Diseases Act, 1903, whose services are, in addition to other places, available and rendered in said townships. But these four inspectors deal not only with hog cholera, but with all other diseases coming under the said Act. Their names, and the total amounts paid them respectively during the past calendar year, are as follows:

J. R. Thorne, expenses, May 4 to July 17	$ 3 73
J. R. Thorne, salary one year	250 00
	$253 73
M. B. Perdue, expenses, Jan. 2 to Dec. 31	366 19
M. B. Perdue, salary one year	1,400 00
	$1,766 19
J. Kime, jr., expenses, March to October	56 93
J. Kime, jr., salary one year	250 00
	$306 93

W. B. Rowe, expenses, Feb. 9 to Dec. 31.. .. .. $ 54 46
W. B. Rowe, salary one year.. .. 250 00

$304 46

4. During the past year, the sum of $714.64 was paid in compensation for hogs destroyed on account of hog cholera in the said townships.

BUTT AND LAP WELDED PIPING.

Mr. CLEMENTS asked.

1. What is the duty on butt and lap welded piping and tubing imported into Canada from the United States ?
2. What amount of the same was imported last year ?
3. Is it the intention of the government to make any change in the duty in the near future on above piping ?
4. If so, is it the intention to increase or to decrease the duty ?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs).

1. The duty on butt and lap welded tubing from the United States is as follows :—

(a). Two inches or less in diameter 35 per cent ad valorem ;

(b). Over two inches in diameter 15 per cent ad valorem ;

(c). Not less than 2½ inches in diameter, when imported for mining purposes, free.

2. Dutiable tubing imported from United States for fiscal year ended June 30, 1905 was as follows :—

2 inches or less in diameter ..$ 69,270
Over 2 inches in diameter 473,628

The amount of free tubing for mining purposes is not classified by itself in the statistical returns.

3 and 4. It is not usual for the government to announce intended tariff changes in advance.

RIVER THAMES SURVEY.

Mr. CLEMENTS asked :

1. Has the River Thames been surveyed from Lake St. Clair to the city of Chatham, with a view of deepening the channel to fifteen feet ?
2. When was the said survey made ?
3. What was the result of the said survey ?
4. Does the government intend to improve the channel of the said river in accordance with the information afforded by said survey ?
5. When will the improvement be made ?

Hon. CHARLES S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works) :

1. Yes.

2. In September, October and November, 1904.

3. Report is dated 2nd February, 1905, and if mover desires production of same, a copy will be brought down.

THAMES DREDGING.

Mr. CLEMENTS asked :

1. Is the government aware of the immediate necessity for dredging the channel at the mouth of the River Thames, in the province of Ontario ?
2. Has the attention of the government been directed to the necessity for this dredging ?
3. Is the government aware that the city of Chatham and the adjoining district are suffering very great loss by reason of the filling in of the said channel ?
4. Is it the intention of the government to put the said channel in a navigable condition at an early date ?
5. If so, when will the work be commenced ?

Hon. CHARLES S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works). 1. Representations have been made and received, and it is the intention of the department to attend to the question of improvements during the next season.

RAW LEAF TOBACCO.

Mr. CLEMENTS asked :

1. Is it the intention of the government to increase the duty on raw leaf tobacco imported into Canada ?
2. What amount of raw leaf tobacco was imported into Canada from the commencement of last year ?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

1. It is not usual for the government to announce particulars of tariff changes in advance.

2. The amount of unmanufactured tobacco imported into Canada for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1905 was 14,707,457 lbs.

WIRE FENCING.

Mr. CLEMENTS asked :

1. Is there any inspection by officers of the government of wire fencing imported into Canada ?
2. Does such inspection, if any, show quality, grade, &c., of such wire fencing ?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs) :

1. Customs officers make inspection of wire fencing on importation into Canada, for the purpose of determining its tariff rating and its valuation for duty purposes.

2. The Customs inspection does not relate to quality and grade of fencing, further than to compare the fencing with the descriptions on invoice and appraise the value of the goods and classify same for duty purposes.

HOGS IMPORTED AND SLAUGHTERED FOR EXPORT.

Mr. SPROULE—by Mr. Sam Hughes—asked:

1. What was the number of hogs brought into Canada from the United States to be slaughtered for exportation, during the years 1901, 1902, 1903, 1904 and 1905 ?

2. What was the number of pounds of meat imported for home consumption, and also for export, if any, distinguishing fresh from cured meats, during the years 1901, 1902, 1903, 1904 and 1905 ?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs). 1. A special compilation requiring some time would be necessary to ascertain the number of hogs imported, to be slaughtered for exportation. The total weight and value of hogs imported, however, were as follows :—

Fiscal Year.	Lbs.	Value.
		$
1901	144,678	8,091
1902	116,366	6,812
1903	19,745	1,626
1904	135,459	7,317
1905	5,334,859	329,078

With reference to the second question, I have the answer with me, but it is a mass of figures and would occupy a long time in the reading. Perhaps it would be more convenient if it were moved for as a return. Still, if the House would rather, I will give it now.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Considered as read.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. I presume that if the minister will allow the mover of the motion to have access to the documents, that is all he wants.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER. Read the first one and the last one.

Mr. PATERSON. I will hand it to the hon. member (Mr. Sproule). We might consider the question as answered—the first part having been answered, and the second might be dropped.

EXPENDITURE ON IMMIGRATION.

Mr. SPROULE—by Mr. Sam Hughes—asked:

1. What was the amount spent for promoting and carrying on immigration work in every line during the years 1901, 1902, 1903, 1904, and 1905, distinguishing the cost of the work in connection with the immigration from the United States and that from European and Continental countries ?

2. What assistance, if any, is given to steamship companies, booking agencies, corporations or associations, religious or charitable, or otherwise, for bringing immigrants to Canada distinguishing the difference in the amount paid for adults and children ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior).

1. The following figures give the answer to this question :—

Fiscal Year.	The total amount spent in promoting and carrying on Immigration for five years ended June 30, 1905 was	The approximate amount spent in promoting Immigration from the United States was	The approximate amount spent in promoting Immigration from Great Britain and Ireland was	The approximate amount spent in promoting Immigration from the Continent of Europe and Iceland was
	$ cts.	$	$	$
1900-1901.	444,729 63	144,000	110,000	43,000
1901-1902..	484,841 55	178,000	121,000	58,000
1902-1903..	642,913 74	161,000	205,000	60,000
1903-1904..	744,788 50	205,000	236,000	78,000
1904-1905..	972,356 69	318,000	198,000	130,000

2. Booking agents, &c., in Great Britain receive a bonus on tickets sold to farmers, farm labourers, domestic servants, and persons intending to follow those occupations in Canada, coming here for the first time. The bonus is 7 shillings on those over 12 years of age and 3s. 6d. on those between one and 12 years of age.

The Salvation Army receive a bonus on the classes mentioned above of 12s. on adults and 6s. on those between one and 12 years of age. They also receive a grant of £20 per month to augment their immigration fund in Great Britain, a grant of $2,000 for 1905-6 as contribution towards the expense entailed in conducting lectures on Canada in Great Britain, a grant of $1,000 for the fiscal year 1905-6 and a further grant of $1,000 for the calendar year 1906 to assist in their work of placing immigrants after arrival in Canada.

The British Women's Emigration Society. The Women's Domestic and Business Guild of Canada, receive a bonus of $3 on each domestic servant brought to Canada.

A bonus of $2 per capita is paid various philanthropic societies sending to Canada children who have not been inmates of reformatories, industrial schools, workhouses, penitentiaries, prisons or other public institutions of a similar character.

A payment of £1 per ticket and 10s. per half ticket is made to ss. companies bringing immigrants from Iceland to Canada, the cost of the ticket to the immigrant being reduced by that amount.

In the United States sub-agents receive a bonus of $3 for adult males, $2 for adult females and $1 for children under 18 years of age sent by them to Canada to engage in agricultural work.

A bonus is paid to the North Atlantic Trading Company of £1 on every man, woman and child of the agricultural class

and on every domestic over 18 years of age, coming to Canada from Holland, Denmark, Russia, Germany, Austria, Hungary, Luxemburg, Norway, Sweden, Finland, and Switzerland, providing the company carries on an active emigration propaganda by advertisements in the public press, publication and distribution of pamphlets and personal canvass in the agricultural districts of the countries named, expending annually thereon not less than $15,000. No bonus is paid on any immigrant not mentally and physically fit or who is a criminal, or has a criminal record, and any expense incurred in having such persons cared for or deported is to be charged against the account of the company. The payment of bonuses on settlers from Galicia, Bukowinia and Poland, excepting Germans, is limited to 5,000 persons per year. The government makes a grant of £750 a year to the company for special work in Norway, Sweden and Finland, providing the company expends a further sum of £1,000 per year on the same special work. The company has deposited with the government £1,000 as a guarantee of good faith and security for the due fulfilment of their terms of the contract, said amount to bear interest at the rate of 3 per cent per annum.

MALLEIN TESTS FOR GLANDERS.

Mr. SPROULE—by Mr. Sam. Hughes—asked:

1. How many mallein tests have been made for glanders in horses during the year 1905, specifying the number in each province?
2. How many of those tested have been destroyed, and what compensation, if any, has been paid for them?
3. Does the Department of Agriculture consider the mallein test reliable as a means of diagnosis?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture):

1. During the year ending October 31, 1905, the departmental year, the following mallein tests were applied:

Quebec	411
Ontario	181
Manitoba	1,414
Northwest Territories	2,714
British Columbia	164
Yukon	15
	4,899

2.

Province.	Tested and destroyed.	Destroyed on inspection.	Total compensation paid.
			$ cts.
Quebec	254	65	23,091 06
Ontario	77	7	5,672 50
Manitoba	591	70	52,776 66
N. W. Territories	829	113	59,308 00
British Columbia	95	3	6,303 20
Yukon	8	1	700 00
	1,854	259	147,851 42

3. Yes.

IMMIGRATION IN LAST FIVE YEARS.

Mr. SPROULE—by Mr. Sam. Hughes—asked:

1. How many immigrants have been deported during the years 1903, 1904 and 1905, on account of being diseased, or physically or mentally unsuited for maintaining themselves without becoming a burden on charity?
2. What was the number of immigrants who arrived and settled in Canada during the years 1901, 1902, 1903, 1904 and 1905, specifying the countries from which they came?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior): 1. The number of immigrants deported was:

For the fiscal year 1902-03	340
" " " 1903-04	359
" " " 1904-05	697
Total	1,396

2. The number of immigrants who arrived and settled in Canada during the years 1901, 1902, 1903, 1904 and 1905, specifying the countries from which they came, is given in the table attached.

IMMIGRATION BY NATIONALITIES

During the Fiscal Years 1900-1901 to 1904-1905.

Nationality.	1900-01.	1901-02.	1902-03.	1903-04.	1904-05.	Totals.
English and Welsh	9,401	13,095	32,510	36,694	49,617	141,317
Scotch	1,476	2,853	7,046	10,552	11,744	33,671
Irish	933	1,311	2,236	3,128	3,998	11,606
Total British	11,810	17,259	41 792	50,374	65,359	186,594

IMMIGRATION BY NATIONALITIES—*Continued.*

During the Fiscal Years 1900-1901 to 1904-1905.

Nationality.	1900-01.	1901-02.	1902-03.	1903-04.	1904-05.	Totals.
South African	.....	.....	.....	21	35	56
Australian	3	11	46	58	204	322
Austrian	228	320	781	516	837	2,682
Bohemian	9	3	16	91	107	226
Buckowinian	128	550	1,759	1,578	1,123	5,138
Croatian	65	59	1	16	27	168
Dalmatian	.....	.....	.....	.....	4	4
Galician	4,702	6,550	8,382	7,729	6,926	34,289
Hungarian	546	1,048	2,074	1,091	981	5,740
Magyar	.....	.....	.....	.....	5	5
Ruthenian	.....	.....	.....	.....	3	3
Slovak	14	27	82	116	47	286
Styrian	.....	.....	.....	.....	29	29
Belgian	132	223	303	858	796	2,312
Brazilian	.....	.....	.....	2	1	3
Chinese	7	2	.....	.....	.....	9
Bulgarian	.....	1	7	14	2	24
Dutch	25	35	223	169	281	733
French	360	431	937	1,534	1,743	5,005
German	984	1,048	1,869	2,966	2,721	9,588
Prussian	.....	.....	5	11	28	44
Saxon	.....	.....	13	8	10	31
West Indian	.....	.....	17	52	69	138
Bermudian	.....	.....	6	3	8	17
Greek	81	161	193	191	98	724
Hebrew	2,765	1,015	2,066	3,727	7,715	17,288
Italian	4,710	3,828	3,371	4,445	3,473	19,827
Japanese	6	.....	.....	.....	354	360
Newfoundlanders	.....	.....	335	519	190	1,044
New Zealanders	.....	.....	2	23	57	82
Portuguese	.....	.....	.....	.....	1	1
Polish	162	230	274	669	745	2,080
Persian	.....	1	40	5	8	54
Roumanian	152	272	437	619	270	1,750
Moldavian	.....	279	1	.....	.....	280
Russian	1,044	2,467	5,505	1,955	1,887	12,858
Finnish	682	1,292	1,734	845	1,323	5,876
Doukhobors	.....	12	.....	.....	24	36
Mennonites	.....	52	38	11	.....	101
Spanish	14	1	7	5	10	37
Swiss	30	17	73	128	150	398
Servian	23	.....	2	10	7	42
Danish	88	163	308	417	461	1,437
Icelandic	912	260	917	396	413	2,898
Swedish	485	1,013	2,477	2,151	1,847	7,973
Norwegian	265	1,015	1,746	1,239	1,397	5,662
Turks	37	17	43	29	30	156
Armenian	62	112	113	81	78	446
Egyptian	1	3	1	3	2	10
Syrian	464	1,066	847	369	630	3,376
Arabian	98	70	46	58	48	320
U. S. citizens *via* ocean ports	68	73	.....	.....	.....	141
Maltese	.....	.....	2	.....	.....	2
Malay	.....	5	.....	.....	.....	5
Negro	.....	.....	.....	.....	5	5
India	.....	.....	.....	.....	45	45
Total continental, &c.	19,352	23,732	37,099	34,728	37,255	152,166
United States	17,987	26,388	49,473	45,229	43,652	182,729
Total immigration	49,149	67,379	128,364	130,331	146,266	521,489

PARTICIPATION OF JUDGES IN BUSINESS.

Mr. SPROULE—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Has the attention of the government been directed to the statements in the public press that the statutory provisions prohibiing judges from acting as directors, or otherwise engaging in outside business, are being disregarded ?
2. Has the government taken any steps to ascertain whether such statements are correct?
3. What opinion has the government on the subject ?

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice) :

1. Yes.
2. No particular complaints have been addressed to the department against any judge, but the government has under consideration the expediency of introducing further legislation to provide a sanction for section 7, 4 and 5 E. VII, chapter 31.
3. The government is of the opinion that the judges ought to obey the Act of parliament. I have no authority under the rules of the House to have an opinion, on a subject of that sort, but if I had an opinion it would be that the judges ought to conform to the law.

EMBARGO ON CANADIAN CATTLE.

Mr. SPROULE—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Have any representations been made since January 1, 1906, to Imperial government, asking for the repeal of the embargo on Canadian cattle exported to Great Britain ?
2. If so, what is the nature of such representations ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). No representations have been made.

THE SALE OF PATENT MEDICINES.

Mr. SPROULE—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. Has the government taken into consideration the question of preventing or controlling by legislative enactment, advertisement and sale of patent medicines containing dangerous or harmful drugs or ingredients ?
2. Does the government intend to deal with the question ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). It is under consideration.

DISMISSAL OF DETECTIVE SKEFFINGTON.

Mr. DANIEL asked :

1. Has detective Skeffington been dismissed from the service of the government ?
2. What was the cause of his dismissal ?
3. Was an inquiry held, and had he an opportunity of making his defence ?
4. Shortly before his dismissal did he make any report as to irregularities or malfeasance by any employee of the government on the Intercolonial Railway ?
5. What was the nature of such report ?
6. Has the government taken any, and if so, what, action on his report ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals):

Mr. OLIVER.

1. Yes, his services were dispensed with.
2. His duties were not performed in a satisfactory manner, and a change was considered necessary for the benefit of the service.
3. An inquiry was not considered necessary.
4. Yes, he brought some charges against some of the officials in connection with appropriating government postage stamps.
5. Yes, the government took action by sending down to Moncton the assistant law clerk of the department to hold an investigation into the charges. The information disclosed by his report showed that the existing practice was of such a nature as to render it practically impossible to keep a proper check on the use of stamps, and the result was that the system was entirely reorganized. There were no doubt irregularities; but they could not be brought home to any of the officials.

THE DEFENCE OF ESQUIMALT.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Has the government taken over the defence of Esquimalt ?
2. What permanent force is in the Canadian service at that place ?
3. How many officers, non-commissioned officers and men compose the force ?
4. Of these, how many have been taken over from the Imperial garrison, how many from the Canadian permanent force, and how many recruited ?
5. What will be the annual cost of maintaining this garrison ?
6. Is it proposed to increase or diminish the force ?
7. What sum if any does the government propose to spend in armament at Esquimalt in the immediate future ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (for Minister of Militia and Defence):

1. Not yet, Canada is, however, paying the full cost of maintenance during current year.
2, 3, 4. None.
5. About $100,000 per annum.
6. Not at present.
7. No expenditure will be necessary.

THE DEFENCE OF HALIFAX.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Has the government taken over the defence of Halifax ?
2. What permanent force is in the Canadian service at that place ?
3. How many officers, non-commissioned officers and men compose the force ?
4. Of these, how many have been taken over from the Imperial garrison, how many from the Canadian permanent force, and how many recruited ?
5. What will be the annual cost of maintaining this garrison ?
6. Is it proposed to increase or diminish the force ?

7. What sum, if any, does the government propose to spend in armament at Halifax in the immediate future ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (for Minister of Militia and Defence):

1. Yes.

2. Staff, Nos. 1 and 2 companies, Royal Canadian Garrison Artillery; one company, Royal Canadian Engineers; headquarters and Nos. 1 to 6 companies, Royal Canadian Regiment; No. 9 section, Ordnance Stores Corps; No. 4 detachment, Canadian Permanent Army Service Corps; detachment Permanent Army Medical Corps.

3. Forty-three officers; 1,117 non-commissioned officers and men.

4. 149 were taken over from the imperial garrison; 1,112 either belonged to the permanent corps, or were recruited subsequently to the decision to take over the garrison. The number under each heading cannot be accurately ascertained without obtaining returns from the several stations of the permanent corps.

5. $800,000 approximately.

6. There is no present intention of increasing or diminishing the forces at Halifax.

7. No expenditure necessary.

SALVATION ARMY IMMIGRANTS.

Mr. URIAH WILSON asked :

1. How many immigrants did the Salvation Army bring to Canada in the year ending June 30, 1905, and from July 1, 1905, to March 1, 1906, respectively ?

2. Where were they located, and were they located in colonies by themselves, or were they distributed ?

3. What sum did the government pay per head to the Salvation Army for bringing out these immigrants ?

4. What arrangements has the government made with the Salvation Army for bringing immigrants to Canada ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Year ending June 30, 1905—3,097 persons. July 1, 1905 to March 1, 1906—702 persons.

2. They were not located in colonies but were distributed throughout the Dominion.

3. The government paid a bonus on farmers, farm labourers and domestic servants and persons intending to follow those occupations in Canada, of twelve shillings on those over twelve years of age and six shillings on those between one and twelve years of age.

4. The arrangements with the Salvation Army are :

(1). To pay bonuses as stated in answer to question 3.

(2.) To pay Salvation Army £20 per month to augment its fund for immigration work, the army to advertise Canada in its papers.

(3). To pay the Salvation Army $2,000 towards the expenses of a lecturing tour in Great Britain.

(4). To pay the Salvation Army for fiscal year 1905-06, $1,000 as a grant towards looking after immigrants after arrival.

(5). To pay the Salvation Army a further grant of $1,000 for calendar year 1906 in connection with looking after immigrants after their arrival in Canada.

LEASE OF J. W. WOODS BUILDING, OTTAWA.

Mr. INGRAM asked :

1. What portion of the Woods building on Slater street, in the city of Ottawa, is occupied by the Militia Department ?

2. How many rooms are there in the building, and what number or proportion of the rooms does the Department of Militia occupy ?

3. What rental does the government pay for the rooms it occupies ?

4. What is the length of the lease ?

5. Do any other government departments occupy any portion of the Woods building ? If so, how many, at what rent, and on what terms?

6. What information has the government as to the cost of the building ?

7. What is the assessed value of the said building for taxes ?

8. Are any taxes paid on the said buildings to the city of Ottawa ? If so, what amount yearly ?

Hon. CHARLES S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works) :

1. The east half and the top floor of the west half.

2. 107 rooms. The Department of Militia occupy at present 58 rooms.

3. 36 cents per square foot, or about $12,500.

4. Lease for ten years from the year 1903.

5. The Department of the Interior (the Geographers Branch) occupy two floors, containing ten rooms, at the rental above given, 36 cents per square foot.

6. No information.

7. $115,000.

8. The minister intends to abide by the statement made by him to the House in February, 1905, with reference to all new leases to be made under his control, whereby the city of Ottawa will receive taxes on property leased by the government. The arrangements for the leasing of the building above referred to were made prior to that statement.

CAVALRY DEPOT AT FREDERICTON, N.B.

Mr. CROCKET asked :

1. Is it the intention of the Militia Department to establish a cavalry depot at Fredericton, N.B., during the present year ?

2. If not, is it intended to re-establish No. 4 Company, R.R.C.I., which was removed from Fredericton to Halifax last year ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (for Minister of Militia and Defence) :

1. No.

2. Not at present.

BUILDINGS LEASED IN OTTAWA.

Mr. TAYLOR asked :

1. What buildings, rooms or apartments, other than those owned by the government, are occupied by each department of the government in the city of Ottawa ?

2. What rental does each department pay for such buildings, rooms or appartments in each case ?

3. To whom is the rent payable for and in respect of each such building, room or apartment ?

4. What is the term of the lease under which the government occupies each such building, room or apartment ?

5. What is the assessed value for taxation, and what is the estimated value of each such leased building wholly occupied by the government ?

6. Are the taxes paid to the city of Ottawa on any and which of such buildings ?

7. If taxes are not so paid, what effect, if any, is given to this consideration ?

Hon. CHARLES S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works) :

1, 2 and 3. Geological Museum, Sussex street, $600.00, P. Baskerville ; Geological Museum, Sussex street, $480.00, F. G. Johnson; French translators, Sussex street, $600.00, D. V. Ranger; coal shed, Central basin; methylated spirits warehouse, $1,-200.00, J. B. & W. A. Lamb; Department of Militia storehouse, $300.00, McDougal & Cuzner; Customs offices, Wellington street, $1,500.00, Ottawa Building Company; Labour Department, Metcalfe street, $1,-200.00, The Molson's Bank; Labour Department, Metcalfe street, $360.00, Great North Western Telegraph Company; Surveyor General's offices, corner Metcalfe and Slater streets, $3,000.00, Ottawa Building Company; Mounted Police Storehouse, Wellington street, $1,140.00, Slater & Sherwood; D. O. C. Military District No. 4, $500.00, Great North Western Telegraph Company; Department of Agriculture, imperial building, Queen street, $2,250.00, Charles Pearson; various departments, Seybold building, corner Sparks and O'Connor streets, $6,-500.00, J. A. Seybold; Departments of Militia and Interior, Woods building, Slater street, $12,500.00, Woods Limited; Georgian Bay Survey—Department of Public Works—Hydrographic Survey—Department of Marine and Fisheries, Corry building, Rideau street, $10,880.00, J. A. Corry; The Railway Commission, Queen street, $5,-300.00, Woods Limited; Department of Justice, Penitentiary Branch, No. 25 Sparks street, $200.00, The Egan Estate.

4. Information will be produced later on if the hon. gentleman will move accordingly.

5, 6 and 7. No, but the minister has, on the 26th February, 1905, from his seat in the House, expressed his policy regarding the payment of taxes by stating that after that period all leases which would be entered into by him would be so made that no loss as regards taxes would be suffered by the city of Ottawa.

Some of the buildings above mentioned and under rental will be abandoned during the next fiscal year, the lease of such buildings being estimated to be as follows :

Department of Agriculture, Exhibition Commission, rental, $1,000.00; Department of Inland Revenue, Weights and Measures and Gas Inspection, $550.00, Post Office Department, Sparks street, Slater building, $180.00; Department of the Interior, rooms 41 and 49 Slater building, $540.00; Department of Public Works, Georgian Bay Survey, $348.00; Surveyor General's offices, Sparks street, $540.00; Department of Public Works, workshops and yard, Wellington street, $1,160.00; various departments, Seybold building, corner Sparks and O'Connor, $6,500.00; Department of the Interior, part of imperial building, $1,950.00; Wellington street, Union Bank building, $2,250.00.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND TUNNEL.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES asked :

1. Has the government, or any department thereof, made an estimate of the cost of a tunnel under the Northumberland Straits between Prince Edward Island and the mainland? If so, what does the estimated cost of the said tunnel amount to ?

2. Who were the engineers who made the calculations, and upon what surveys and data did they base it ?

Hon. CHARLES S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works) :

1. Matter is now engaging the attention of the department.

JOHN NELSON AND CHARLES SUTHERLAND.

Mr. LAKE asked :

1. Is John F. Nelson in the employ of the government as fishery inspector, or in any other capacity ?

2. Is Charles Sutherland in the employ of the government as Indian farm instructor, or in any and what other capacity ?

3. If either of these gentlemen is not now in the employ of the government, when and under what circumstances did he or they leave such employ ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. No; but John F. Neilson, of Prince Albert, was Fishery Overseer for that district.

2. Not connected with the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

3. So far as Mr. Neilson is concerned, the department was notified of his resignation on the 5th February, 1906.

ATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. STOCKTON asked :

1. Has the government recently entered into any contract or contracts for the carriage of the mails across the Atlantic ?
2. When were such contracts entered into ?
3. Who are the contractors in each case ?
4. Which, if any, of the said contracts were let after public advertisement and tender ?
5. What is the amount of each contract ?
6. What rate of speed or time limit is provided in each contract ?
7. Is provision made in each contract for carriage by more efficient and faster steamers, in case such should be placed on the route during the term of the said contract ?
8. If such provision is not made, why has it been omitted ?
9. If the contracts, or any of them, were let without public advertisement, why was that safeguard omitted ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). A contract has been entered into which will be laid on the table at an early day. My hon. friend will have all the information.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will the return show the information asked for in the several questions ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Let the question stand.

LIFE ASSURANCE COMMISSION.

Mr. LALOR asked :

Is it the intention of the government that the Life Assurance Commission investigate the financial position and investments of fraternal societies doing a life assurance business in Canada ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). No special reference is made in the Commission to any particular form of life insurance, but the Commissioners have full authority to investigate fraternal insurance as well as other forms of insurance when carried on by companies operating under Dominion charters or under Dominion license.

TRENT CANAL.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Has there been an official inquiry into matters and officers connected with the Trent canal recently ?
2. What was the object of the inquiry ?
3. What was the result ?
4. By whom was the inquiry conducted ?
5. What counsel were employed in the inquiry ?
6. What remuneration was given to each of those employed in conducting said inquiry ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. Yes.
2. To ascertain where the responsibility rested for faulty construction of works.
3. Five officials connected with said works have resigned.
4. Mr. Henry Holgate, C.E.
5. Messrs. R. J. McLaughlin, K.C., and D. O'Connell.
6. Mr. Holgate received $450 for his services as commissioner. No remuneration has yet been paid the counsel.

POSTMASTER AT CANNINGTON.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES asked :

1. Has the postmaster at Cannington been recently removed from office ?
2. What cause was assigned for his removal ?
3. How many years had he been in office ?
4. Were there ever any complaints against him ?
5. If so, what were they ?
6. Who has been appointed to succeed him ?
7. Upon whose recommendation was the postmaster dismissed ?
8. Was the post office inspector favourable to the change ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Postmaster General). Mr. H. D. Talbot, formerly postmaster at Cannington, Ontario, was relieved of his office on January 12, 1906, for the reason that he was, under the name of another man, carrying on a mercantile business in the village in competition with others in the same line of business, though the salary and allowances connected with the post office seemed sufficient to maintain the postmaster.

Action in the matter was taken on the report of the post office inspector.

Mr. Talbot was appointed to the office on April 1, 1890.

There had been complaints from time to time in regard to the management of this post office.

Mr. William McPherson was, on January 16, 1906, appointed to the office.

FISH HATCHERIES.

Mr. BOYCE—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. What fish hatcheries have been established during last year, ending 28th February last, on the lakes of Huron and Superior ?
2. At what points or places are fish hatcheries now maintained by the government on these lakes ?
3. Is it the intention of the government to establish more fish hatcheries on the great lakes during the present year ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (for Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. None.
2. No hatcheries are maintained by the government on these lakes.
3. Under consideration.

WHITEFISH ISLAND.

Mr. BOYCE—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. What, if any, railways have filed plans for the expropriation of Whitefish Island, in the St. Mary's River, or portions thereof ?

2. When were such plans filed, respectively, and for what apparent object ?

3. Have they, or any of them, been allowed or approved ?

4. If so, when were same allowed or approved ?

5. Is the government aware that the corporations of the towns of Sault St. Marie and Steelton claim that any proposed expropriation by railways would interfere with and injuriously affect the interests of those towns, or either of them ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. The Algoma Central Railway, the Pacific & Atlantic Railway, and the Ontario, Hudson's Bay & Western Railway Companies filed plans for the expropriation of Whitefish Island, in the St. Mary's river. The three applications cover the whole island.

2. The plans were filed by the Algoma Central Railway Company for right of way on January 3, 1900; by the same company for terminals on January 13, 1900; by the Pacific & Atlantic Railway Company for right of way and terminals on December 24, 1901, and by the Ontario, Hudson's Bay & Western Railway Company, for the purposes of the railway, on December 28, 1901.

3. They were all approved and allowed.

4. The plans were approved when filed, namely, January 3, 1900; January 13, 1900; December 24, 1901, and December 28, 1901. The acquiring of the land for the purposes aforesaid was allowed by order in council of March 5, 1900; February 12, 1900; January 10, 1902 and January 15, 1902.

5. The corporations mentioned have made no such claim to the government.

SCHOOL LANDS.

Mr. AMES asked ;

How many acres of school lands were disposed of by the government during the six months ending 31st December, 1905, the average price obtained per acre, respectively in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

	Area in Acres.	Amount Realized.	Average. Price.	Average price of Total Sales.
		$ cts.	$ cts.	
Manitoba.				
Tyndall Sale	233·60	3,350 40	14 34	
Saskatchewan.				
Killaley Sale	3,200·00	46,560 00	14 55	
Yorkton "	8,096·83	81,917 96	10 12	
Saltcoats "	10,689·20	82,872 44	7 75	
	21,986·03	211,350 40	.....	9 62
Alberta.				
Edmonton Sale	8,874·00	106,842 70	12 04	
Leduc "	1,756·00	15,834 50	9 02	
Wetaskiwin "	4,679·29	46,820 92	10 06	
Lacombe "	4,081·04	35,952 52	8 81	
Innisfail "	7,530·59	62,561 29	8 32	
Didsbury "	23,202·94	241,473 08	10 41	
Calgary "	23,099·00	231,117 17	10 01	
High River "	24,117·04	355,046 05	14 72	
Pincher Creek Sale.	7,434·23	102,951 56	13 85	
Macleod "	16,008·19	195,716 37	12 23	
	120,782·32	1,394,316 16	.....	11 54

SALE OF SCHOOL LANDS.

Mr. AMES asked :

1. What was the quantity of school lands sold up to the end of the fiscal year 1905, in Manitoba and the Northwest, and the total amount received or receivable for the same ?

2. What is the amount annually paid to the several provinces on account of school lands ?

3. What is the estimated quantity of school lands unsold in the surveyed portions of the three provinces ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The area of school lands sold in Manitoba to the 1st July, 1905, was 271,384·45 acres, for the sum of $2,180,673.95. The area sold to the same date in the Territories, now comprised in Alberta and Saskatchewan, was 147,245·32 acres, for $1,473,949.90.

Mr. OLIVER (reading).

PROVINCE OF MANITOBA.

Fiscal Year.	Interest.	Revenue other than Principal Moneys.	Total.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1891-1892....	8,698 34	.....	
1892-1893....	9,400 56	.....	
1893-1894....	10,465 21	.....	
1894-1895....	12,108 03	.....	
1895-1896....	13,699 82	.....	
1896-1897....	15,000 00	.....	
1897-1898....	13,992 88	.....	
1898-1899....	15,128 73	.....	
1899-1900....	16,516 67	.....	
1900-1901....	22,115 33	.....	
1901-1902....	25,086 24	224,114 76	
1902-1903....	24,278 28	6,886 24	
1903-1904....	31,290 66	43,934 26	
1904-1905....	35,946 56	89,774 94	
	253,727 31	364,710 20	618,437 51

PROVINCIAL DISTRICT OF ASSINIBOIA.

1898-1899....	2,092 19	.....	
1899-1900....	260 09	.....	
1900-1901....	502 66	.....	
1901-1902....	650 44	.....	
1902-1903....	913 29	9,031 54	
1903-1904....	4,955 11	3,541 81	
1904-1905....	6,631 06	50,117 46	
	16,004 84	62,690 81	78,695 65

PROVINCIAL DISTRICT OF ALBERTA.

1898-1899....	15,316 86	.....	
1899-1900....	1,595 79	.....	
1900-1901....	1,487 32	.....	
1901-1902....	1,140 32	.....	
1902-1903....	1,704 67	15,597 32	
1903-1904....	2,073 66	5,582 65	
1904-1905....	1,388 66	1,629 89	
	24,707 28	22,809 86	47,517 14

PROVINCIAL DISTRICT OF SASKATCHEWAN.

1898-1899 ...	215 22	.....	
1899-1900....	31 02	.....	
1900-1901....	31 62	.....	
1901-1902....	33 07	.....	
1902-1903....	40 78	1,050 96	
1903-1904....	85 81	289 80	
1904-1905....	356 97	1,757 89	
	794 49	3,098 65	3,893 14

3. The approximate area of the school lands remaining unsold in the surveyed portion of Manitoba to the 1st July, 1905, is 1,477,096 acres. The approximate area of the school lands remaining unsold to the same date, in the surveyed portions of Alberta and Saskatchewan, is 4,817,875 acres.

PHILIP WAGNER.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. Has Philip Wagner been at any time since 1900 in the employ of the government?
2. If so, where, during what period, in what capacity, and at what pay ?
3. Was Philip Wagner, previous to or during his employment by the government, convicted of crime, and did he serve any time in prison therefor ?
4. Has he ever been given larger pay or promotion in office since these occurrences ?
5. Is Philip Wagner now in government employ ? If so, in what capacity, and at what rate of remuneration ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :—

1. Yes.

2. As Galician interpreter at Edmonton at $40 per month from 1st January, 1901, to 30th June, 1901, and as assistant Immigration Agent at $25 per month, and interpreter in the Dominion Lands Office at $75 per month from 1st July, 1905, to date.

3 and 4. Nothing on record in the Department of the Interior to show that P. Wagner served any time in prison.

5. Answered under No. 2.

ADDITION TO WESTERN BLOCK.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

What is the total amount so far expended on the new structure in the Western Block, and what is the amount estimated to finish it ?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (for the Minister of Public Works). Amount expended to date $51,330. Amount estimated as required to complete, $47,000.

JOSEPH NIXON.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. For what time, in what capacity, and at what pay, has Joseph Nixon been in the employ of the government since July, 1905 ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Joseph Nixon has not been in the employ of this department since July, 1905.

ALIENATION OF LANDS IN SASKATCHEWAN AND ALBERTA.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

Has any arrangement been made by the government since July, 1905, by transference or by sale involving the co-operation of a railway company, by virtue of which a large block of public lands in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta passed out of the possession of the government into the hands of private indivi-

duals or corporations ? If so, what quantity of lands were involved, what was the nature of the transaction, and the consideration involved?

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

PROVINCIAL SUBSIDIES.

Mr. PARMELEE asked :

1. Has the government received a request from the provincial governments for a conference to present their claims for a readjustment of provincial subsidies ?
2. Is it the intention of the government to have such a conference ? If so, when ?

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

1. The government has received a request from the provincial governments for a conference to present their claims for a readjustment of provincial subsidies.
2. It is the intention of the government to have such a conference to discuss the claims of the provinces and various other subjects affecting their relation to the Dominion. It is expected that this conference will take place during the recess between this session and the next.

KENTVILLE RIFLE RANGE.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. What is the result of the reference to the Exchequer Court of the Nova Scotia rifle range question ?
2. Has an award been made ?
3. Has the government accepted the award, if one has been made ?
4. If not, why not ?
5. Has the range been completed ?
6. What is the cost up to the end of 1905, (a) of the range grounds ; (b) of the improvements ?
7. Is it the intention to use the range as a provincial drill ground as well as for a range ?
8. Is the range suitable for artillery as well as rifle firing ?

Hon. CHAS. FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). Mr. Crawley, barrister, of Kentville, N.S., was appointed special referee by the Exchequer Court and made his report on October 18, 1904, awarding the defendant $38,000. From this report the Crown appealed and after argument the Court referred the matter again to the referee to report upon certain specified points. He made his supplementary report on September 18, 1905, confirming his former finding and award in all particulars. From the latter report the Crown also appealed, and the case was argued a few days ago and the court reserved its judgment, which has not yet been delivered.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). I answer on behalf of the Minister of Militia and Defence :

5. Yes.
6. (a) None. (b) $14,992.40.
7. Yes.
8. No.

IMMIGRATION TO CANADA DURING THE LAST YEAR.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. How many immigrants reached Canada during last year from each (a) Great Britain and Ireland ; (b) the continent (mainland) of Europe ; (c) Iceland ; (d) the United States of America ; (e) other countries ?
2. What was the bonus per head to those from each of the above paid by the Canadian government ?
3. To whom were the cheques in each case made payable ?
4. Who regulates or decides to whom payments are to be made ?
5. Has W. T. R. Preston authority to make payments to agents or subagents for steamship or railway companies for immigration ?
6. What companies or agents, or subagents have received moneys for immigration during the last two years, and by whom were they paid ?
7. What sums have been disposed of upon the recommendation or authority of W. T. R. Preston, in each year 1902-3, 1903-4 and 1904-5.
8. Who were the members of the North Atlantic Trading Company during 1903-4 and 1904-5 ?
9. What is the North Atlantic Trading Company ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. There reached Canada during the last fiscal year from :

(a) Great Britain and Ireland..	65,359
(b) The Continent, Mainland of Europe..	35,108
(c) Iceland..	413
(d) The United States of America	43,652
(e) Other countries..	1,734
Total..	146,266

2. a. In Great Britain the bonus is paid on agriculturists, domestic servants and persons intending to follow those occupations in Canada. To ordinary booking agents the bonus is 7 shillings on those over 12 years of age and 3s.6d. on those between one and 12 years. In the case of the Salvation Army, the bonus is on the same classes, but at the rate of 12 shillings on those over 12 years of age, and 6 shillings on those between one and 12 years. A bonus is paid to various philanthropic societies who bring to Canada children who have not been inmates of work-houses, industrial schools, penitentiaries, prisons, reformatories or other like institutions. In several cases a bonus of $3 is paid to parties bringing domestic servants to Canada.

b. On agriculturists and domestic servants coming from Holland, Denmark, Russia, Germany, Austria, Hungary, Luxemburg, Norway, Sweden, Finland and Switzerland, a bonus of £1 per head is paid to

the North Atlantic Trading Company. In the case of settlers from Galicia, Buckowinia and Poland, excepting Germans, the payment is limited to 5,000 persons per year.

c. On persons coming from Iceland, a payment of £1 per ticket and 10 shillings per half ticket is made to steamship companies on the understanding that the price of the immigrant's ticket is reduced by that amount.

d. A bonus is paid to subagents in the United States on agriculturists sent to Canada, of $3 on adult males, $2 on adult females and $1 on children under 18 years of age.

3. The cheques for bonuses were made payable:

a. To the head offices of the different steamship companies and in the case of philanthropic societies to their head office.

b. To the North Atlantic Trading Company.

c. To the head offices of the different steamship companies.

d. To the individual subagents sending immigrants to Canada.

4. The decision as to whom payments are to be made rests with and all such payments are regulated at the head office of the Immigration Department, Ottawa.

5. No.

6. As stated in answer to question 3. Paid by the department direct in case of United States agents and North Atlantic Trading Company, and through London Office in case of British booking-agents.

7. The amounts of money disbursed by the High Commissioner for Canada and W. T. R. Preston out of letters of credit issued in their favour based on estimates submitted and approved by the department during the following fiscal years were:

1902-03	$187,731 67
1903-04	221,402 23
1904-05	173,367 10

8. During 1903-04 and 1904-05 Messrs. S. Glück and N. E. Kohan of Amsterdam, Holland, were manager and secretary respectively of the North Atlantic Trading Company, the names of the other members of the company are not known to the government.

9. The North Atlantic Trading Company is a body corporate, engaged in active emigration work in various European countries.

MR. HIRAM KEECH, TAMWORTH, ONTARIO.

Mr. INGRAM asked:

1. Is Mr. Hiram Keech, formerly of the village of Tamworth, in the county of Lennox and Addington, an employee of the Dominion government?

2. If so, what is the date of his appointment?

3. What are the duties of the said Mr. Hiram Keech?

4. What is his salary, and does he receive travelling expenses as well?

5. By whom was he recommended for such appointment?

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice):

1. Yes. Temporarily.
2. February 1, 1906.
3. Cordage sales agent.
4. (a) $100 per month. (b) Yes.
5. Inspectors of penitentiaries.

FAST ATLANTIC SERVICE.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked:

1. Has the government under consideration the establishment of a fast Atlantic steamship service?

2. If so, when do they expect to make a report regarding same?

3. Is it the intention of the government to advertise for tenders to establish a fast Atlantic steamship service? If so, when will the tenders be opened?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The government has passed a mail service contract which will be laid on the table of the House at an early date.

MAIL MATTER SHIPPED THROUGH CANADIAN AND AMERICAN PORTS.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked:

1. How many pounds of Canadian mail was shipped from American ports in the year 1905?

2. How many pounds of Canadian mail was received through American ports in the year 1905?

3. How many pounds of Canadian mail was shipped from Canadian ports in the year 1905?

4. How many pounds of Canadian mail was received through Canadian ports in the year 1905?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Postmaster General):

1. The only record in the Post Office Department of the weight of mailable matter sent to, or received from, places over-sea is a record which shows the weight of such matter (exclusive of parcel post packages) despatched to the United Kingdom each month by way of Canadian ports and by way of United States ports.

2. In the year 1905 the weight of Canadian mailable matter shipped to the United Kingdom through United States ports was 786,497 lbs. and through Canadian ports 131,297 lbs.

3 and 4. The Post Office Department has no record of the weight of mailable matter received through Canadian or United States ports in any year.

MANITOBA BOUNDARY EXTENSION.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE asked:

1. Has the conference been held between the governments of Manitoba, Ontario and Saskatchewan, and the Dominion government, in reference to the extension of the boundaries of the province of Manitoba, which the premier stated during the session of 1905 he would be

prepared to hold immediately after the creation of the new provinces ?

2. If not, why not, and when will such conference be held ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). No conference has been held between the government of the Dominion and the government of Manitoba, but I have just stated that it is intended that during the recess there shall be a conference between the Dominion government and these several governments to discuss all matters affecting the relations between the Dominion and the provinces.

TRENT RIVER WATERS.

Mr. PORTER asked:

1. Are the waters of the Trent river and its tributaries under the control of the Federal government ?

2. How was such control, if any, obtained, and for what purpose was such control obtained ?

3. What is the extent of such control, if any?

4. Are the waters of the Trent river available, and if so, to what extent, to private individuals for development ?

5. Is it the intention of the government to retain control, and to what extent, if any, of said waters to the exclusion of private individuals ? If so, for what purpose ?

6. What is the estimated water power which may be developed in the River Trent from Peterborough to the Bay of Quinté ?

7. Has the government considered the disadvantages to private individuals of having the waters of the Trent river tied up for the purposes of the Trent Valley canal, as against development by private individuals, and in what manner does the government propose to relieve the situation as against such private interests ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1, 2 and 3. By the Act of the province of Upper Canada 3, Wm. IV., ch. 32 (1833) authority was given for improving the navigation of the River Otonabee, in the district of Newcastle, and also the adjacent waters leading from Mud lake to Scugog lake in the said district; commissioners were appointed and moneys appropriated for the purpose; also tolls for navigation were fixed.

By the Acts 6 and 7, Wm. IV., ch. 66, 1836 and 1837, certain works required to complete navigation on the River Trent, the River Otonabee, Buckhorn lake, Bobcaygeon falls and Purdy's mills, also the construction of a canal between the waters of the Bay of Quinté and Rice lake 'by improving the navigation of the River Trent' were authorized; money was provided, and the appointment of commissioners authorized. The commissioners were authorized to take lands for dams and locks and, further, to grant leases for the use of waters from the said erections or dams, canal or canals, for hydraulic purposes, and to fix and collect tolls for navigation.

At the time of the union of the provinces in 1841, an Act of that year, chap. 28, appropriated moneys for certain public works, in which were included those 'for improving the internal waters of the Newcastle district', the powers of the commissioners being thereby transferred to the Board of Works.

By the Act of Confederation, 1867, 'Rivers and Lake Improvements' were included in the Provincial Public Works and Property to be the property of Canada, and 'navigation and shipping' was placed under the exclusive legislative authority of the parliament of Canada.

Authority over the Trent canal and its waters has descended through the several commissioners, Board of Works and Department of Public Works to the Department of Railways and Canals.

It may be added that by the Fisheries Act of 1868, ch. 60, 'any river or other water' may be set apart for the propagation of fish, and leases for fishing granted. In pursuance of this authority, various lakes and tributary waters of the Trent canal in the county of Peterborough, the River Otonabee and the River Trent down to the Bay of Quinté, have been so set apart.

4. There does not appear to be any restraint on the development, by private individuals, of any rights they may have acquired to the waters of the Trent river, subject, always, to the interests of navigation.

5. This is a matter of policy, to be determined by the exigencies of each case, as it may arise.

6. The water power which may be developed in the Trent river from Peterborough to the Bay of Quinté has not been estimated.

7. The waters of the Trent river are not tied up for the purposes of the Trent Valley canal, but the recognized principle of the department is always to dispose of the surplus water.

PASSAGE AT L'ILE-AUX-GRUES.

Mr. PAQUET asked :

1. Is the government aware that there is only 27 feet of water, at low tide, in the passage at l'Ile-aux-Grues ?

2. Has the attention of the government been drawn to the necessity of deepening and widening the channels at the de Beaujeu bar, near l'Ile-aux-Grues and at the St. Roch des Aulnaies ferry ?

3. Does the government intend to have the channels at the de Beaujeu bar and at the St. Roch des Aulnaies ferry deepened and widened during the year 1906?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Yes, the government is aware that there are only 21 feet of water at l'Ile-aux-Grues and it is intended to have the channel deepened during the present season.

BELL'S RAPIDS POST OFFICE.

Mr. PORTER asked :

1. When was the post office known as Bell's Rapids established ?
2. Who is the postmaster ?
3. Upon whose recommendation was such office established, and such postmaster appointed, and when ?
4. Were there any other recommendations or applications for establishment of such post office ? If so, by whom, and when ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Postmaster General). Bell's Rapids Post Office was established on April 1, 1905, with John Hicks as postmaster, on the application of the Rev. Father McInerney, of Maynooth, the report of an inspector, and the recommendation of Mr. Henry Pringle, of Belleville.

MIMINEGASH BREAKWATER.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked :

1. Are any repairs being made on Miminegash breakwater, Prince Edward Island ?
2. What is the nature of these repairs ?
3. Has a petition been forwarded to the minister regarding the placing of a proposed extension to said breakwater ?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (for the Minister of Public Works) :

1 and 2. A contract has been awarded for the construction of an extension to the southern breakwater, 30 by 50 feet, built of close face cribwork.

3. There is no such petition in the department.

TARIFF COMMISSION—PRINTING OF EVIDENCE.

Mr. HENDERSON asked :

1. Does the government propose at an early date to lay on the table of the House a copy of the evidence taken before the Tariff Commission during the past autumn and winter ?
2. Will such evidence be printed for the use of members of the House ?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). Yes, it will be laid on the table at the first opportunity to-day, when the Orders of the Day are called, or at the adjournment. In reference to the printing there are over eight thousand pages of typewritten matter, about 300 words to the page, and comprising some nine large volumes, and it will be for the Printing Committee to determine that point.

Mr. PATERSON (Minister of Customs), later laid the report on the table.

Mr. FOSTER. Is this all that took place ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, every thing.

ATTENDANCE OF MEMBERS—DAILY RECORD OF.

Mr. HENDERSON asked :

Is it the intention of the government to cause a daily record to be made of the attendance of members during the present session ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I intend to move at the first opportunity for a Committee of the House to revise the rules of the House, and this question will be taken into consideration by that committee.

TRENT VALLEY CANAL.

Mr. PORTER asked :

1. What steps or proceedings have been taken by the government during the last year to determine the route of the Trent Valley canal ?
2. Has any report been made thereon since 1904 ? If so, what ?
3. Has the government determined the choice of routes ? If so, what is it ?
4. Has any investigation been had into the cause of the breakage in the banks or lift locks of the Trent Valley canal If so, what is the result of such investigation, and has a report been made thereon, and by whom and when ?
5. What is the estimated cost of repairs or damage sustained by such breakage in the (a) banks, (b) lift locks ?
6. Have any proceedings been taken to repair such damages ? If not, is it the intention of the government to proceed with such repairs at once, and how ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. The government have had surveys made.
2. Yes, interim reports have been received.
3. No.
4. Yes, and as a result five of the officials connected with the work have resigned. Yes, a report has been made by Mr. Henry Holgate, C.E., dated January 8, 1906.
5. (a) With reference to the embankment approach at the Peterborough lift lock, where the leaks occurred, the commissioner states in his report that $2,000 should cover the expenditure in connection with the repairs to be made. The concrete walls approaches at Kirkfield leaked badly and were subsequently plastered with cement mortar, reducing the leaks materially, but it is impossible to say at the present time what the cost will be to insure permanent tightness. (b). No repairs are required to the lift lock at Peterborough, and the lift lock at Kirkfield is under construction.
6. Yes, specifications have been prepared; the necessary materials are being provided, and as soon as the weather permits, the work of repairs will be proceeded with under the officer of the department.

LIFE INSURANCE COMMISSION.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin) moved :

For copies of all telegrams, reports, communications, investigations, letters and documents of every description, relating to the necessity of investigating the working of insurance companies doing business in the Dominion of Canada, including all correspondence, communications and other documents, whether advocating or opposing, or otherwise relating to the commission recently appointed for the

above purpose ; or any investigation either by the government or by a commission, committee of the House, or otherwise, into the matters aforesaid, also in connection with the recommendation and appointment of the commissioners.

He said : I intended to move in this motion, and I think it really means that, for all the correspondence in connection with the appointment of the commissioners and the instructions to them dealing with this question. In order that it may be perfectly plain I move the motion with that amendment.

Motion agreed to.

TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe) moved :

For a copy of the appointment of the Commission on Transportation, consisting of Mr. John Bertram, of the city of Toronto, Mr. Ashdown, of the city of Winnipeg, and Mr. Reford, of the city of Montreal ; together with all the evidence taken before the said commission, and also the report presented to the Honourable the Minister of Public Works by the said commission.

Hon. CHARLES S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works). This report is now in the hands of the printer and will be brought down at an early date.

Motion dropped.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY—SURVEYS IN NEW BRUNSWICK.

Mr. O. S. CROCKET (York, N. B.) moved:

For copies of all correspondence had between the government, or any department or member thereof, and the Grand Trunk Pacific Construction Commission, in reference to the surveys or location of the route of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, in the province of New Brunswick.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). The name is not correctly given in the motion. I imagine that the reference is to the Transcontinental Railway Commission. The motion says : 'Grand Trunk Construction Commission.' There is no such commission. I move that the motion be amended in this sense.

Motion amended.

Motion as amended agreed to.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For copies of all contracts and agreements between the government or any department of the government, and the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company, and of all Orders in Council, reports, papers, documents and correspondence, respecing : (a) Any loan to the said company ; (b) any indebtedness of the said company to the Crown or to the government ; (c) any lands to which the company might become entitled by virtue of any statute, contract or agreement ; (d) any land granted to or earned by the company ; (e) the area within which such lands might be selected by the company ; (f) any enlargement, change or alteration of the area within which such lands might be selected by the company, or by any purchaser from or assignee of the company.

2. All correspondence respecting the matters above mentioned between the government, or any department of the government, or any official or person acting or purporting to act for the government and the said company, or any official thereof, or any person acting or purporting to act therefor, or any assignee of or purchaser from the said company.

3. All Orders in Council relating to, touching or concerning the said company's land grant, or the area within which the same might be selected, or any enlargement or alteration of that area.

4. All correspondence between the government, or any department or official thereof, and the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, or any officer or person purporting to act for that company, or any person or persons, firm or firms, syndicate or syndicates, from whom the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company acquired any portion of the land grant of the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company.

5. All correspondence between any shareholders or persons intersted in the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company, with the government or any department or official thereof, and all claims and demands made by that company, or by any person interested therein against the government, in respect of the said land grant or the selection thereof, or any of the matters above referred to.—Mr. R. L. Borden by Mr. Foster.

For a copy of the special report of the Superintendent of Insurance addressed to the Minister of Finance, bearing date 9th November, 1905 ; also copies of all other reports, correspondence and documents, from January 1, 1905, up to the date of the return, respecting the regulation of life insurance in Canada.—Mr. R. L. Borden by Mr. Foster.

For a return showing (a) how many wrecks occurred in the River and Gulf of St Lawrence during the season of 1905. (b) the names, tonnage and character of the vessels so wrecked ; (c) whether such wreck resulted in a total loss of the ship and cargo, or either, in any and what cases ; (d) to what causes each of said wrecks were attributable ; (e) whether any inquiry was held in any and what cases. Also for a copy of all reports, evidence, correspondence, documents and papers, relating to or connected with the said wrecks, the inquiries concerning the same, and the loss thereby occasioned.—Mr. R. L. Borden by Mr. Foster.

For copies of all contracts entered into during the past two years for the transportation of mails across the Atlantic, and copies of all correspondence, documents and papers relating to the same matter or connected in any way therewith.—Mr. R. L. Borden by Mr. Foster.

For copies of all telegrams, reports, recommendations and correspondence in connection with the appointment of David Liddle as assistant inspector of weights and measures for the inland division of Windsor, in the province of Ontario—Mr. Ingram.

For copies of all telegrams, letters, petitions, reports, documents, recommendations, investigations, correspondence and all other communications concerning the appointment and removal of Mr. Alexander Darroch from the position of Collector of Customs at St. Thomas, Ontario.—Mr. Ingram.

For copies of all petitions, reports, letters, notices, telegrams, correspondence, recommendations, bonds, leases, papers and documents in relation to a site and new post office building in the county of Elgin, at Aylmer.—Mr. Ingram.

For copies of all telegrams, letters, reports, petitions, documents, investigations, correspondence, communications of every description, from or between any department or head of any department of the government, and any person or any government, regarding the collection of a head tax of two dollars on persons or passengers entering the United States.—Mr. Ingram.

For a return showing the amounts voted and the amounts expended, under their proper headings, each year since June 30. 1896, on Port Stanley harbour; the date of such payments, to whom payments were made, and the amount paid to each person; the amount paid for actual labour performed; the amount paid for material not used; the quantity and kind of material purchased, with the price, and from whom purchased; the present actual condition of the harbour. A copy of the estimated cost of the harbour, the statement to include dredging and the breakwater. Also copies of all advertisements calling for tenders, as well as all tenders and contracts and correspondence on the subject; the names of all dredges employed on the works since June 30, 1896, and their owners. Also copies of all telegrams, letters, reports, petitions, documents, correspondence, investigations and communications of every description in connection with said harbour works. Also a copy of the pay roll for each year since June 30, 1896; the names of all foremen, superintendents and inspectors, their length of service as such, and by whom recommended, giving all correspondence in connection with their appointment; and if dismissed or resigned, state reasons for said dismissal or resignation; the names of all civil engineers employed on the works, and by whom recommended, and all correspondence in connection therewith. Also the name of the person or persons who paid the respective amounts at Port Stanley for material furnished and labour performed.—Mr. Ingram.

For a return showing the amounts voted and the amounts expended, under their proper heading, each year since June 30, 1896, on Port Bruce Harbour; the date of such payments, to whom the payments were made, and the amount paid to each person; the amount paid for actual labour performed; the amount paid for material not used, and when, and the amount paid for material used; quantity and kind of material purchased, and the price, and from whom purchased; the present actual condition of the harbour; a copy of the estimated cost of the harbour, including dredging and breakwater. Also copies of all advertisements calling for tenders, as well as all tenders and contracts and correspondence on the subject. The names of all dredges employed since June 30, 1896, and their owners. Also copies of all telegrams, letters, reports, petitions, documents, correspondence, investigations and communications of every description in connection with said harbour works. Also a copy of the pay-roll for each year since June 30, 1896, the names of all foremen, superintendents and inspectors, with their length of service as such, and by whom recommended, and all correspondence in connection with their appointment; the names of all civil engineers employed on the works, and by whom recommended, and all correspondence in connection therewith. Also the name of the person or persons who paid the respective amounts at Port Bruce for material furnished and labour performed.—Mr. Ingram.

For a return showing the amounts voted and the amounts expended, under their proper headings, each year since 30th June, 1896, on Port Burwell Harbour; the date of such payments; to whom the payments were made, and the amount paid to each person; the amount paid for actual labour performed; the amount paid for material not used, and when; the amount paid for material used; the quantity and kind of material purchased, and the price, and from whom purchased; the present actual condition of the harbour. A copy of the estimated cost of the harbour, and a statement showing how much it will cost to finish said harbour; the above statement to include breakwater and dredging. Also copies of all advertisements calling for tenders, as well as all tenders and contracts, and correspondence on the subject; the names of all dredges employed on the works since 30th June, 1906, and their owners. And copies of all telegrams, letters, reports, petitions, documents, correspondence and communications of every description in connection with said harbour works. Also a copy of the pay-roll for each year since 30th June, 1906; the names of all foremen, superintendents and inspectors; their length of service as such, and by whom recommended; with all correspondence in connection with their appointment; and if dismissed or resigned, the reason for said dismissal or resignation; the names of all civil engineers who are or have been employed on the works, and by whom recommended; the said return to include Mr. John H. Teall, resident engineer, the date of appointment, dismissal or resignation, as the case may be, and the reason for same; and all correspondence, petitions, telegrams, letters and communications connected therewith.—Mr. Ingram.

For copies of all correspondence for the last two years on immigration between the Canadian High Commissioner, in London, England, and Mr. W. T. R. Preston, Dominion Commissioner England.—Mr. Uriah Wilson.

2. For copies of all correspondence for the last two years on immigration between the said W. T. R. Preston and Mr. W. T. Griffith, Secretary, High Commissioner's office, London, England.—Mr. Uriah Wilson.

1. For a copy of the first contract made between the government of Canada and the North Atlantic Trading Company, of Amsterdam, Holland, giving the said company a bonus for immigrants to Canada from certain European countries, and copies of all correspondence in connection with the subject-matter of said contract before and since the date thereof.

2. For a return showing the names of all the directors and shareholders of the said company on the date of said contract, and their addresses.

3. For a copy of the contract made between the government of Canada and the said North Atlantic Trading Company in November, 1904.

4. For a return showing the names of all the directors and shareholders of the said company on the said date, and their addresses.

5. For copies of all reports made to the government by the said company, especially reports referring to the number of immigrants sent or brought to Canada by or through the said company.

6. For copies of all correspondence, documents, papers and reports in connection with the subject-matter of the last mentioned contract before and since the date thereof.

7. For a return showing the amount of money paid by the government each year to the said company since the date of said contract in November, 1904, to the 1st March, 1906, and the total amount so paid.

8. Also the general business of the North Atlantic Trading Company, other than any contract they have with the government.—Mr. Uriah Wilson.

For a return showing :—1. All contracts since 30th June, 1902, between the government and (a) the Eastern Railway Supply Company; (b) the New Brunswick Petroleum Company; (c) the Sherman Williams Paint Company ; (d) the Maritime Wire Fencing Company,—for supplies to any of the railways of the government.

2. The tenders upon which such contracts were based, and all tenders made by other parties for such contracts.

3. All correspondence and communications of the Railway Department and officers thereof, with the several tenderers and the contractors, relating to such tenders or contracts or supplies. Also all correspondence and communications between the department and its officers and between such officers, relating to such tenders, contracts or supplies.

4. All advertisements, notices, statements, accounts, papers and vouchers, relating to such contracts, or the supplies, or the payment thereof.—Mr. Barker.

For copies of all forms of application for homestead entries used since the year 1890.—Mr. Ingram.

1. For a return showing : The number of homesteaders to make entry in and for the territory now included in the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, during each year between 1896 and December 31, 1905.

2. The nationality of said homesteaders, dividing same into the following categories : (a) British North America ; (b) Great Britain and Ireland; (c) the United States; (d) France, Belgium and Switzerland; (e) Germany, Holland, Norway, Sweden, Denmark and Iceland; (f) all other countries of Continental Europe; (g) all other nationalities; (h) persons who had previously made entry.—Mr. Uriah Wilson.

For a return showing the several sums of money paid to judges, under the provisions of section 13 of an Act respecting the judges of Provincial Courts, chapter 138 of the Revised Statutes, as amended by sections 7, 8 and 9, of chapter 52 of the Statutes of 1898, from June 30, 1903, to July 20, 1905, and under this section and amendment, as enacted by section 6 of chapter 31 of the Statutes of 1905, from the said July 20 to this date ; with the items in respect of which the said several payments were made, set out and showing the payments in respect of the period before and since July 20, 1905.—Mr. Lennox—by Mr. Taylor.

For a return showing, in respect of every case where, during the year ending June 30, 1905, and during the six months ending December 31, 1905, an extension of time within which to complete his entry, has been accorded any homesteader within the territory now included in the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, giving : (a) the name of the applicant for said extension ; (b) his post office address at the time of original entry ; (c) the date and agency of original homestead entry ; (d) the location of the land in question, indicating township, range and section ; (e) the earliest date at which applicant might have become entitled to secure a patent, had all conditions been promptly fulfilled ; (f) post office address of applicant at time of demand for extension; (g) the date of demand for extension; (h) the length of extension granted; (i) the cause of granting extension; (j) the name or names of any and all parties who may have communicated with the department for the purpose of recommending the granting of said extension ; (k) the name of the homestead inspector who reported on the case, and whether he advised in favour of granting an extension or the contrary; (l) the name and address of any and every person who shall have applied to record a cancellation against said section or part thereof.

All the above information to be arranged according to agencies.—Mr. Ames.

For a return showing, in the case of every homestead against which, during the year 1904 and 1905, a report of non-compliance with the law, or a demand for cancellation has been received by the Dominion Land office or offices; giving : (a) the location of said quarter section, range, township and meridian; (b) the name and address of the party by whom the original entry was made; (c) the name and address of the party or parties, (if there have been several) who endeavoured to lodge cancellations; (d) the reason alleged by complainants why cancellation of entry should be allowed; (e) whether warning of threatened cancellation was served upon the alleged delinquent; (f) the action taken by the department in each case.—Mr. Ames.

For a return showing the parcels of land, other than railway grants, which, since 1896, have been sold, in the present provinces of Alberta or Saskatchewan, for irrigation projects; giving in each instance area, location and price obtained, and the name of the company or individual to whom sale was made.—Mr. Ames.

For copies of all letters, telegrams, reports or other communications which, between July 1, 1904, and December 31, 1905, passed between the Minister of the Interior, or any official of of his department, on the one hand, and (a) the Canadian Northern Railway Company; (b) the Manitoba and Southeastern Railway Company; (c) the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway Company, or any company to whom any of said companies shall have transferred its land rights, in regard to the area in which any of said companies were to be permitted to select lands due by way of subsidy.—Mr. Ames.

For a return showing the name and post office address of each person or company having a closed grazing lease, granted for a period of

more than three years, by the Department of the Interior, of lands in Alberta or Saskatchewan, giving in each instance, (a) the location, boundaries and area of each tract of land so leased; (b) the date of issue and expiry of said lease; (c) the annual rental specified therein; (d) and the amount of overdue rental wherever such be the case.—Mr. Ames.

For a return showing: 1. The total number of acres of land within the present limits of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, voted by parliament to railway companies?

2. The area of said lands in respect of which the time by law specified for earning the same has elapsed.

3. The area of said lands (a) which has been earned, selected and patented; (b) which has been earned and selected, but not patented; (c) which has been earned but neither selected nor patented.

4. The area of land which may yet be earned by any railway company, indicating the name of the company, and the amount of subsidy possible.

5. In the case of each of the following roads, the Canadian Northern Railway Company, the Manitoba and Southeastern Railway Company, and the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway Company, (a) the quantity of land which may yet be earned; (b) the quantity earned but not patented; (c) the extent, location (giving township and range), and boundaries of the reserved territory wherein each of the remaining selections may be made.

6. The several orders in council by virtue of which the area of selection affecting the companies mentioned in paragraph 5 were indicated, and any amendments of the same. The whole of the above information to be brought up to 1st January, 1906.—Mr. Ames.

For a return showing the total number of land patents issued, together with the acreage covered thereby, in and for the territory included within the limits of the present provisions of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, between the year 1872 and the 31st December, 1905, under each of the following forms of grant, stating also whether odd or even sections were affected; commutation grants, homesteads, Manitoba Act grants, military bounty grants, Northwest half-breed grants, parish sales, quit-claims special grants, railways, sales of mining, farming, ranching, &c., school land sales, special grants, and all others.—Mr. Ames.

For a return showing: 1. The number of homestead entries recorded each fiscal year from 1872 to 1905, and also during the six months ending 31st December, 1905, for the territory comprised in the present provinces of Manitoba Saskatchewan and Alberta.

2. The number and percentage of such entries for each year for which patents have prior to the 31st December, 1905, been granted, or recommendations made for the issue of patents.

3. The number and percentage of such entries for each year that have, prior to the 31st December, 1905, been cancelled.

4. The number and percentage of such entries for each year which, neither patented or cancelled, remained in an incompleted state on the first day of January, 1906.—Mr. Lake.

For a return showing: 1. The number of authorizations granted, under the authority of subsection 3 of article 34 of the Dominion Lands Act, for one person to make homestead entry on behalf of another person, during each of the years of 1901, 1902, 1903, 1904 and 1905.

2. Of the homestead entries made in consequence of said authorizations, during each of the years 1901 and 1902; how many have been in a demand for a patent; how many have been cancelled; how many stood upon the books of the Department of the Interior on January 1st, 1906, as neither patented nor cancelled.—Mr. Lake.

For a return showing the names of all the homestead inspectors at present attached to the thirteen agencies throughout Manitoba and the Northwest, and a record showing the number of days that each inspector was absent from his regular duties, between the 1st of July and the 31st of December, 1905, the cause of said absence, and a statement of expenses for each month during that period.— Mr. M. S. McCarthy by Mr. Ames.

For a return showing (a) the number of land sales, withdrawing even sections from homestead entry made by the Department of the Interior during the year 1904-5, and during the six months ending 31st December, 1905, together with the total acreage represented thereby; (b) the same regarding land sales affecting only odd sections; (c) the same regarding land sales affecting solid blocks of both even and odd sections.—Mr. M. S. McCarthy, by Mr. Ames.

For a return showing the amount of money scrip redeemed in Dominion land, and the number of acres thus purchased from the government, (a) in Manitoba; (b) in the Northwest; the figures for each year from 1875 to 31st December. 1905, being given separately.—Mr. W. J. Roche.

For a return showing: 1. The number of allotments of 240 acres of land, and acreage covered by the same, made between the 1st of July, 1896, and the 31st of December, 1905, to the halfbreeds of Manitoba, giving separately the figures of each year, and for the final six months.

2. The land scrip, if any, issued during the aforesaid period to colonization companies, giving in the case of each such company the name and head office address, and also giving the face value of such scrip and the year of its issuance.

3. The number and acreage of land scrip issued during the same period, to the halfbreeds of the Northwest (now Alberta and Saskatchewan), giving separately the figures for each year and for the final six months.

4. The number of acres of land scrip located within the limits of each of the thirteen Dominion land agencies of Manitoba and the Northwest, between the 1st of July, 1896, and the 31st of December, 1905, the figures for each agency each year to be given separately.

5. The number of acreage of land scrip granted prior to 1st July, 1896, to the halfbreeds (a) in Manitoba, and (b) of the Northwest.

6. The amount outstanding, granted but not located, on 1st July, 1896.—Mr. W. J. Roche.

For a return showing: 1, The number of allotments of land scrip and the total acreage covered thereby, made to halfbreeds (a) in Manitoba, and (b) in the Northwest, between 1st July, 1904, and 31st December, 1905

2. The number of land warrants, if any, and the acreage covered thereby issued for military services within the same period.

3. The number of scrip, if any, and the acreage covered thereby issued to the Northwest Mounted Police within the same period.

4. The number and acreage of all the above outstanding on the 31st December, 1905. All the above information being required in order to bring the information contained in Sessional Paper No. 67d, brought down the 13th July, 1904, up to the end of the last calendar year.—Mr. W. J. Roche.

For copies of all correspondence between the provincial governments and the Dominion government on the subject of the readjustment of provincial subsidies.—Mr. Parmelee.

ELECTIONS TO THE HOUSE.

On the Order being called:—

That a select committee of nine be appointed to inquire into the Acts relating to Elections to this House, and the prevention of corrupt practices thereat, and the procedure and practice upon petitions relating to such elections, and to report to the House if any changes are desireable therein. That the said committee have power to send for persons, papers and records. That three be a quorum of the committee.—Mr. R. L. Borden.

Mr R. L. BORDEN. I would like to discuss that as early as possible.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We might do it to-morrow.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It will be the first order to-morrow.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. On the motion of the Minister of Justice ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, on your motion. You have preference.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not insist on my motion provided the Minister of Justice is going on with his discussion on the same line. If it is more convenient he can begin.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. To-morrow public Bills and orders are on the first order but none are printed. Therefore the first motion will be that of Mr. Bennett, then that of Mr. Smith, and then my hon. friend's.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Postmaster General for the year ending 30th June, 1905.—Hon. A. B. Aylesworth.

ADJOURNMENT—INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER. On the 20th March last year, I moved for an order of the House which was passed asking—

For a return showing the number of wharfs, docks and piers constructed by the government in Canada in each year since 1896; the situation of each ; the total amount expended thereon, (a) in construction, including cost of land; (b) in maintenance, whether owned by the government or by corporations or individuals; the current expenditure in each year for (a) employees; (b) repairs; revenue derived therefrom each year; the number of vessels (a) steam; (b) sailing, which called each year and the tonnage of each.

A report has been laid on the table but it is not complete. I presume it is intended to cover a portion but does not cover all which was called for and is consequently practically of no use. I understand my hon. friend will be able to say that what is not brought down is in another department, but I will take it very kindly if he will see that the other department submits its portion and have the return brought down as a whole.

Hon. CHAS. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works). The return is not complete for the reason given by my hon. friend, but as he seemed so anxious for the information, I thought it better to give what was in the Public Works first. I shall be very glad to ask the Marine Department to bring down the balance.

Mr. FOSTER. There is one other report brought down on an order of the House of July, 1905, with reference to timber licenses and leases, which is imperfect in one respect, namely, that the advertisement and consequently the information as to the berths and conditions with reference to 340 lots is not given. This has to do with the limit purchased by Mr. T. O. Davis, of Saskatchewan. Will the minister make a note of that ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Will my hon. friend give the name and date ?

Mr. FOSTER. I shall send it over.

TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to ask the Prime Minister when we may expect the report of the transportation commission. I have not yet seen it and do not know whether or not it is being printed; and as some of the motions on the order paper have to do with this report, it is advisable that it should be printed and put in the hands of members at the earliest moment.

TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is another matter. When a certain report was laid on the table, I misunderstood its purport. It proves to be a report of Mr. Schreiber with respect to the progess of the work on the transcontinental between Winnipeg and the coast. We have not however the report of the Transcontinental Railway Commission although it is provided by statute that an annual report shall be submitted to each House of parliament within fifteen days after the making thereof or after the commencement of the next session of parliament whichever happens first.

If the report was made more than fifteen days ago, it should be laid on the table now. I assume that it has not been made, or that course would have been followed. I would

like to remind the commission by this public notice that we shall expect the report within fifteen days, and, if possible, we would like it earlier.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The president of the commission told me that he expected to have his report ready in good time.

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. member for Carleton (Mr. R. L. Borden) was absent from his place when I answered another question on this subject by stating that the report of the transportation commission is now in the hands of the printer and I hope to be able to lay it on the table soon. It is quite a lengthy document.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). I wish to call the attention of the Pastmaster General (Hon. Mr. Aylesworth) to the subject of an order made over a year ago—on the 6th of March, 1905. The hon. Minister will find a reference to it in 'Hansard', page 2067. As this report will be somewhat lengthy and as the session is to be a short one, I presume, that if the work in compliance with the order has not already been prepared, it should be set about at once. I call the hon. gentleman's attention to the matter now, because yesterday, owing to considerable confusion in the House at the close, I could not ascertain from any act of the Postmaster General whether his attention had actually been directed to it or not.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 5.40 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, March 15, 1906.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

ADULTERATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 15) to amend the Adulteration Act. He said: The object of the Bill is to force those who sell patent medicine to have attached to the package the formula of the medicine they offer for sale. This is the same Bill that I introduced towards the end of last session. The then Minister of Inland Revenue, I understand, intended to bring in a Bill to the same effect. The new Minister is not in, and I do not know what is his intention in the matter.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I would like to ask the mover of the Bill how his Act is to be construed in connection with a similar Act which is being introduced into the legislature of Ontario ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is impossible to say. We shall have to wait until the measure is brought up for discussion. This motion is simply to introduce it.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

TELEPHONE LEGISLATION.

Mr. INGRAM asked :

1. Is it the intention of the government to introduce any legislation this session affecting telephone companies ?
2. What amount was paid to witnesses and others for travelling and other expenses in connection with the inquiry made by the Select Committee on Telephone Systems last session, including all amounts paid for clerks, experts, expenses as representatives to telephone conventions, or for services performed for said select committee ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I would ask my hon. friend to wait until the Minister of Railways introduces the Bill of which he has given notice, to amend the Railway Act, and he will then perhaps find an answer to his question. With regard to the second part of the question I have not yet obtained the information, but I hope to obtain it in a few days for my hon. friend.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT.

Mr. SPROULE—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. How many members of parliament have been appointed to positions of emolument from the Crown since the year 1896 ?
2. What are the names of such members so appointed, and what is the salary attached to each appointment ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). If my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) were here, I would remind him that I gave him an answer to a similar question last year, and since then the only appointments that I am aware of have been those of Sir William Mulock to the bench, Mr. Peter Talbot to the Senate, and Mr. McKenzie, of Cape Breton, to the bench.

ATLANTIC MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. STOCKTON asked :

1. Has the government recently entered into any contract or contracts for the carriage of the mails across the Atlantic ?
2. When were such contracts entered into ?
3. Who are the contractors in each case ?

4. Which, if any, of the said contracts were let after public advertisement and tender ?

5. What is the amount of each contract ?

6. What rate of speed or time limit is provided in each contract ?

7. Is provision made in each contract for carriage by more efficient and faster steamers, in case such should be placed on the route during the term of the said contract ?

8. If such provision is not made, why has it been omitted ?

9. If the contracts, or any of them, were let without public advertisement, why was that safeguard omitted ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). In the year 1902 the government invited tenders for a fast mail service. Four tenders, if I remember rightly, were received, but they were not satisfactory. Then the government entered into negotiations with the Allan Company for an improved service. A contract has been made with that company, and it will be laid before the House in a few days.

THE PROHIBITION OF CIGARETTES.

Mr. BLAIN asked :

When will the government introduce a Bill embodying the principles contained in the following resolution, as passed by the House on April 1, 1903, by a vote of 103 for and 48 against:

'That the object of good government is to promote the general welfare of the people by a careful encouragement and protection of whatever makes for the public good; and by equally careful discouragement and suppression of whatever tends to the public disadvantage.

'That the smoking of cigarettes has been proved by overwhelming testimony to be productive of serious physical and moral injury to young people; impairing health, arresting development, weakening intellectual power, and thus constituting a social and national evil.

'The legislataion licensing and restricting the sale of cigarettes has not proven sufficient to prevent these evils, which will continue while the public sale of the cause of the mischief is permitted to go on.

'That this House is of the opinion, for the reasons hereinbefore set forth, that the right and most effectual legislative remedy for these evils is to be found in the enactment and enforcement of a law prohibiting the importation, manufacture and sale of cigarettes.'

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). In connection with some amendments to the Criminal Code which I proposed a session of two ago, provision was made for this cigarette nuisance, but my amendment as then proposed did not meet with the approval of either side of the House, and I was forced to withdraw it. It is possible that during the present session other amendments to the Criminal Code may be introduced, in connection with which this matter may be taken into consideration.

Mr. STOCKTON.

FREE RURAL MAIL DELIVERY.

Mr. LENNOX asked :

1. Has the Postmaster General, since the 6th March, 1905, applied to the government of the United States for a tabulated statement of the services rendered and expenses, under the system of free rural mail delivery established in that country, and as to the routes, distances, equipment, and other data, to enable the department to judge as to the expediency of the establishment of such a system in Canada ? If so, with what result ?

2. If not, why not ?

3. Or has the Postmaster General sent an officer to the government of the United States to endeavour to obtain such statement and information ? If so, with what result ?

4. If not, why not ?

5. Since the 6th of March, 1905, what steps, if any, other than as above, has the Postmaster General or his department taken to acquaint himself with the working of free rural delivery in the United States, the conditions existing there, the probability of its being permanently maintained, and as to the expediency of its adoption in Canada.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Postmaster General). No formal application has been made to the government of the United States officially, but two officers of the Canadian Post Office Department were sent to Washington in April last to make inquiries on the subject. They asked for a tabulated statement such as is above described, and were told that no statistics had been compiled from the data in hand except such as had been furnished from year to year in the printed reports of the United States Postal Department.

EMPLOYEES ON INTERCOLONIAL.

Mr. MORIN asked :

How many employees of all kinds were employed on the Intercolonial Railway and its several branches for the years 1899, 1900, 1901, 1902, 1903, 1904 and 1905 ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

There were 5,037 employees of all kinds on Intercolonial Railway and branches in 1899; 5,601 in 1900; 7,251 in 1901; 7,013 in 1902; 6,962 in 1903; 7,160 in 1904; 8,540 in 1905.

THE QUEBEC BRIDGE.

On the Orders of the Day being called :

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton). Before the Orders of the Day are called I wish to call the attention of the government to a very important matter. We all recognize that the port of Montreal is one of the most important ports on the North American continent, and I am sure there is not a member in this House—

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

An hon. MEMBER. What is the point of order ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The point of order is that if my hon. friend wants to put a question it is all right, but I understand he is going to make a speech.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I do not intend to make at all a lengthy speech, I merely wish to place before the House the facts. If necessary I shall move the adjournment of the House in order to place the matter before the House, because I believe that not a day should be allowed to pass without having the matter brought under the consideration of the government. I was calling the attention of the government to the importance of the port of Montreal and to the necessity of not interfering with that waterway in any way, of not interfering with the transportation of exports from that port. I have here, Mr. Speaker, a letter from a prominent engineer and if you will be good enough to allow me time, I shall place it before the House. It conveys some facts with reference to the Quebec bridge. The writer says :

I hereby take the liberty of calling your attention to an article 'Canada on the world's highway' in the March issue of 'The Canadian Engineer' exhibiting a danger which threatens both the navigation of the St. Lawrence river, and the position and importance of Montreal as a harbour.

I believe that this danger can be averted if energetic steps are taken at once toward a raising of the superstructure of the bridge in question. I believe that this can be done without seriously interfering with the construction, or without incurring additional expenses of any amount worth consideration in comparison to the importance of the problem ; which is nothing less than the preservation of the navigability of 165 miles of first-class waterway leading directly to the mercantile and industrial centre of the continent.

The article to which this engineer refers in the 'Canadian Engineer' is one, I believe of very great importance. Diagrams are given here of the different ships that are under construction at the present time and it distinctly shows that the new turbine under construction by the Cunard Company, a 40,000 ton boat is of such a height that even the smoke stack would not pass under the Quebec bridge as it is now proposed. When you take into consideration the fact that the height of the Quebec bridge above high water mark is 150 feet and that of the tower bridge in London built in 1890, is 143 feet; of the Baltic canal bridge, 137 feet; and the East River bridge in New York, built in 1870 is 135 feet, the gravity of the situation will be understood. I do not know that I can do better than quote the words of this article. It is written by Mr. Alfred J. Roewade, consulting engineer, civic designer, Chicago, Ill. He says :

To contemplate new transportation lines for the world's traffic is one thing ; to maintain and improve those already existing is another and often equally important thing. Hence I beg as an addendum to the previous articles under this heading to call attention to a danger threatening Canada's oldest and probably most important, trade route, namely the waterway from the sea to the Great Lakes.

It has up to date been taken for granted that the St. Lawrence river would be kept navigable for ocean ships to Montreal, from whence the canal route to the lakes begins. This great route, on which so much genius, work and money has already been expended and the completion of which is expected to tax the country's resources in the future, is threatened with a serious setback by the building of a fixed bridge 165 miles from Montreal, near the city of Quebec.

It is a generally acknowledged fact that whenever great enterprises like the Quebec bridge are contemplated a number of side problems butt in, demanding serious consideration. It is a common practice to keep as many as possible of the minor side problems out of sight in order to simplify the main scheme and thus accelerate its adoption. This practice is eminently correct so long as more or less temporary solutions are aimed at ; but a different course becomes necessary when problems of great prospective importance are involved. Among the side problems which ought to have been seriously considered before finally adopting the Quebec bridge was that of overhead clearance for vessels of the largest type. It must be admitted that the ideas in technical circles with regard to this problem are rather vague and hazy. The question is : What is the height of the rigging of the future ship? In the time of the sailing ship it was approximately equal to the length of the hull ; but now that the steamship has superseded the sailing vessel on the ocean the proportional height is considerably lower—how much is commonly regarded as a matter of guesswork. In some quarters it is even regarded as unimportant, because if the rigging of a steamship is too high to pass obstacles overhead it can be cut down. Yet this is a mistake, for the structure and dimensions of the modern steel rigging do not allow of such easy handling ; besides, the funnels of the largest modern steamships have already reached a height which forbids their passage under any of the fixed bridges over waterways, which generally are supposed to have clearance enough for any ship afloat. The lack of sufficient clearance for the future ship types under bridges like that at Quebec will, it is feared, result not in a lowering of the rigging, but in the employment of smaller vessels for carriage of freight and passengers ; and this means a reduction of the waterway to a lower class. The danger in this lies in the fact that the little ship and the ship of moderate size do not count at the present stage of evolution in mercantile marine because it does not pay. It is the large ship which is the economical one in regard to power and manning expenses ; hence, the harbour which cannot admit the great modern ship is out of the competition for ocean traffic, is but an inland port—a harbour for the coasting trade.

I do not wish to read all this article, but I wish to call to your attention this fact that on investigation at the Deparment of

Railways and Canals, I find that these figures are based upon facts, and if the minister will investigate this matter he will find that in accordance with the statistics contained in this article not only ships of the 40,000 ton type but ships of the 25,000 ton type, will not be able to pass under the Quebec bridge. I feel confident that the people of Montreal and vicinity and not only the people of Montreal are interested but the people of the whole of Canada and of the western and northern states, of which a large portion of the trade will be gradually flowing to the port of Montreal. We must take into consideration the fact that in the past ten years the exports out of the port of Montreal have more than doubled, we must also bear in mind that ten years from now we will probably be shipping from that port not $250,000,000 worth of exports but $500,000,000, and that it will be necessary for the large ships to come up there to take care of that export trade. I sincerely hope the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) will take this matter into consideration and investigate it at the earliest possible date, because I understand, Sir, that the superstructure can be built and can be made higher than it is at present without any very great expense to this country, and even if it does cost some $50,000 or $100,000 to place it ten feet or fifteen feet higher I feel satisfied that the people of Canada, when they consider this question, will believe that it is money well expended, so that the port of Montreal which is 165 miles this side of Quebec will be able to have the advantage of the large ships coming up to that port and also the advantage of the lower freight rates which this will naturally bring into effect. I do not wish to take up more of the time of the House, but I will again ask the minister to investigate this matter, in view of the height required by the large ships which are being built in other countries, and of the vital importance to Canada of building up the trade by the St. Lawrence route. If he will take into consideration the construction of the docks at Liverpool and along the Mersey and those along the Thames, and also the overhead bridge at London to which I have referred, where I have seen boats of even moderate size with not too great room in going under, he will readily know that the arguments given by this gentleman in the 'Canadian Engineer' are worthy of the most serious attention. I sincerely trust that the minister will investigate the matter and will give the case his most careful consideration. I move that this House do now adjourn.

Mr. E. D. SMITH (Wentworth). This seems to me a matter of very serious importance, and one which should receive careful consideration. If the statements made by this civil engineer, that modern vessels are being constructed of such height that they will be unable to pass under this bridge—a permanent structure—are well founded, it will be a serious menace to the trade of the St. Lawrence route. The port of Montreal ought to be the outlet of the greater part of the traffic of Canada, as well as a large part of that of the northern United States. At present, a considerable portion of the traffic passes out, not by way of Montreal, but by way of Portland, Boston, and New York, because the freights of these ports are lower than those of Montreal. And the reason why the freights at Montreal are relatively higher is because the St. Lawrence is not fully equipped so that large ocean vessels may traverse it safely night and day at full speed. In view of the fact that Montreal is much nearer Liverpool than New York or Boston this ought not to be so. Two years ago I made a careful estimate of the freight on the amount of produce shipped out of the port of Montreal, and found that it would amount to $800,000 in a year more than by the other routes. Besides this, we are paying large subsidies to induce steamers to come to Montreal. Ostensibly we pay this largely for the carriage of the mails. But, if these were paid for in the ordinary way, the sum of $4,000 or $5,000 would be sufficient instead of the $200,000 or $300,000 we now pay in the shape of subsidy. Altogether we find that we are paying $1,000,000 a year more on our outward freight and our subsidies than we would have to pay by American routes. Surely it is worthy of consideration that we should have no further impediment in the way of the traffic by the St. Lawrence route. We must make this route as safe as any other route across the Atlantic. When this is brought about, the fast ocean vessels will be able to use the St. Lawrence as freely as the open sea, and we shall save the enormous sum that we now lose annually in freights. And, year after year, the vessels will increase in size. We have, naturally, an impregnable position if we can make the St. Lawrence route as safe as the open ocean, because in Montreal we have a port that can be reached with a shorter rail haul from the interior than any other ocean port. This great natural advantage we ought not to lose. Therefore, I trust that the government will realize the duty resting upon it of carefully investigating this matter before it is too late.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). I want to congratulate my hon. friends from Ontario upon the fact that they seem to be imbued with the maritime spirit; and I shall welcome their co-operation in other matters in which mari-

time interests may be menaced or affected. The question raised by my hon. friend from East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) may be an important one, but I think that if he had read the opinions expressed by men who are regarded eminent authorities in such matters, as set forth in the Montreal 'Gazette' of this morning, he would have seen that there was no ground for alarm. I shall simply give the measurements, and will then call attention to the opinions expressed by Mr. Kennedy, a very eminent engineer connected with the port of Montreal, and the Messrs. Allan, who certainly, would be alive to the importance of this question. The Quebec bridge has two approach spans—one at the north and the other at the south end of the bridge—of 210 feet each. Both of these spans have been completed. The bridge consists of two anchor arms of 500 feet span each and the main span of 1,500 feet between the main piers. The clearance above the highest water level is 150 feet for a distance of 1,200 feet covering the channel of the river. The railway approaches with bridges on the south side, have, I think, been constructed to this grade above high water level, and I understand that the north approaches are being constructed to the same level.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is that the height of the clear space, or is it the height from the rail to the water ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is the height under the bridge from the highest water level to the lowest point of the bridge. An article appears in the Montreal 'Gazette' of this morning under the following headings :

Alarm is needless.

New bridge at Quebec will not interfere with the steamers coming up to Montreal.

Can easily pass under.

Structure over Manchester ship canal allow 75 feet. At Cap Rouge there are 150 feet.

I will not read all the article, but only a part of it, as follows :

According to the statements given below by men of experience, the Quebec bridge can never be a serious menace to the trade of Canada's national port, and for several reasons. In the first place, the theory appears to be quite well sustained that no masts or steamer's funnels will be too high to pass the good city of Quebec, sail under the bridge and proceed to the commercial metropolis of the Dominion. If, however, the best authorities on the St. Lawrence river be in error, and Mr. Alfred J. Reonade's fears are justified some time in the remote future, masts can always be lowered without any difficulty whatever, and steamers' funnels can be made telescopic, as is the case with all the Manchester liners.

Mr. John Kennedy, chief engineer of the harbour board, being interviewed, said that he did not think there was any foundation for the Quebec bridge scare. All those who had read the article in the 'Canadian Engineer' noticed that there were no figures given by Mr. Roenade, except the height of the bridge from high Water. Generalities had alone been indulged in, and Mr. Kennedy was at a loss to know where the data had been secured prompting the declaration that the funnels of the very largest steamers could not pass under the bridge. He had no idea that any of the big ships would have masts or funnels of such height. Masts of the present day ships are not particularly high. Some time ago the maximum height of the tunnels of the United States warships was 130 feet, but they are now cut down to a much lower figure He remembered that the masts of old sailing ships were as high as 160 feet, and a Yarmouth, N.S., ship, called the Ellen A. Read, 1,760 tons, had a mainmast 204 feet over all

This, however, did not mean anything, as the upper masts could always be lowered when circumstances required.

Mr. Kennedy also drew attention to the fact that the fixed bridges over the Manchester ship canal were no higher than 75 feet, and this decision was reached after a good deal of inquiry and discussion by the canal, shipping and civic authorities. If a great and progressive community like Manchester felt that there was no danger to its interests with 75-foot bridges over the canal, he did not think the trade of Montreal would be jeopardized while there were 150 feet to the good at Cap Rouge.

Mr. Hugh Andrew Allan, of the firm of Messrs. H. & A. Allan, who was also seen, expressed views identical with those of Mr Kennedy. As soon as Mr. Allen had seen the height of the piers of the Quebec bridge he had made up his mind that all danger to Montreal's trade in that direction was exceedingly remote. He had also been struck by the entire lack of data in the 'Canadian Engineer's' article. He had looked over the plans of the new turbine steamer 'Virginian,' and found that it was 84 feet from the keel to the highest bridge deck on the steamer, and allowing her to draw 26 feet, there still remained a margin of 92 feet for the funnels and masts. He did not think there were any grounds whatever for alarm. He said it was quite a common thing for steamers to have telescopic funnels, like the Manchester liners.

Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me that the opinions here expressed by these gentlemen should dispose of the question. The Department of Railways and Canals, through its engineers, and in the specifications, have made every necessary provision; I have no doubt that this matter was very fully considered. When you come to talk about 40,000 ton ships coming up to Montreal, that is not likely to occur in the very near future. In the first place, the best depth of water that can be found, I fancy, would not permit vessels of that tonnage approaching the port of Montreal. The class of vessels that are likely to be constructed for that trade within the near future, is not likely to be barred from visiting the port of Montreal by reason of the height of this bridge.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I do not wish to prolong the debate. I merely wish to say with reference to the masts, that the Minister of Railways and Canals must realize that with the steel masts that are in use to-day it

is almost impossible to adjust them to the height of bridges.

Mr. EMMERSON. The hon. gentleman forgets about the top masts, they lower those.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. If he will look at the articles in the American papers with reference to those bridges I referred to, the height of the one at New York and on the Baltic canal, he will readily understand that they will not admit of large ships such as are mentioned in that article. I merely want to draw attention to these facts. As to the St. Lawrence not being capable of admitting large ships coming up to the port of Montreal, I would be the last to believe it until the fact was ascertained by the very best engineers we can place upon that river. I hope and believe that in the years to come we will take a more energetic stand with reference to the development of the St. Lawrence river, and that instead of our widening it a hundred feet or two hundred feet, if it is necessary we will widen the channel three hundred feet or five hundred feet, so that large vessels can ply up and down that river day and night, and I believe that the people of Canada would feel that in doing so they were spending their money to a very good purpose. The minister must admit that so far as transportation on that river is concerned, it will materially assist in reducing the rates on the railroads for these could not possibly carry freight 165 miles for 50 or 75 per cent less than large boats could carry it up to the port of Montreal. I know there are some people who think that in consequence of the rapids 40 miles above Quebec it would be impossible to take away those rocks without lowering the water at the port of Montreal. But if they will investigate what has been done on the Danube, for instance, and see the dams that have been built there and the immense value they have been in improving navigation on those rivers, they will realize that in years to come it is possible to make the St. Lawrence navigable for the largest ship.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). Before the motion is carried I think I should take some notice of the remarks made by the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong). He seems to be under the impression that the government has not been doing its duty in connection with opening the St. Lawrence channel. For some years past, especially since 1899, great efforts have been put forth in order to deepen the channel to 30 feet. I may say that in all probability, by the 1st of October next, the channel will be deepened to 30 feet as far as Batiscan; and at high tide, from Batiscan to Quebec there will be certainly more than 30 feet. So I think there is no danger and no possibility that the navigation of the St. Lawrence will leave anything to be desired after that.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does the minister mean to say that from Montreal to Batiscan or from Quebec to Batiscan there will be 30 feet ?

Mr. BRODEUR. From Montreal to Bastiscan. On the 1st of October next, I think, I can assure the House that the work will be completed and that we will have a channel 30 feet deep at extreme low water. Last year, if I remember right, some more work remained to be done, and when that is finished we shall have 31 feet at low water. So we may expect that at extreme low water between Batiscan and Montreal there will be at least 30 feet on the 1st of October. Now as concerns the width of the channel, we are taking the necessary steps in that direction also. Where we find large curves we are trying to give greater width to the channel. Since I have been at the head of the department I have had an opportunity of seeing many persons who are interested in navigation on the St. Lawrence, and with the system of lights we have established, especially during the last two years, we may expect the channel can be navigated not only during the day but also during the night without any difficulty at all. I am convinced that the work we are now carrying on will be found absolutely satisfactory to the navigation and shipping interests on the St. Lawrence. I am sorry however to see occasionally in the press some references to the difficulties of the navigation of the St. Lawrence. I do not know where this information comes from, but we are sometimes in the habit of seeing charges made against the facility of the navigation of the St. Lawrence. I do not think this is fair because not a single one of the accidents which occurred last year was due to the depth of the channel and nothing consequently can be charged to the government or the department in that respect. I desire to assure the House that no effort will be spared to make the channel of the St. Lawrence one of the best channels that can be found.

Motion (Mr. Armstrong) to adjourn negatived.

ARBITRATION BETWEEN HIS MAJESTY AND THE GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY COMPANY.

On the Orders of the Day being called :

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the government what is the position of the arbitration between His Majesty and the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada. It has been carried on under a special Act passed in the session of 1904. I have seen some reference to a report or a partial report, and it would be convenient to have information conveyed to the House as to what the present position is.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). The arbitration is practically disposed of; that is to say, of the seven or eight questions which were submitted to the arbitrators five or six of them have been already disposed of. There are two which still remain to be considered and these are the two which, in my judgment are probably the most important. They are the questions which affect diversion of traffic. These questions are now under consideration, all the evidence is in, and I expect that the arbitrators will give a finding on these two points within the next month or two. I might in the interval, perhaps, if it were thought desirable, bring down the findings we have got so far from the arbitrators.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It might be desirable to have them if there is no objection.

Mr. BERGERON. Are the findings final?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes. I was asked to agree that there could be an appeal from the findings of the arbitrators if the parties chose to take one, before the arbitrators gave their decision, but I refused because our intention was that it should be a final settlement of the whole matter as between the Intercolonial Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway.

REPORTS PRESENTED.

Report of the Inland Revenue Department, part I, in regard to Excise, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1905; also part II, in regard to the inspection of Weights and Measures and Gas and Electric Light.—Hon. L. P. Brodeur.

Report of the Department of Labour for the year ended June 30, 1905.—Hon. A. B. Aylesworth.

POSTMASTER AT CANNINGTON.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I desire to direct the attention of the hon. the Postmaster General (Mr. Aylesworth) to the fact that subquestion 5 of the question concerning the removal of the Cannington postmaster was not answered yesterday. Question 4 is:

Were there ever any complaints against him?

The answer given is:

There had been complaints from time to time in regard to the management of this post office.

Question 5 was:

If so, what were they?

Question 5 has not been answered.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. They were various.

MINISTERIAL CHANGES.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to ask the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) whether or not he proposes to give the usual explanation of the ministerial changes?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will be very happy to do so at any time which may be convenient to my hon. friend (Mr. Borden). What day shall we say—to-morrow, or Monday, or Tuesday?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Whatever will suit the convenience of my right hon. friend.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Well, to-morrow will suit me very well.

MASSACRE OF JEWS IN RUSSIA.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL (South Toronto). Mr. Speaker, I would ask the indulgence of the House in addressing to it the few remarks that I will make on the resolution that I have placed upon the order paper. The resolution as proposed is as follows:

That during the reign of terror which recently prevailed in many parts of Russia, large numbers of helpless men, women and children of the Hebrew race were massacred in a most brutal and inhuman manner.

That no adequate effort appears to have been made to prevent these outrages, the perpetrators of which were permitted to complete their atrocious work.

That the parliament of Canada, expressing the sentiment of the Canadian people, without distinction of race, creed or party, deplores such wanton and inhuman massacre of the Jews in Russia, and affirms that these atrocities are a disgrace to the civilization of the twentieth century.

That this resolution be forwarded through His Excellency the Governor General, to the Right Honourable the Secretary of State for the Colonies, in order that His Majesty may be advised of the sentiment of his Canadian subjets in the premises, and to the end that such action may be taken thereon as His Majesty's advisers may deem meet.

The resolution speaks for itself but my object in introducing it to the House is two-fold; firstly, for the purpose of expressing sympathy with the victims and sufferers of these massacres and of deploring and condemning them in so far as we have the right to do so, and secondly, for the purpose of, if possible, by placing ourselves on record in this matter and by voicing the sentiments of the Canadian people through the Canadian House of Commons, averting a continuation or repetition of these outrages, or at least of mitigating the rigour of them. It is within the knowledge of every hon. member of this House, and I think of every citizen of Canada, that these outrages have been committed. I, therefore, need not dwell at any length upon them. Suffice it to say that during the last two years over 100,000 helpless men, women and children of the Hebrew race have been massacred in Russia. The Russian people took advantage of the riots which they themselves, apparently, incited, to rise and massacre these helpless creatures. The intensity of these mas-

sacres, if I may use the term, increased as time went on and they seemed to culminate in one great outburst of passion and the shedding of blood in the month of November last. Since that time practically the whole civilized world has gone on record against such a condition of things. The peoples of Canada, Great Britain and the United States particularly have condemned these occurrences. We have seen throughout this country public meetings held and resolutions passed condemning these outrages, and I think I am correct in saying that the right hon. the Prime Minister of this country dignified one of these meetings in this city with his presence and either by presiding thereat or speaking thereat expressed what I believe to be the sentiments of the Canadian people in regard to these outrages. Much has been done towards, if possible, preventing a recurrence of them. Various Ministers of the Gospel throughout the country have preached against them. Public contributions have been made to relieve the sufferers, collections have been taken up for the purpose of aiding these helpless creatures. The public press, I think, without exception, has condemned these outrages. They have been condemned by the public press and by public writers. The letters that have appeared in the public press have been almost innumerable, and as recently as January of this year the Congress of the United States of America has gone on record by the passing of a resolution similar in sentiment to the one which I have proposed to this House, but in much stronger terms and language.

I think Sir, it is not asking this House too much when I ask it to endorse this resolution, as the resolution itself says : without distinction of creed, or race, or party. Let us at least enter out protest ; let us hope this resolution will not miscarry. It may be said and no doubt it will be said that such a resolution is futile and can be of no avail. I decline to accept that view. I believe that if we thus formally place the sentiments of the Canadian parliament in the hands of His Majesty it will strengthen his Majesty's hands to take whatever course his advisers may see fit in regard to the matter. It is known to us all that massacres of a somewhat similar character were stopped in Turkey and in China by the interference of other nations, and let us hope that this resolution may tend towards a similar result in the present sad circumstances. We see in the newspapers to-day, threats of a recurrence of these dreadful massacres during the coming Easter season. It seems strange that the sanctified Easter time should be selected for such an inhuman purpose, but we have the fact that these outrages occurred at Easter time in 1903, 1904 and 1905. Even if this resolution should have the effect of staying the hand of only one assassin of the Jews, the resolution will not be passed in vain.

Mr. MACDONELL.

And, Sir, who are these people who have been so persecuted in Russia ? If we are to judge them as we find them in Canada we must form a high opinion of the Jewish race. It is safe to say there are no more law abiding citizens of His Majesty in this country than are our Hebrew fellow subjects. They enjoy perfect security under our British constitution, they enjoy equal rights with their Christian fellow subjects and in their turn they respect the law which protects them, and evidence their desire to uphold the constitution. They are law abiding and good citizens of Canada. They are a charitable race and this resolution partakes of the qualities of charity and mercy. They are a people who maintain their own poor ; they make that a practise of their religion. We see no Jews in the public charitable institutions of the country, and I am happy to say very few of them in the prisons and penitentiaries. I trust Sir, that this resolution will not contravene any international usage, law, or custom. I trust that this expression of the sentiment of the people of Canada will not in any way be considered as a violation of the comity of nations. The resolution is framed in as moderate language as it is possible to frame it in order to give expression to the sentiments it contains. But, Sir, if it is thought that the resolution is too strong in its terms, if it is thought it asks more than we in Canada have the right to ask of his Majesty in connection with this matter, then I am perfectly willing that the resolution should be modified so as conform to the ordinary usage. This is a humanitarian and a philanthropic resolution. I hope that there will be no difference of opinion in this House regarding it, and no misconstruction of my motives in bringing it forward. I submit it with the suggestion, that if it is considered to be too strong in its terms, it may be modified in any way that may suit the exigencies of the case, so long as it preserves intact the expression of the unanimous sentiment of the Canadian people which I believe it embodies. I have great pleasure in moving the resolution.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I certainly have no exception to take to anything that has been said by my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonell) nor to the motive which has inspired him in bringing this resolution before the House. Our fellow citizens of the Hebrew race deserve every encomium he has bestowed upon them. They are industrious, they are peaceful, they are frugal, they are respectable citizens of Canada in every sense of the word. We have reason to presume that their character in Russia is the same as it is here, but whatever may be their character as citizens of the Russian empire, there is no possible justification for the harsh treatment to which they have been subjected. What has taken place in Russia

must instill a feeling of horror in the breast of any civilized man. I have however to call the attention of my hon. friend, and of the House, to this point: Whether it is advisable that we should pass such a resolution in this parliament. The citizens of Canada have passed somewhat similar resolutions in public meetings—in one of which I have myself taken part—and that proceeding is quite proper. It is right that the sense of horror of every man in this free country should be expressed, so that by the multiplicity and unanimity of these expressions of opinion some influence may perhaps be brought upon the government of Russia to induce them to protect the lives of their citizens. That is a thing that is quite within the duty of every Canadian citizen. But, I would like the House to remember that this parliament does not represent the full plenary sovereign power. We are a colony of England, and whilst we have full autonomous power, we have not at this moment the right to interfere in foreign matters as to which the Crown of England alone is responsible. We have on more than one occasion in this House passed resolutions on matters affecting a people beyond our own purview and jurisdiction, but in relation to the condition of British subjects in other parts of the empire. Take the example with which we are all familiar; upon more than one occasion this House has passed a resolution on the question of Home Rule for Ireland. I believe it is quite within our power and quite within our right as British subjects to express opinions as to conditions which may affect our fellow British subjects in any part of the world, but I think we should hesitate somewhat, or at all events take some care to reflect, before we interfere in a matter which is purely within the domain of the Foreign Office and the relations of England with a foreign power. If we had full plenary power it would be for us to determine whether it would be advisable for us to interfere even ever so slightly with the domestic policy of any other nation. But, the relations of England at the present time with Russia are the relations which belong simply to the diplomatic service of Great Britain and in that service we have no voice whatever. I am not prepared to say at this moment that I would condemn the action taken by my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonell); far from it. I would simply ask this House of Commons to reflect whether or not it is wise for us as a dependent colony of Great Britain, having no plenary sovereignty, to interfere in the slightest degree with the sovereignty of England in its relation to other nations. I am not prepared at this moment to express any opinion on this question I would like to have the opinion of the House upon it, though I express my own conviction that it is far preferable for us not to attempt to advise England as to what her duties are with regard to other nations. At this moment, while I am not prepared to take issue altogether with my hon. friend, I would ask the House again to reflect on this matter and to postpone the consideration of it to a future date. As I have said, I sympathize with the object of my hon. friend. He is moved by motives of humanity. We all sympathize with him. He has put his case in moderate language, to which I am sure no exception can be taken. But I think that the matter had better be deferred for future consideration, and therefore I beg to move that the debate be now adjourned.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). Mr. Speaker, I do not altogether agree with the doctrine that has been laid down by the Prime Minister on this occasion. The British parliament has taken up questions of this kind and has expressed sympathy with oppressed people in various portions of the world, and I think the parliament of Canada has sufficient rights, if it cares to assert them, to express its sympathy in the same way. This parliament is not secondary to the British parliament in matters of this kind, and I hope the day will soon come when we shall have the fullest liberty, and assert the fullest liberty, of declaring our views with regard to matters of this kind. I sympathize altogether with what the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) has said. While I regret the massacres that have taken place and the injustice that has been done to the Jews, it must be a matter of satisfaction to Canadians and to the world at large that Russia to-day is effecting her emancipation, and that constitutional government is coming in that country. Everybody must be more than pleased to see the dawn of a better day in Russia, with the coming of constitutional government founded somewhat on British lines.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). I agree with the Prime Minister that it is better to postpone the further consideration of this question at the moment. The resolution is couched, as the mover has said, in less forcible language than that which was employed in a resolution on the same subject passed by the Congress of the United States. With most of what the Prime Minister has said. I would be inclined to agree, except that one qualification perhaps might be made, which is this, that technically as well as actually this parliament has a perfect right to address the King on any subject whatever. From that standpoint one would think that this parliament might be very well justified in passing a moderate resolution with regard to what has taken place in Russia; and I join most heartily in what has been said by the Prime Minister and by the mover of the resolution as to the feeling with which these outrages have been regarded by the people of Canada as

a whole. The position of Canada with regard to the foreign relations of the empire is, as the Prime Minister has said, somewhat peculiar. It is possible that it may be a transition stage. As to that we can only speculate. On one occasion I recollect that this House passed a resolution, since I have had the honour of being a member of it, which concerned people outside the empire. That was the resolution which we passed I think in 1899, with regard to the rights of British subjects in the Transvaal.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. England claimed a suzerainty over the Transvaal.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. She claimed suzerainty, it is true; there is that observation to be made. There was a good deal of difference of opinion as to whether that was merely a nominal right or a practical right. The Prime Minister will remember that English jurists and statesmen differed a good deal in opinion as to what that amounted to, after all. However, for the moment I entirely agree with the proposal which the Prime Minister has made that the debate be adjourned. If it is proper for this parliament, having regard to its relation to the King, and to the empire, to make a moderate expression of opinion with regard to these outrages, it seems to me that the motion of my hon. friend is well founded, and that some resolution couched in these or similar terms might very well be passed. It is, however, a case in which it is not wise for us to make too great haste. Therefore I am entirely in accord with the motion of the Prime Minister.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). Mr. Speaker, in case this motion should result as some other motions for the adjournment of debates have resulted in times past, I think this debate should not be ended without some sober thought being expressed now to clear the atmosphere of what I might call the fictitious sentiment which has been sought to be developed in this country in favour of the Jews. I need not say that I am animated by no feeling against the Jews, any more than I suppose the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) is animated by consideration of the influence the Jewish vote may have in his constituency. I take for granted that both my hon. friend and myself are speaking our mind on this subject. I may say in passing that the province of Quebec was the first part of the British empire to accord to the Jews their rights as citizens. Even at the time when my co-religionists and those of my hon. friend were denied those rights in England, the French Canadian Catholics in the province of Quebec passed a law—and if I may speak personally, I may say that my own grandfather was the author of it—to give the Jews civil rights in the province of Quebec, before England or any other part of the British empire had done so. But if we allow ourselves, even before we have the right to rule ourselves as a nation, to be drawn into debates on international questions and to take upon ourselves the tremendous responsibility of advising all nations on earth as to what they should do in regard to their internal affairs, I think we should take care to study a little the questions on which we pass resolutions, otherwise our action might carry us very far. For instance, we might be induced to pass resolutions condemning the barbarous custom of lynching which is kept up in the United States in time of peace, and when there is no social revolution to excuse the American government for not stamping out that barbarous custom. We might also from time to time pass resolutions condemning the criminal neglect of the Turkish government to prevent the massacre of thousands of Christians in countries where England, France and some other European powers have the right to exert their influence. So far as Russian Jews are concerned, perhaps we might be a little careful about our expressions of sympathy, in view of the well established fact, which has been vouched for by the most sober correspondents of British newspapers, that the Jews have been at the bottom of most of the social troubles that have arisen in Russia—that a great deal of the money that has been raised by subscriptions in foreign countries on behalf of the Russian Jews has been as a matter of fact used in purchasing firearms and supplies for the revolutionists. Therefore it might be embarrassing for the British government, of which I suppose my hon. friend from Toronto is a loyal supporter, if we passed a resolution here asking the British parliament to express sympathy for people who, having taken a large share in the revolution in Russia, are now to a certain extent sufferers from that revolution. It is a well known fact, and this has been published in the London 'Times,' that the slaughters in some of the Russian cities were made by the Christians, because the Jews had prepared a conspiracy to slaughter the Christians.

Now so far as the charity of the Jewish people is concerned, I shall not go into a long historical study. I certainly sympatize with the Jews for some of the persecutions to which they have been subjected on account of their religious belief, but as had been very clearly stated time and again by one of the most illustrious of English writers, Mr. Goldwin Smith, the sentiment of hatred against the Jews, not only in Russia but in other countries, does not come from racial or religious feeling but from the fact that the Jew does not assimilate himself to the country in which he is living, except to that extent that will enable him to profit by the citizenship of the country in which he is living in order to enrich himself and contribute in the least possible de-

gree to the development of that country. It is a well known fact that the Jews do not become owners of property to a large extent. In Russia especially, they have not purchased land but have lived and enriched themselves to an enormous extent by extorting from the poor people not only their money but the blood of their life, and repeating in fact the historical example that has been illustrated over 300 years ago by the greatest of English poets. In days of revolution, the common people simply go and strike blindly but instinctively against the people who have persecuted them for years and years. Revolutions in England, revolutions in France, gave rise to a great deal of slaughter and abominable crime, but they were the natural result of the oppression under which the people had suffered for years and years; and when the law was weak and revolutions came, the people struck at those from whom they had suffered. The Russian peasants had been sucked for centuries by the Jewish usurers, it is no surprise now that they are acting terribly in their dealings with them. I think it would be most ridiculous of this parliament to adopt a resolution, inspired, I am afraid, by local conditions of an electoral character, passing judgment on a problem which has been trying the spirit not only of Russian statesmen but the statesmen of many countries for years, for centuries, a problem which consists in trying to bring the Jewish people to adopt themselves to the social conditions of the country and not merely to use those social conditions for their own benefit. Moreover, Sir, I think that it would place this parliament in a still more ridiculous position within our own imperial borders. We have been reminded by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) that some seven years ago a resolution was adopted by this parliament expressing sympathy with the British citizens who were for the time being living in the Republic of Transvaal. The pretense was then made of the suzerainty of Great Britain over the Transvaal, and parliament being surprised, as it would be surprised at this time, by an absence of the knowledge of facts, put on its records the doctrine of suzerainty of the British over the Transvaal, after that doctrine had been entirely discarded by the British government, and when it had been decided by the highest tribunal in Great Britain that the suzerainty was abandoned. Therefore it was an interference in international matters. But now that the Transvaal is part of the British empire, why not propose a resolution of sympathy with the effort being made to stamp out slavery under the name of the British crown and British sovereignty ? The British people have decided by hundreds of thousands of majority that the slavery established by the Conservative government in the Transvaal should be stamped out.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does my hon. friend not know that that expression was absolutely discountenanced and withdrawn by members of the British government in recent debates in the British parliament ?

Mr. BOURASSA. I know that members of the British parliament——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. —of the British government, not of the British parliament.

Mr. BOURASSA. Of the British government, all right; the word is very little to me, I must say. I attach very little importance to words, it is to facts that I look, and when I see men, when I see corporations organized under British law, going to a foreign country and purchasing men for money, and having nearly the right of life and death over them for years, and having the right of using corporal punishment to force them to work so many hours a day and so many days a year, I call it slavery. And as a matter of fact, it is the process and not the word which has been condemned so strongly, and with such an unmistakable voice, by the British people at the last election.

What I was just going to say, when I was interrupted, was that if we had something to do with the reform of social iniquities, we should begin within our own world first; and therefore if we wish to utter expressions of sympathy in matters of this kind, we should begin by those parts of the British empire, where under British law, processes similar to slavery are now held one century after that magnificent movement which was started by Wilberforce for the abolition of the slave trade. But, Sir, I do not wish to bring on a discussion of that extent, I simply remind you of the fact to show that we are apt to be carried away by prejudices raised by petty interests to step out of our constitutional, of our national, of our social, of our political role, and that we would do far better if we want to enjoy the confidence of the British people, if we want to co-operate with the British government in the good works of social reform within our own imperial borders, we had better come down to the basis of common sense, and not bother ourselves with problems which we are not prepared to solve, and of which we even do not know the basis.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). I would not have risen to say a word had it not been for the insinuation of the last speaker that those who have spoken in favour of this resolution have been influenced by the fact that there was a vote in their constituency that might be favourably influenced by remarks of this kind. I am not aware that there is a single Jewish vote in my constituency, and I therefore rise that I might at least claim to speak with absolute freedom from any such bias as was suggested by the last speaker. At the same time if the last speaker had read the notice

of motion instead of preparing to pour out his vials of ridicule and wrath on its mover he would have seen that we are not asking His Majesty to do anything whatever in connection with these massacres. We merely, as a body which certainly has plenary authority as far as its rights to express its opinions are concerned, express our opinion on a most lamentable state of affairs. I am not aware of any person the world over who is prepared to defend the murderers who in the last few months have been slaughtering the unfortunate Jews in Russia. It may be possible that, among the Jews there, there are some who have excited the enmity of the Russians, but I am sure if the last speaker will read the play of England's greatest poet, when he reads the gems that fall from the lips of Portia, he will hardly find that she is inspired by the same spirit that seems to actuate him this afternoon, even although it may be impossible that in the whole history of Russia there could have been a greater usurer than old Shylock himself. My hon. friend to be consistent would have to advocate that it would have been Portia's duty to raise a rabble to slaughter old Shylock and all his family and all other Jews, old and young, male or female whom they could find. I quite agree with what has been said by the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) that perhaps it is well to have this matter considered, but I do hope that after due consideration is given to it that this parliament of Canada which was not afraid to send representations home to the mother country at a time when, on such a subject as home rule, there was a great diversity of opinion in that country. And when, therefore, we were suggesting to the home authorities what they should do, it might well be said that we were acting beyond our authority, perhaps impertinently. Surely, a body that was prepared to give advice at such a time cannot be afraid to express sentiments which, I think, I am safe in saying, are the sentiments of every man, woman and child in Canada except the last speaker.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

ELECTIONS TO THE HOUSE.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont) moved:—

That a select committee of nine be appointed to inquire into the Acts relating to elections to this House, and the prevention of corrupt practices thereat, and the procedure and practice upon petitions relating to such elections, and to report to the House if any changes are desireable therein. That the said committee have power to send for persons, papers and records. That three be a quorum of the committee.

He said: In connection with this motion, I wish to say a few words. The motion is, in effect, superseded by a motion which my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) has placed upon the order paper. I shall not press the motion, but shall ask that the debate upon it be adjourned until after the motion of the Minister of Justice has been disposed of. But, perhaps, it may be convenient if, at this time—as I am not in a position to be a member of the committee—I make a few suggestions which, possibly, may be of a little service to the hon. gentlemen who are to be members of the committee, seeing that I have given some little attention to the subject during the last few months with a view to endeavouring to bring about in our legislation such amendments as will accomplish the result which, I am sure, members on both sides sincerely desire.

I think it was in the session of 1903 that this subject engaged, to some extent the attention of parliament. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) at that time urged members on both sides of the House to co-operate with a view of placing upon our statute-books further legislation which would tend to bring about cleaner and purer elections in Canada. The subject was considered by a special committee upon a Bill introduced by Mr. Charlton. That committee made a report in the closing hours of the session. The report, among other things, embodied the suggestions that men who do not exercise the right of franchise should lose, for a certain time at least the privilege of voting for members of parliament. There was a very great difference of opinion in the House with regard to that particular portion of the Bill which had been reported. A great many members were opposed to any such suggestion. Eventually the Bill stood for further consideration and the report of the Minister of Justice upon it. The session was very far advanced at that time. The Minister of Justice was unable to give the necessary consideration to it, and, from that time until the present no step of importance has been taken for the purpose of bringing about the reforms which were then suggested. I am not approaching the subject to-day from a partisan standpoint, but with the sincere desire that gentlemen on both sides of the House should co-operate for the purpose of reforming our electoral law.

I may aid the committee by giving the results of an examination which I have made of certain fairly recent proceedings in the British House of Commons. In the session of 1897 Sir Charles Dilke moved for a select committee to inquire into the procedure and practice in parliamentary election petitions, and to report to the House if any changes be desireable therein. The committee sat on several days and heard a great deal of evidence. Among other witnesses called before the committee were Mr. Justice Cave, Mr. Justice Wright, and Baron Pollock who were judges of

Great Britain having great experience in the trial of election petitions. Mr. Samuel Day, an eminent English counsel who had had great experience as counsel in such petitions was examined, as were the public prosecutor and various other gentlemen who might be regarded as experts with regard to this particular subject. The committee did not complete its labours in the session of 1897, and a similar committee of nine was appointed in the session of 1898, to whom was referred the evidence taken before the committee of 1897, and who did make a report after examining further witnesses. To the report of this committee, I have already directed the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice. It is possible that some of the suggestions which are to be found in that report may be of service to the committee for which the Minister of Justice will shortly move.

Looking a little at the subject from the standpoint which I have indicated, I would say that it is very desirable indeed to bring about some change in our law which will result in bringing on by-elections within a reasonable time. I am not saying this by way of reproach or speaking from a partisan standpoint or with any desire to pass censure on the government in this connection. I shall take another occasion to do that if it shall be necessary. But we have known, both in the parliament of Canada and in the legislatures of the various provinces, this result to be brought about—that a certain constituency has sometimes been unrepresented for a whole session. There is no doubt that under the law as it exists at present, there is a temptation to any administration whether it be Liberal or Conservative, to fix the time for holding the by-elections at a date when it will be most convenient to the political party in power. I do not think that that condition should continue. I have introduced already two Bills for the purpose of amending the law in that regard, and I should be very happy indeed, as I previously stated, if these two Bills should be referred to this committee.

There is another particular in which the law should be amended. The government nominates the returning officers throughout the country and these returning officers, appoint their several deputies. It is desirable, if it be possible, to have returning officers appointed who will not be of a partisan stripe. For my part, I would prefer that some particular officer out of a class should be selected as deputy returning officer, and that it should be provided that he must exercise his independent judgment in and shall be responsible for the choice of a respectable deputy. Again I say that I am not dealing with the subject from a partisan standpoint when I allude to the fact that many of the evils with which we have been confronted in recent years, have arisen from the circumstance that either the returning officer himself has seen fit to appoint as deputies men who are not fit to discharge that office, or else, in the selection of these officers, he has acted solely upon the recommendation of the candidate of the party in power. That again, I say, is liable to occur under the present system, whether a Conservative or a Liberal government be in power; and the result is readily observable. If the candidate is a dishonest man himself, or if, being an honest man, he acts upon the recommendation of dishonest advisers, the result may be, as sometimes has occurred, that a deputy returning officer will be selected for the very reason that it is intended that he should put in practice certain frauds in the conduct of the election. That is the second suggestion which I make to my hon. friend the Minister of Justice as one which should engage the attention of the committee.

With regard to bribery generally, I do not think we can congratulate ourselves upon any advance in that regard, either in public practice or in public opinion in Canada. I have heard reports, as all of us have heard reports, of what goes on in various elections throughout the country, and I do not think we can reasonably say that the standard of public life in that respect is being raised or has been raised in Canada during the last ten, fifteen or twenty years. The subject of dealing with voters who decline to vote until they are paid is a subject that engaged the attention of parliament during the discussion in 1903 to which I have referred. Whether or not it be practicable to deal with that subject by depriving those voters of the franchise in case they do not see fit to exercise it, is an open question upon which there has been a great deal of discussion in the United States of America. Against it there is put forward the consideration that neither one candidate nor the other, that neither one political party nor the other, may command the confidence of certain electors, and that those electors should be left free, if they see fit, to refrain from voting for either one or other at the election. On the other hand it is perfectly obvious that the offence of bribery, so far as it occurs in that connection, might possibly be checked by putting upon the statute-book of Canada some such enactment as that which was urged in the session of 1903. The conveyance of voters to the polls was also dealt with, and if I remember rightly, the committee brought in a report that the payment of money for the conveyance of voters to the polls should be allowed with certain restrictions, certain limitations. From what one can learn there does not seem to be much doubt that the present law in that regard is not much respected by either one political party or the other in this country. We should either create such sanctions and such means of

enforcing the law as will make that provision respected, or else we should bring about some limitation of it so that it shall be in actual accord with public opinion.

Now there are some provisions in the British Act of 1883 which have not been placed upon the statute-book of Canada, and to which I invite the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice. That Act is 46 and 47 Vic., chapter 51, with which the Minister of Justice is familiar. I would refer him to section 33 and to subsections 1, 2 and 3 of that statute. It is true that we have in this country a provision that a candidate within two months, after polling day or declaration day, shall make a full statement of all expenses which have been incurred by him or by any person on his behalf in connection with the election. But the British statute goes very much further, and it seems to me is very much more effective. The British statute might perhaps be quoted with advantage, but I shall not quote it in full. It provides for a very full statement, not only by the candidate but by his election agent; and further it provides that the candidate himself as well as his election agent shall make that declaration under oath, that is to say he shall make a solemn declaration that the statement filed by him is true. There is another important provision in the British statute which we have not, namely, that unless the candidate has made that declaration and made it under oath, he shall not, after the time limited for filing the declaration, sit or vote in the House of Commons until he has obtained from a competent court under conditions which are prescribed by statute, permission to do so. That is to say the statute provides that under exceptional circumstances the candidate may make application to the court and may obtain from the court an exoneration of his default on account of those special circumstances. But apart from that one provision, no candidate in Great Britain can sit or vote in parliament until that declaration has been filed. Now I would like to call the attention of the House and my hon. friend the Minister of Justice to the character of the declaration which must be filed. It is to be found on pages 584 and 585 of Rogers' work on Elections, and it is an appendix to the statute.

> And I hereby further solemly and sincerely declare that, except as appears from that return, I have not and to the best of my knowledge and belief no other person, nor any club, society, or association has on behalf of the said candidate made any payment, or given, promised, or offered any reward, office, employment, or valuable consideration, or incurred any liability on account of or in respect of the conduct or management of said election.

The effect of the British statute is set forth very forcibly in an article in the 'North American Review' for February, to which I will allude later. But I may go on for a moment and point out to my hon. friend that by the schedules which are to be found on pages 579 to 583 of Rogers on Elections, and which are made part of the statute by certain sections thereof the expenditure of a candidate in Great Britain for legitimate purposes is limited to a certain amount and to certain defined purposes. That amount depends upon the number of electors in each constituency. Thus not only is the amount which a candidate can expend in an election for legitimate purposes limited in this way, but the amount which any political club or association in Great Britain can spend on his behalf is likewise limited to the amount fixed by statute. In this country we have a statute which, perhaps, strictly construed, might amount to a prohibition of any contribution towards elections and to certain defined purposes except through the election agent. The British Act of 1883, section 28, contains a very much more forcible and more direct prohibition of any contribution being made except through that agent. Perhaps it may be well to quote some words from that section.

> Except as permitted by or in pursuance of this Act, no payment and no advance or deposit shall be made by a candidate at an election or by any agent on behalf of the candidate or by any other person at any time, whether before, during, or after such election, in respect of any expenses incurred on account of or in respect of the conduct or management of such election, otherwise than by or through the election agent of the candidate, whether acting in person or by a sub-agent; and all money provided by any person other than the candidate for any expenses incurred on account of or in respect of the conduct or management of the election, whether as gift, loan, advance, or deposit, shall be paid to the candidate or his election agent and not otherwise.

The word 'person' as used in the section. is defined by section 64 of the British Act in this way.

> The expression 'person' includes an association or body of persons, corporate or unincorporate, and where any act is done by any such association or body, the members of such association, or body who have taken part in the commission of such act shall be liable to any fine or punishment imposed for the same by this Act.

That, it seems to me, is a very important provision and one which might well engage the attention of the committee.

Another very important function in connection with elections in Great Britain is discharged by the director of public prosecutions. Now, I am perfectly well aware when I allude to the duties imposed upon the director of public prosecutions in Great Britain that we have in this country a very different system. I am perfectly well aware, as we are all aware, that under our federal system the administration of justice is confided to the government of the provinces and not to the government of Canada. Therefore, I fully appreciate the

answer which might be made that a director of public prosecutions in the exact sense in which that office has been established in Great Britain is not perhaps possible in this country; but it seems to me possible that we might establish some officer who, in respect of election petitions and possibly in respect of infractions of federal laws relating to customs and revenue might discharge the duties which are imposed upon the director of public prosecutions in Great Britain. I am referring throughout to the same English statute—the Act of 1883. Section 43 of this statute provides as follows:

> On every trial of an election petition the director of public prosecutions shall by himself or by his assistant, or by such representative as hereinafter mentioned, attend at the trial, and it shall be the duty of such director to obey any directions given to him by the election court with respect to the summoning and examination of any witness to give evidence on such trial, and with respect to the prosecution by him of offenders, and with respect to any person to whom notice is given to attend with a view to report him as guilty of any corrupt or illegal practice.

By section 41 of the English Act it is provided that upon any motion to withdraw an election petition copies of the affidavits are to be delivered to the director of public prosecutions who can attend, cross-examine upon the affidavits, or take any course which seems desirable if he has any suspicion that the proceeding is the result of a corrupt agreement between the two political parties.

We have good reason to believe that arrangements are made between the two political parties, or between members against whom petitions have been filed, with the view of the discontinuance of these petitions in this country. In the public press the practice has been denounced as a scandal and I do not know that I would dissent very much from that description The statute as we have it rather lends itself to the practice for more than one reason. I will not enumerate all of these, but, for example, it is the practice of the judges throughout Canada—and I am to assume for the moment that it is a practice which they must follow having regard to the provisions of the statute—to accept the assurance of counsel that he has no evidence to offer and to dismiss the petition. It is the practice after evidence of one or two corrupt acts has been offered and agency established that the candidate shall be unseated without further inquiry. There are sometimes good reasons to believe in these cases that if the inquiry were persevered in important facts might be disclosed which it is not to the interest of the persons engaged in the investigation to have brought forward to or disclosed to the general public. The appointment of an officer in this country having some such functions as those which are discharged by the public prosecutor in Great Britain, would, it seems to me, constitute a force independent of either one political party or the other and it would lead or ought to lead to a much more thorough investigation than at present.

Another difficulty is that while our law contains somewhat elaborate provisions in regard to the circumstances under which an election petition may be withdrawn the statute provides that if a petition is not brought to trial within six months after it is at issue or within the extended time fixed by the judge, it absolutely lapses and no further proceedings can be taken because the judges regard themselves as functi officio after the period has elapsed. So that the provisions contained in the statute limiting the right of the petitioner to withdraw his petition do not have the cogency and effect which they might otherwise have.

There is another important provision in the English statute to which some attention might be directed and it is that contained in section 44. The provision in short, is, that if upon the trial of any election petition corrupt practices are found to have prevailed somewhat extensively, and if these corrupt practices cannot be brought home to the candidate himself or to any person who, under the law, is regarded as his agent the court has the right to make an order that the expenses of the investigation shall be paid by the municipality in which these corrupt acts have so extensively prevailed.

I referred a moment ago to an article in the North American 'Review.' That article is written by Mr. Arthur Bottow. I do not know anything of the gentleman except that he describes himself as having performed the duties of an election agent on many occasions in Great Britain. He is evidently a person who has a very familiar acquaintance with the law of Great Britain as it was before 1883 and as it has been since the Act of that year passed into law. His article is somewhat long. I want to quote something from the last two pages:

> The end came through the law of 1883, and ever-blessed let me call that law. For, under its benificent powers, the knife of the public prosecutor cut deep down into the very roots of the political ulcer, and the scandal which originated in the lax morality of the court of King Charles II, and had in the two hundred years of its orgy permeated the very vitals of the body politic, ended its pestiferous life. All previous legislation had been half-hearted, ambiguous or narrow; the drag-net of Sir Henry James caught the whole breed of corruptionists and its provisions left no loop-hole but cessation or the gaol. If for no other reason, it would mark a new era, inasmuch as for the first time it brought under discipline political clubs and associations; but it has many other claims to everlasting gratitude.
>
> It may assist in suggesting some points to our present-day reformers, and I make no apology for summarizing some of its most novel

and drastic provisions it starts by defining bribery and treating, and extending these offences to periods before, during or after any election, and in making the receiver as well as the giver guilty of a corrupt practice, punishable by one year's imprisonment or $1,000 fine. It makes the aider, abetter, counseller and procurer of personation as guilty of felony as the personator, punishable by a term of two years' imprisonment with hard labour. Its next blows are at long-established abuses, never before unlawful. It makes it an illegal practice, punishable by $500 fine on summary conviction, to hold any committee in public houses or saloons; or to pay for the use of any house, or other premises, for the purpose of exhibiting posters; to pay for any bands of music, torches, banners, ribbons or other marks of distinction, or to pay for the conveyance of voters to the poll.

It disfranchises every person employed for money by the candidate, and cuts down the number who may be employed to one agent, one polling clerk and one messenger for every 500 voters.

It defines the purposes—so much for printing, so much for this and so much for that—for which alone money can be spent; and it limits the total maximum to $1,750 where the voters number 2,000, and $750 for each 1,000 votes above that number; a subject never before touched by law.

It prohibits a single cent of this expenditure being incurred by any other person than the agent. Whatever aid any club or association may desire to give must be in cash to the agent, of which hereafter. The spending-agent has to make an itemized account with the names and duties of every person employed or bills incurred, confirmed by their vouchers. Within thirty-five days after the election, the agent is compelled to file a statement of all moneys received by him from the candidate or from any other person, with the name of every person, club or association from whom the same was received. Both the candidate and the agent are charged with actual personal knowledge of all the details of these receipts and payments, and each of them has to declare solemnly and sincerely that, except as appears on the returns, they have not, nor to the best of their knowledge has any other person nor has any club, society or association, on behalf of the said candidate, made any payment or incurred any liability on account of it, or in respect to, the conduct and management of such election.

To clench the whole legal fist, and to bring it down swiftly and mercilessly; if there be a petition against the member the director of public prosecutions is to attend it; and it shall be his duty, without any direction of the court, to prosecute persons guilty of corrupt or illegal practices before any court competent to deal with the offences. Finally, if there be no petition, and if any information is given to the public prosecutor that any corrupt or illegal practices have prevailed, it shall be his duty to make inquiries, and institute such prosecutions as the circumstances appear to him to require.

Under these provisions, the old conditions passed away, and individual political debauchery has to be written of as history.

Now, if the Minister of Justice by means of this proposed committee can bring about such reforms in our Canadian law as will ensure to this country in the future the better conditions which have been described in the extract I have read, he will earn a higher and a better claim, then possibly he could in any other way earn, to the gratitude of the Canadian people.

Just one word more. I recently attended a conference of the National Electoral Reform Association of the United States in the city of New York, and at that conference certain suggestions were printed for the consideration of the gentlemen who took part in the discussion. Among the subjects treated there are three or four which I would like to read to the House, in order that these subjects might have consideration from the committee which is shortly to begin its work. Among the subjects treated at that conference were:

First. The full publication of election expenses both by individuals and organizations. There is a general feeling that publicity will do much to mitigate present evils. But it is doubtfull whether correct and complete statements will be made unless some easy form of procedure, is provided by which some statements can be readily inquired into and criticised, on the motion of responsible citizens or organizations.

Second. The prohibition of corporate contributions for election purposes. These contributions are shrouded in such secrecy that they can probably be detected only by beginning with the expenses in a given election district, and working back to the contributor.

Third. The fixing of proper objects of expenditure, such as meetings, publications, &c,. and the fixing limits to the amounts so to be spent. No state law now covers this branch of the subject with any thoroughness, but the Ontario Act is carefully worked out.

There are other suggestions, but I think they are covered by the existing law in this country.

One more suggestion I wish to make and it is with regard to the desirability of amending the law respecting controverted elections. That law is not at the present time in a very satisfactory condition. Preliminary objections are filed, a great deal of delay takes place, the case eventually comes on for trial, the particulars are filed. I have alluded already to the manner in which protests are sometimes disposed of when they come on for trial before the judges. I believe that a very radical change should be made in the procedure, and even if no radical change be made, then beyond all question, preliminary objections should be absolutely abolished. At present they serve only for delay; the period for putting them in is usually extended; they are brought on, disposed of; an appeal is taken to the Supreme Court of Canada, if the prelimanry objection, in case it were allowed, would put an end to the petition. The candidate takes his seat in the following parliament, and then similar delays take place after the conclusion of parliament, during the sitting of which, if the members' attendance at the trial is necessary, as it usually is, the trial cannot

proceed. A very radical change should be made there so that an immediate inquiry could be had, the attendance of a judge procured at once, an investigation held immediately, possibly the candidate not allowed to take his seat until that summary and prompt inquiry had been held ; if that could be brought about I think it would be a very desirable change. Certainly the law as it stands at present does not accomplish very great results. The withdrawal, the abatement, the pairing off of elections are undoubted evils, and, whether or not the suggestions which I make be approved by the Minister of Justice, at all events greater simplicity of procedure and greater expedition in disposing of these cases ought to be ensured.

I would suggest to the Minister of Justice that the committee shall call before them (as was done in Great Britain) some of the judges of this country who have great experience in the trial of election petitions. It might call before it some counsel who have been engaged in those trials. It might call before it experts of this character and obtain their suggestions and advice. I would respectfully suggest that if some able and competent man from the Department of Justice could assist the committee for the purpose of examining the statutes of Great Britain and those of some of the American states in order to obtain suggestions as to amendments in our law, the committee would be very much assisted in that way. If an officer from the Department of Justice could not be procured, I think it would be worth while to employ counsel for that purpose, in case the gentlemen upon the committee were not able to devote the very large amount of time which would be necessary in order to do this work thoroughly.

In summing up my suggestions, they are: that there should be non-partisan returning officers and deputies; that there should be a limitation of expenditure somewhat as in Great Britain; that there should be stringent provisions in regard to payments or assistance by political organizations or associations; that there should be provisions touching contributions by corporations; that, above all, there should be created some independent authority, charged with the enforcement of the law. The law as we have it in Canada at the present time is fairly effective, and would accomplish very much greater results than it does at present, if we had some force outside of and independent of both political parties which would see that the law is carried out, whenever an election petition is filed, or whenever, apart from any election petition there is grave reason to suspect that corrupt practices have prevailed on a great scale. I regard this suggestion as perhaps the most important of all those which I have ventured to make.

The committee might with advantage consider the prohibition of inducements to communities or constituencies. It is under our law illegal to hold out a bribe or offer intimidation to a single voter; but there is no law in this country at the present moment which prohibits a public man from going into a constituency and offering what was in effect a bribe or intimidation by the suggestion that if a particular candidate is elected an expenditure of money will be made in the constituency, or that if that particular candidate is not elected the interests of the constituency will not receive the consideration they otherwise would obtain.

I think the committee should also take into consideration the desirability of a simpler and speedier procedure for the investigation of matters connected with election petitions, or indeed corrupt acts in any constituency although no election petition happened to be filed.

It is with all diffidence that I venture to make these suggestions to my hon. friend the Minister of Justice. He is very familiar, no doubt, with all that I have brought to the attention of the House to-day. I can only say to him that in this work he will receive every possible assistance not only from the members of the committee who represent this side of the House, but also I am sure from every hon. gentleman on this side of the House. I sincerely trust that the work of the committee will result in bringing about better conditions in Canada; because, speaking, as we do to-day, in no partisan spirit and from no partisan standpoint, we all can agree that the conditions in Canada at the present time are not what we should desire. If, as I have said, the work of that committee shall result in such conditions as those described in the article which I have quoted to the House, I venture to believe that no greater work will have been accomplished in any session of the parliament of Canada since confederation.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). Mr. Speaker, I am sure it is quite unnecessary for me to say, in view of the motion which stands in my name on the order paper, how fully I sympathize with the object my hon. friend the leader of the opposition has in view; and I think I may safely add that this House is under a debt of gratitude to him for the very complete and very learned statement which he has made of the law as we now have it both in Canada and in England. So far as I am concerned, it shall be my desire to do all I can to accomplish the object we all have in view. A free vote, a pure vote, an honest ballot box, are the essential requisites to the maintenance of our free institutions. Among the Bills which I was instructed by the Prime Minister to prepare for this session was one with respect to elections. After having carefully and fully considered the matter, I came to the conclusion that I would derive much benefit in the preparation of

such an Act if I could have the advantage of a committee of this House to co-operate with me—a committee composed of members from both sides of the House—who would bring to the consideration of the different questions involved an unpartisan mind; and I am quite sure that to-day we are all animated by but one desire—to give to this country such a law as will enable us to have a pure and honest election. In looking over the law, I have come to the conclusion that so far as our Election Act, is concerned, it is a fairly good one. The difficulties have been largely with the application of the Act. There are three Acts which have to be considered—the Election Act, the Controverted Elections Act and the Franchise Act. The great difficulty, I think, exists with respect to what my hon. friend has called the 'saw-off'—the settlement of election cases. I can see no good reason why we should not—I am speaking now perhaps hastily—deal with the question of the settlement of these controverted election cases somewhat in the manner in which the Criminal Code deals with the compounding of felonies and misdemeanours. With respect to returning officers, we might return to the system which exists in Quebec and Ontario, which existed here prior to 1882 or 1883, that is, appointing as returning officers certain public officials in the various counties, such as sheriffs and registrars, who occupy non-partisan positions, and who, in the great majority of cases, I might almost say in all cases, are men upon whose reputation we may fairly rely for a proper administration of our Election Act. With respect to bringing on by-elections, I quite agree with what my hon. friend has said, that it is not fair that a constituency should remain disfranchised because the representatives of either political party do not deem it necessary or advisable to have an election in that constituency. It seems to me we might easily arrange in that respect that we should leave it to some extent in the hands of the Speaker, or in the hands of any two members of the House to require the bringing on of the election as we now do with respect to the issue of the writ.

With respect to bribery I think our Election Act is very complete, that it goes very far and I may say that so far as I am concerned I would be disposed to round off some of the provisions of this Election Act because at the present time a man, however honestly he may attempt to conduct an election, may expose himself to very severe penalties quite innocently under the Election Act as we have it now. However, that can be easily provided for, I think we can make some improvements, there that will meet all real existing difficulties.

With respect to compulsory voting I myself am no very ardent partisan of the principle of interfering with any man's individual liberty. I am one of those who have been looked upon as perhaps opposed to public franchises being vested in municipalities and things of that sort because I always stand for the liberty of the individual; I stand for liberty as I understand it at all events. I would not like to say that I would be in favour of compulsory voting. This view has gone through my mind many times. If you give to the individual, to the citizen, the right to vote, that is a very sacred right that he receives not only for his individual benefit but as a trust to be exercised for the benefit of the whole community, and if he does not see fit to exercise or fails to exercise that trust I do not see why he should be vested with it very much longer. I would seriously consider that aspect of the case and see whether or not it would not be possible for us to do something towards bringing about a remedy to what is undoubtedly a grievance. That is to say that the man who sits on the fence near the booth on polling day and will not deliver up his vote, looking upon it as a piece of merchandise for which he is entitled to be paid, should not be left in possession of that vote.

The next question to which my hon. friend has directed attention is the appointment of a public prosecutor. I do not think that the appointment of such an official is surrounded with so many difficulties as might appear at first sight. It is quite true that the administration of criminal justice is in the hands, to a large extent, of the provinces but so far as our election matters are concerned, the judges of our provincial courts are federal officers, and for the purposes of our Election Act the provincial courts become federal courts. The practice, the procedure, everything connected with them is under our jurisdiction and control and therefore I cannot very well see why with respect to these courts, which are after all federal courts, it should not be in our power to appoint such an official as my hon. friend has referred to. Of course the appointment of such an official would be an enormous burden to any political party that would have the responsibility of making it. As things go in this country there is no use of pretending to shut our eyes to the fact that political partisanship runs very high, and no matter what might be the honesty or purity of the motives of the gentleman who would make the appointment he would be sure to be criticised. However it does seem to me the appointment of such an official might very well be considered, and if we could only agree and secure the appointment of a man such as we have in this country by the score—for, after all, all is not bad in Canada; we have very good men in this country and if I had any criticism to offer of what the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) has said it would be that it seems to me he painted the conditions existing here with perhaps too heavy a hand—I would be disposed to consider that

we could find such a man in this country and that we can in this country do all that is necessary to carry on a pure election.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I hope my hon. friend did not understand me as saying we could not find a competent man ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Perhaps I exaggerated a little. What I wanted to say is that these are the things that occurred to me off hand, but where I see the real difficulty, where, when we come to consider the whole question, we will find the subject that deserves the most serious consideration that the members of this House or the committee can give it, is in the preparation of our election lists. We have agreed to adopt the provincial franchise as the basis of the Federal Election Act. In the provinces there is, of necessity, overlapping of constituencies. As a result we have conditions existing which make it necessary for us to find some remedy for what has occurred for instance in Manitoba. And I may say to this House—I do not intend to discuss that question now, but my chief object in seeking to obtain this committee, and I think the chief reason that determined my colleagues in allowing me to have my way in that respect was that we might have that matter thoroughly and fully investigated, because I say to this House that in the light of the information that I have got—and I have taken great trouble to become informed in respect to all that occurred in Manitoba—the error that was committed there, so far as my information goes, was one which was the result of the conditions existing with respect to our electoral lists. Now, I want that matter investigated, because it is not fair, Mr. Speaker, that we should allow the impression to get abroad in this country that any official has been placed in a position to disfranchise any number of electors in this country. It is not fair that we should be in this position and under the law as we have it now it should not be in the power of any man, by error or design, to deprive his neighbour of his vote, and if that is a condition which exists as a result of the operation of our law we must find a remedy for it. I deprecate as strongly as it is possible for me to do it, the attacks that have been made on the judges with respect to this Manitoba election matter, and I beg to assure the House that when that matter is investigated—and I say now and here that as I hope to be a member of that committee and as I intend to summon some persons to appear before that committee to give evidence with respect to what occurred in Manitoba, it shall be open to any member of the committee to summon any one he chooses so far as I am concerned in that connection—when that matter is fully investigated it will be found that the charges made against the judiciary are absolutely without foundation and that it was not open to the judge who tried that case to come to any other conclusion than the conclusion to which he did come.

Now I did not intend to speak of that subject because that might be considered as trespassing on controversial ground, but I wanted to make that observation, and I say that I shall do all that lies in my power to carry out the object which the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) had in view when he made that motion and I trust that we shall not be entirely deprived of his valuable services in so far as that committee is concerned.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would suggest that the debate be adjourned.

On motion of Mr. Ingram the debate was adjourned.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

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

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. To-morrow we will resume the debate on the motion of the Hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals, (Mr. Emmerson).

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 5.25 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, March 16, 1906.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. LEIGHTON G. McCARTHY (North Simcoe) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 16) to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, 1898.

Mr. LANCASTER. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if the Bill is in the same terms as the one he introduced last session.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. It is not exactly in the same terms. I have made some amendments in view of the investigation made by the committee that considered the Bill last year. I have dropped out the second paragraph and increased the nominal horse power so that it enables tugs up to the nominal horse power of ten to be managed or engineered by men with permits.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RAILWAY ACT 1903, AMENDMENT.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 17) to amend the Railway Act, 1903.

Mr. HENDERSON. Explain.

Mr. LENNOX. This is made necessary in consequence of certain provisions that existed in the law of 1890 and that were left out in the Act of 1903, provisions which made the railway company liable in some instances in which cattle escaped not from the land of the owner of the cattle but from other land. That law was considerably discussed in 1888 when the main Railway Act was introduced but it was not incorporated in it there being some division of opinion at that time. It was afterwards introduced in 1890 with the unanimous consent, apparently, of the House, both sides concurring in the necessity of it and some very eminent gentlemen on the government side of the House —I refer to the government of to-day— expressing their opinion as to the necessity of such legislation. Following upon that legislation we had some cases one of which was that of Fensom vs. the Canadian Pacific Railway showing the effect of that Act of 1888 as amended by 53 Vic., chap. 28. The provisions that I have incorporated are substantially the provisions that were in force at that time and that are the subject of the decision in the case I have referred to, the provisions being :

If in consequence of the omission of a railway company to erect and maintain a fence, 'any animal gets upon the railway from an adjoining place where under the circumstances it might properly be, then the company shall be liable to the owner of every such animal for all damage in respect of it caused by any of the company's trains or engines.'

Also that

No animal allowed by law to run at large shall be held to be trespassing on a place adjoining the railway merely for the reason that the owner or occupant of such place has not permitted it to be there.

I have modified the wording to some slight extent in consequence of the legislation since introduced. The Bill I move for leave to introduce also provides for a new law in regard to the question of fencing railways. In the Act of 1903, third subsection of section 199, provision is made that

Whenever the railway passes through any locality in which the lands on either side of the railway are not improved or settled, and inclosed, the company shall not be required to erect and maintain such fences, gates and cattle guards unless the board otherwise orders or directs.

That was a retrograde movement in 1903 and was objected to in this House at the time. Experience has shown the necessity of having the law in a different condition. The bonus, by the legislation of 1903, is thrown upon the farmer or resident in the country, whereas the onus should be thrown as I submit, upon the railway company, they being nearer at hand and having better means of getting the order of the Board than any private individual could possibly have. I have therefore provided that the Board shall have power to make orders modifying or relieving the company from compliance with the provisions under subsections 1 and 2 as to fencing for a limited time so that the railway company shall not be absolutely bound to fence in every case, but they shall always be bound to fence unless the board shall otherwise order.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

REVISION OF THE RULES OF THE HOUSE.

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

That a special committee of seven be appointed, with instructions to carefully examine the rules of the House, and to report what changes, in their opinion, might be adopted, with the view to simplify, accelerate and expedite its business ; and that said committee be composed of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Mr. Brodeur, Mr. Laurence, Mr. Belcourt, Mr. Borden, Mr. Haggart and Mr. Bergeron.

Motion agreed to.

ELECTIONS TO THE HOUSE.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice) moved :

That a select committee composed of Messrs. Aylesworth, Greenway, Stockton, Ingram, and the mover be appointed to inquire into the operation of the Acts relating to the elections of members of this House, and into the practice and procedure in connection with election petitions ; and to consider what changes are desirable therein ; with power to send for persons, papers and records, to examine witnesses under oath, and to report from time to time.

He said : It is unnecessary for me to say anything in support of or in explanation of this motion as the matter was fully discussed yesterday afternoon.

Motion agreed to.

MINISTERIAL CHANGES.

On the Orders of the Day being called :

Rt. Hon. Sir. WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I rise in pursuance of a promise which I made yesterday to the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) that I would to-day give the usual explanation in regard to the ministerial changes which have taken place since last session. Two vacancies occurred during the recess. One has already been alluded to. It was occasioned by the lamented death of my hon. friend and colleague the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Préfontaine). The government thought when they had to fill the vacancy in the cabinet, that it would be good policy to select a successor to Mr. Préfontaine in the

new western provinces and I advised His Excellency the Governor General that I would present the name of Senator Templeman who for some time had been a member of the cabinet without portfolio. The recommendation was at once acceded to by His Excellency. The question then arose to what portfolio should be assigned to Mr. Templeman.

Mr. Prefontaine had been the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and he had been engaged in very important work in improving the St. Lawrence route, and which I think he carried out to the satisfaction of the House and of the country generally. The province of British Columbia has fisheries which are equal perhaps to the fisheries of the Atlantic coast, and the province of British Columbia might very well believe that if a Minister of Marine and Fisheries were being selected, its claim to the portfolio should very well be considered. I discussed the matter with Mr. Templeman after he had accepted office, and I reported to him that whilst the cabinet fully recognized the importance of the fishery interests in British Columbia, the paramount question at the present time with which any Minister of Marine and Fisheries would have to deal was the continuation of work which had been commenced by the government and successfully prosecuted by Mr. Préfontaine in regard to the St. Lawrence route, and that under such circumstances it was more in accord with the fitness of things that a man from the east should be entrusted with the task of continuing this work. To this, Mr. Templeman readily acceded. Therefore, I asked my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Brodeur) to agree to take the portfolio of Marine and Fisheries; Mr. Templeman agreeing to take the portfolio of Inland Revenue. At the same time I discussed with my new colleague a point which I had had an opportunity of previously discussing with the member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) when he was Minister of the Interior, and with the present Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) That is: That some work at present entrusted to the Minister of the Interior should be transferred to another department. At present the Minister of the Interior has to look not only after the general business of his department, but he has also to attend to the Lands branch, the Indian branch, and the Geological survey. I had discussed with the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) and with the present Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), the suggestion that it would be advisable to transfer some of this extra work to another department which was not so encumbered as is the Department of the Interior. I suggested to Mr. Templeman that perhaps, when he had taken possession of his department he would think it advisable to take the Geological survey under his administration, with the possible creation of a Mines branch. To this, Mr. Templeman also acceded.

The next thing we had to consider was the fact that Mr. Templeman was at that time a member of the Senate. I suggested to him, and he agreed readily in the suggestion, that it would be more fitting that he should sit in the House of Commons, the popular branch of parliament. Mr. Riley, the then member for the city of Victoria, readily vacated his seat. I am glad to say that when Mr. Templeman went back to the people of Victoria he was elected by a very large majority, a result to which as I understand, indeed as I know, a large proportion of the best Conservatives of that city contributed.

Another vacancy occurred, as the House is aware, by the fact that Sir William Mulock was appointed to the Bench in the province of Ontario. That came about as is fully explained in the correspondence which took place last fall between Sir William Mulock and myself. On the 7th of October I received the following letter from Sir William Mulock:

Ottawa, October 7, 1905.

My dear Sir Wilfrid,—

The time has at last arrived when I must without further hesitation withdraw from public life. As you may remember, I made known to you on my return from Australia, which country I visited in 1901, at the request of the government to represent Canada at the inauguration of the Commonwealth parliament, that I contracted during the somewhat severe Atlantic voyage, a serious attack of neuritis which for nearly a year caused me continuous suffering, the pain at times being almost unendurable. After a while, it gradually yielded to treatment, but left my nervous system seriously impaired, and in consequence less able to stand the strain inseparable from the public life in which I have been engaged for nearly a quarter of a century. Several times since, there have been partial recurrences of the attack which, I have been advised, are but premonitions that if I am not to succumb entirely, I must seek a less wearing life.

During the last two or three years, I have on several occasions informed you of my condition, and requested your permission to my retiring into private life, but you have always been so anxious for me to remain, and I myself have felt so interested in my public work, that until now I have postponed reaching a final conclusion.

The last occasion of my speaking to you upon the subject was in June last when about to leave for England to attend the Pacific Cable Conference. I then mentioned to you that the pain was constantly returning and that I was assured it would continue to do so as long as I was engaged in my present strenuous occupation, and therefore again made known to you my earnest desire to retire. With your invariable sympathy and kindness, you renewed your expressions of regret at the prospect of my withdrawal, urging me to postpone reaching a final conclusion until my return from England, adding the hope that perhaps the change would prove beneficial.

Realizing your very strong desire for my continuance in the government, I again deferred to your wishes, and have thus had advantage of the interval in which to give further consideration to the matter.

Taking a deep interest in public affairs, being in entire political harmony with the government, on the most friendly and intimate relations with each minister, and being deeply attached to the constituency of North York, which has unswervingly reposed its confidence in me ever since my entry into public life, it is with the greatest regret that I have now to inform you of my having reached the final decision, that I feel myself compelled without further delay to give up the public career into which I have for so large a portion of my life thrown my whole heart and energies. Nevertheless, it is, I feel assured, in the public interest that I should take this course and I therefore now tender my resignation as a member of your cabinet and would ask you to kindly submit it to His Excellency at the earliest moment for his acceptance.

It will, I know, be a great satisfaction to you to learn that my nervous system alone is affected and that with proper care and under more peaceful and restful condition, I may reasonably hope for a gradual and complete recovery.

Believe me, my dear Sir Wilfrid,

Yours sincerely,

(Sgd.) W. MULOCK.

The Right Honourable
Sir Wilfrid Laurier, G.C.M.G., P.C.,
Prime Minister of Canada, Ottawa.

His Excellency at that time was away from the capital and I could not communicate with him. On the 11th of October I replied to Sir William Mulock as follows:

Ottawa, October 11, 1905.

My dear Mulock,—

I have your letter again asking me to accept your resignation, and I feel that I cannot longer withhold my consent.

You know how reluctant I have been to agree to this decision on your part. My mind is not in any way altered, but as there is no hope of any permanent improvement in your health, so long as you continue in the arduous work in which you have been engaged for the last nine years, there is no alternative left to me but to acquiesce in your request. I will, therefore, place your resignation in the hands of His Excellency immediately upon his return to Ottawa. After twenty years of close and intimate association, this severance, even though it be only of official ties, is a deep personal sacrifice to me, far deeper and greater, I am sure, than you can imagine. The loss will also be very great for the country which you have served with so much ability, zeal and success.

It has occurred to me that, whilst your health has been steadily declining for some years, you have still enough left of your former vigour to allow you to serve the public in some other, almost as useful, though less exacting capacity. I have thought of asking you to accept the Chief Justiceship of the Exchequer Division of the High Court of Ontario. The Minister of Justice entirely agrees in this, and I hope you will accept.

Believe me as ever, my dear Mulock,

Your old and sincere friend,

(Sgd.) WILFRID LAURIER

Sir William Mulock, K.C.M.G., &c.,
Ottawa.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

On the following day I received this letter from Sir William Mulock:

Ottawa, October 12, 1905.

My dear Sir Wilfrid,—Yesterday I received your extremely kind letter of the 11th instant, in acknowledgment of mine of the 7th October in which you with great reluctance have agreed to submit to His Excellency my resignation as a member of your cabinet. I assure you that words fail to express my pain at withdrawing from public life, and from associations in the ministry with yourself and my other dear friends there. One of the happiest memories of my life will be the recollection of your unfailing kindness to me beginning in 1882 and continuing without interruption and increasing with years until the present moment.

I appreciate greatly the offer in your letter of the chief justiceship of the Exchequer Division of the High Court of Justice for Ontario approved of, as you mention, by the Minister of Justice, and gratefully accept it.

Yours sincerely,

(Sgd.) W. MULOCK.

The Right Honourable,
Sir Wilfrid Laurier, G.C.M.G.,
Premier of Canada.

I say nothing new to the House, to the old members especially, when I recall the fact that for some years back the health of Sir William Mulock has not been so good as it was formerly. He has a very strong constitution, but the arduous work in which he was engaged told heavily upon him. I have seen in the press a remark to the effect that if Sir William Mulock withdrew from the cabinet on account of the state of his health, it was inconsistent that he should be called upon to perform the duties of a judge. If such an opinion prevails outside of this House, I am sure that it requires no refutation on the floor of parliament. It is known to every hon. member that the duties of public life are very exacting. It is a fact of public notoriety, as to which there can be no doubt, that though one may not find his health adequate to the ardent furnace of political life, he may find it quite sufficient for the more sedate atmosphere of the bench. Therefore, to those who know Sir William Mulock's great ability there was nothing inconsistent in asking him to accept a position on the bench of the province of Ontario. There was another consideration which I had for some time discussed with my friend Sir William Mulock. Many years ago, I think it was in 1894, Sir William Mulock introduced into this House a Bill which proposed that a member of parliament should be ineligible for any position under the Crown while a member, and for a considerable time after he ceased to be a member. That proposal met with very little response—in fact, with no response whatever. For my part, I strongly dissented from the views of Sir William Mulock on that subject. I discussed it with him on more than one occasion, telling him that my view was—and it has been so ever since—that such a policy was altogether inacceptable—that it was not in my estimation

conducive to the public welfare. Such a policy is not in accordance with British precedents or with the British system of parliamentary government. It has been held in England, and I think it may be accepted in this country, that the experience which a man gains in the active work of politics while sitting in this House or in the other branch of the legislature, is a proper and efficient training for the discharge of any duties to which he may afterwards be called. Even in the profession of the law, I believe that a man who has passed through the severe order of political life, who has sat in this House and seen the many questions which come here for discussion and adjustment, is better trained, even for the discharge of the duties of a judge, than he would be if he had not that experience. It is part of the unwritten law of Great Britain that the Attorney General has the refusal of the highest judicial office that may become vacant while he is a member of the administration. We have seen, in our own day, several examples of this. Sir Charles Russell retired from the office of Attorney General to become the Lord Justice of England. Only a few years before Lord Coleridge had done the same thing; and after him the same thing was repeated by the present Lord Chief Justice of England, Lord Alverstone. If we go farther back, we shall find a long list of precedents to the same effect. Not only is this the case in the judicial department of the government, but it is a matter of history that the most important offices which have to be filled in the public administration of Great Britain, not only within the three realms, but all over the world, are bestowed upon members of parliament for the very reason that members of parliament have acquired an experience which will be of good service to them in the discharge of any public duties with which they may be entrusted. Thus, ever since the union of the provinces of Upper and Lower Canada, with very few exceptions, all the Governors General who have been appointed in Canada have been members of parliament, either in the popular branch or in the superior branch. From the first incumbent of that office, Mr. Poulett Thompson, appointed in 1840, to the last, the present Governor General, with only two or three exceptions—Sir Charles Bagot, who had been trained in the diplomatic service, Sir Edmund Head, who had been trained in the civil service, and Sir John Young, who had also been in the diplomatic service—every man who has been appointed to the high and responsible office of representative of the King in this Dominion has been taken from parliament. So I represented to Sir William Mulock that although his views on this point were not quite in accord with my own, or, I believe, with those of the large majority of this parliament, they should not stand as a bar to his acceptance of the office which was offered to him; and, after consideration, he yielded to my persuasion and accepted the office. When it came to looking for a successor, I offered the portfolio of Postmaster General to my friend the present Postmaster the hon. Mr. Aylesworth. Mr. Aylesworth had never sat in parliament before; but in my estimation he should have been a member long ere this; and I may say here, what I have said elsewhere, that five or six years ago I first approached Mr. Aylesworth with the view of inducing him to give his great talents and great abilities to the service of the country. This was nothing but a sacrifice to him. The small salary which he is receiving to-day—I purposely call it a small salary—is no compensation whatever to him for the great sacrifice he has to make in giving up the large and lucrative practice which he has built up for himself. Mr. Aylesworth yielded to my entreaties, presented himself for election to the electors of North York, and I am happy to say was elected.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). Mr. Speaker, I am sure we all sympathize with the expression of hope by the Prime Minister that the health of Sir William Mulock will be in some measure restored in the calmer atmosphere which will greet him upon the bench of Ontario. It would apparently seem that while Sir William Mulock has left public life to obtain rest and repose upon the bench, the new Postmaster General has left the active practice of the legal profession for the purpose of finding rest and repose in that strenuous public life which Sir William Mulock has vacated.

We have, it is true, been told by a late member of the cabinet that the scenes within the Privy Council chamber were sometimes of an extremely strenuous character. The gentleman I refer to took occasion to inform the Canadian public, while he was yet a member of the cabinet, that, to use his own graphic expression, 'We often fight like blazes.' It is therefore perfectly evident that such tempestuous intercourse and the participation in scenes of such active hostility must tell eventually on any man's constitution; and I trust that the new Postmaster General brings to his duties that freedom from any nerve strain and that vigour and hardihood which will enable him to survive for some years to come the turmoil of office.

The right hon. gentleman has not intimated to us that the new Postmaster General attached any conditions to his acceptance of that position which, it appears, the first minister has been urging upon him for so many years. Nor has my right hon. friend been good enough to tell us whether he took his followers into his confidence regarding these frequent requests to the new Postmaster General to enter the cabinet. On that point we are entirely in the dark.

Upon one subject mentioned by my right

hon. friend, namely, the acceptance by members of this House of offices of emolument under the Crown, there is force in some of his suggestions. At the same time we must all agree that it is not very seemly to have members sitting in parliament with written promises of judicial or other preferment in their pockets and supporting the government on the strength of such promises. In one instance at least a gentleman in this country made public the fact that he had sat through one whole session with a written promise in his pocket of a certain high position. True he did not get what the government promised but he got something else. He received high judicial position. How often that has occurred in other cases we know not. We do know however—and I speak with some knowledge of the fact—that public office in this country, and even high judicial position, has been made the subject of petty intrigue among members of parliament on the other side. There can be no doubt about that. And if the government should see fit to bring down the whole correspondence—withholding nothing—on that subject, I venture to say that everything I have stated today would be more than substantiated. Therefore while there may be occasions when the experience any man has attained in the public life of this country will be of service to him hereafter in another office, and when the fact that he is about to receive a public office will in no wise influence his independent judgment in this House, nevertheless the practice may be carried to an extreme; and the right hon. gentleman himself no doubt recollects today that in the years when his party was in opposition, no matter was made more a reproach to the Conservative government than the very circumstance that they had appointed certain men who sat behind them in parliament, to offices of emolument under the Crown. My right hon. friend did not in those days take that dignified and philosophical view which he now adopts. But of course, as we know, convictions and opinions are apt to shade off considerably when one passes from opposition to power, and thus we must make every allowance for the right hon. gentleman.

But there are one or two matters immediately connected with the advent of these gentlemen, Mr. Templeman and Mr. Aylesworth, to public life about which a word might be said. One is whether or not the government have taken into consideration the advisability of reducing the number of cabinet portfolios. Was it not, during eight or ten years before they came into power, a subject of reproach by the right hon. gentleman and all his colleagues that the Conservative government of that day required to carry on the administration in a country comprising only four million or five million people, thirteen or fourteen ministers of the Crown, while in the United States, with a population of from 60 to 70 millions then and eighty millions now, the administration required only seven cabinet ministers in all? No doubt my right hon. friend has some recollection of hearing arguments of that kind put forward by his supporters. Is it intended that we shall have a new portfolio? Apparetly not, since according to the first minister, the Department of Mines and the Geological Survey, are to be attached to the Department of Inland Revenue. That is almost as excellent an idea as attaching the subject of copyright and patents to the Department of Agriculture. The arrangement seems to me rather incongruous and one would suppose that if the number of portfolios is not to be reduced, at least some better arrangement might be made than that suggested.

Nor is there any suggestion of any change in policy by reason of the bringing in of these gentlemen. I suppose we shall have the same old policy of appropriating and expending public money, when desirable in the interests of strong supporters of the government. I suppose we shall have the same policy of appointing to high public office—as in the case of Mr. Jackson—men whose sole qualification is that they have performed some partisan service. I suppose we shall have the same exploitation of the public domain for the benefit of friends of the administration. Well, we might have hoped for something better.

But there is one subject upon which some little inquiry might be made. Have the new Postmaster General and the new Minister of Inland Revenue been made thoroughly acquainted with the views and policy of the government regarding the tariff? If these two gentlemen enjoy that distinction, I am afraid they enjoy it alone among all the people of Canada. However, there is a further consideration, and that is whether or not these two gentlemen agree with the Minister of Agriculture or the rest of the cabinet with regard to the British preference. On that point we have had two policies announced within a very short time of each other. We have had the policy of the Minister of Agriculture given out at Montreal and that of the right hon. gentleman pronounced at Toronto, in which my right hon. friend reiterated his belief that what he and his colleagues had promulgated at the colonial conference, in 1902 was still sound policy to which the government was committed. But the Minister of Agriculture has pronounced an entirely different, an entirely inconsistent and opposite policy. It would be interesting to know whether or not the Postmaster General (Mr. Aylesworth) and the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) whom we welcome to this House, are in accord with the one or the other wing of the cabinet in that regard.

There is another and a very important subject on which we should have some

light. Some of us had an impression that perhaps it had a little to do with the retirement of the late Postmaster General. It appears that our suspicions—if they might be called suspicions—were entirely unfounded, from the correspondence which has been brought down. The Postmaster General, at the last session of parliament, brought in a motion, as a member of the administration, by which he asked that a certain inquiry should be made into the telephone system of this country. He himself acted as chairman of the committee which investigated that subject somewhat fully and thoroughly. The inquiry made by that committee was either incomplete or it terminated so late in the session that it was impossible for the committee to make any report—that is a report of any value. A few days before prorogation this majority report was passed in the committee and subsequently presented to this House:

> During the course of the inquiry, your committee have held some 43 sittings and examined about 50 witnesses, and have had a large number of exhibits and other papers and documents laid before them.
>
> Owing, however, to the voluminous nature of the evidence submitted, and to the late period of the session, your committee feel that it is impossible for them during the present session to come to any conclusions, or to make any recommendations to the House upon the subject referred to them, but they beg to submit herewith for the information of the House the Minutes of their proceedings from March 20th last, together with all the evidence taken by them and the exhibits and other papers laid before them.

It has been the practice, I think, when a committee of this kind has not concluded its labours in such a way as to enable it to make some report to the House, that the whole subject matter, including the evidence taken in the previous session, should be again referred to a similar committee and that the inquiry should be carried on in the succeeding session. Either the time of this House and the time of members of this committee have been absolutely wasted to no purpose, or this matter should be proceeded with by the new Postmaster General, and we should have the advantage in this House of a report based upon the evidence submitted to that committee last session, and upon any further evidence which a new committee may deem it advisable to hear at the present session.

The right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has not made any reference to the policy which will be pursued by this government, the policy which will be carried out by the new Postmaster General in that regard. It would have been desirable to have had some information on this point and if the inquiry is not to be proceeded with we should have the reasons that have induced the goverment, after undertaking an inquiry of this kind, to stay proceedings before its conclusion, leaving the matter just as it was before the inquiry was initiated.

I shall not again allude at any length to a subject which I mentioned the other day. The Prime Minister in speaking of the members of this House from Ontario who sit on the government benches put the matter very frankly—I might perhaps use a stronger word—put the matter, to say the least, very frankly when he said that these gentlemen had been passed over and that they had submitted. That is the language which the right hon. gentleman used with regard to his followers from Ontario and he seems to congratulate himself and these followers of his upon the circumstances that although these men, old and tried, some of them, in public life, men of experience in parliamentary procedure, men who have devoted their lives to public questions, that although they were absolutely competent to fulfil the duties of Postmaster General, nevertheless for some reason which apparently he does not desire to disclose, he has seen fit to pass over every one of them, and to call in a gentleman who, however able and competent he may be, has had, up to the present time, no experience in public life and has made no sacrifices whatever in the performance of public duties in this country. The right hon. gentleman seems to congratulate himself very much upon the machine-like obedience of the hon. gentlemen behind him. Sometimes he puts that as a reproach to us, but in this case he takes it as a compliment to himself. Nebuchadnezzar of old established a divinity in the Plains of Babylon and called upon his subjects to fall down and worship it, and they all did except one, Daniel. But the right hon. gentleman is able to congratulate himself on this occasion that there is not one Daniel among all his followers.

However, these are matters of internal economy in the ranks of the right hon. gentleman's party, and as he affirms to us that everything is calm and smooth and absolutely satisfactory to the able and experienced and competent men who sit behind him, I am sure we will receive his words without the slightest question or qualification and compliment him on having so remarkably uselfish and obedient a following.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in addressing the House to-day exhibited his usual facility in evading the question at issue. He was very successful in that, but what the people of Canada wish to know is something about the maintenance of the independence of parliament, and that phrase he never mentioned here to-day. Sir William Mulock's reputation in this country was based on that record to which the right hon. gentleman referred, namely, that he did believe in the independence of parliament and did not believe in giving offices

to members who were sitting in this House. He tested that question in this House, and while he did not have the support, probably, of many members in this House, he had the support largely of a majority in this country to-day. The independence of parliament is a good sound doctrine, a doctrine that will exist long after hon. gentlemen who are now in the House of Commons shall cease to be in it. We hear nothing now of the independence of parliament, but day after day we see hon. gentlemen in this House going into offices in every direction. As I pointed out the other day, at least eight of them who sat here last session are no longer here but have passed into positions of emolument under the Crown or have taken other offices that have come to them by the assistance of the government. Now, I think the right hon. gentleman should have told the people of Canada where he stood and where his government stood in regard to the maintenance of the independence of parliament or rather they have told us to-day by ignoring the question that they no longer believe in the maintenance of the independence of parliament, that they intend to appoint any and every one of their followers that they possibly can to office. The right hon. gentleman also told us that he consulted the new Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) as to how the policy of his predecessor, the late Mr. Préfontaine was to be continued ; he talked the matter over with him. Did he also discuss with the present Postmaster General the question of how the policy of the late Postmaster General was to be continued ? As was pointed out by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) the late Postmaster General by his conduct in the Telephone committee, by the speeches that he made in this country, by the editorials that were published in organs of hon. gentlemen, gave the impression that it was the intention of the government to fully and thoroughly investigate telephone conditions in this country, and if I am any judge of what a man says and means, after watching the late Postmaster General, I was convinced that it was his intention to nationalize the telephone system of this country. That he had studied that question, had gone to England and had investigated the nationalization of the telephone there and I felt that he had come back to Canada not only to nationalize the telephones but to nationalize the telegraphs and even to extend the principle of national ownership to a cable system between Canada and the mother country, as he had taken part in the discussion which resulted in the construction of the Pacific cable system for the benefit of the empire. But we have had no statement from the government to-day as to whether the policy of the late Postmaster General or the intention perhaps of the late Postmaster General were to be continued. We have been told that the policy of the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries is to be continued and we know that the present Postmaster General (Mr. Aylesworth) in the election in North York told the people there that he intended to continue the policy of Sir William Mulock in regard to the post office and in regard to telephones. Now, I hope some statement will be made here to-day in regard to that. This question of the telephones is a burning issue in this country. Different provinces of the Dominion have taken it up; it is an issue in Manitoba and they propose to have a provincial system in connection with telephones. But there is an opportunity in this country to have a Dominion system of telephones, a Canadian telephone system, at least a government ownership of the trunk lines as they have in the old country and as they have in a great many other countries. Now, surely the Prime Minister should have told the House to-day whether that committee is to be continued. He told us in a side issue the other day that it had exhausted itself; he has not told us whether there is to be anything done this session with regard to telephones, whether it is the intention to take advantage of all the information that was collected last session and to introduce legislation that will give some relief to the country in regard to the telephone grievances that exist to-day. So I think the statement that has been made here to-day is not sufficient, is not wide enough, does not communicate to parliament the things that parliament is entitled to know, and I hope before this debate is closed some member of the government will tell the House and the country what the intention of the government is with regard to that important matter that was in charge of the late Postmaster General which has not been completed, which is to-day unfinished business.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria and Haliburton). I am not going to discuss the matters that have been brought up to-day. I rise to make a suggestion with regard to the matter arising out of the remarks made by the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). That right hon. gentleman spoke about some rearrangements of the departments. May I draw his attention to the fact that, in the opinion of the many people in the country, it would be greatly to the advantage of the conduct of the affairs of government if there were a geographical department in which the survey work and map work for the Marine and Fisheries Department, the Lands Branch, the Geological Survey and the Militia Department could all be done under the same head. This would relieve each department of a great deal of routine and detail work which now takes up attention, and I am satisfied that the mapping of the coun-

try would be more advantageously carried on.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Perhaps this might mean the creation of a new portfolio. If my hon. friend (Mr. Sam. Hughes) insists upon it, I may consider the matter.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). It is to be regretted the Postmaster General (Hon. Mr. Alyesworth) has not risen in his place to repeat here some of the ideas he expressed in the campaign in North York, and for the benefit of the country, to emphasize here the line of conduct he pursued in that campaign. His predecessor in office, Sir Wm. Mulock, had always taken a high and mighty stand in the public life of Canada, so far as talk was concerned; but, when it came to performance he was among the lowliest and most retiring in the land. The public records of Canada teem with instances of the paltry politics played by the ex-Postmaster General when he was a member of this House. Take, for instance, his giving out of doles of public money in his own riding. In one case, boots were required for the letter-carriers in the city of Brantford. In the home of the Minister of Customs (Hon. Mr. Paterson), no dealer was found, even among the Liberals there, fit to supply a few pairs of boots. These boots had to be bought in the village of Aurora in the Postmaster General's riding. Then, the mail bags of the country had to be repaired. The city of Toronto could not provide men to do the work, neither could Hamilton. All this work had to be dragged up to the village of Aurora in the riding of the Postmaster General, in order that a few dollars might be disbursed there to impress the people with the idea of what a high and mighty man the ex-Postmaster General was, and how profuse he was in his expenditure, when he was handling other peoples' money. Sir Wm. Mulock, not knowing whether he might drop into the Exchequer Court, of whether his cabinet position might be made so tolerable that he might stay for another year or two, was preparing himself for an election in the riding of North York. He went into that riding, and said to the people: Let me tell you what I am going to do for the people of this riding; I am going to dig a ditch from Lake Simcoe to the town of Newmarket, a wing of the Trent Valley canal. In the years to come it will probably be known as 'Mulock's folly,' but, in the meantime, it will be the means of spending a lot of money among the faithful. When the present Postmaster General (Hon. Mr. Aylesworth) was elected he was not afraid to say that all these acts were contemptible and disgraceful. Be it said to the hon. gentleman's honour, he had the manhood not to mention Mulock's ditch in North York. I congratulate the hon. gentleman upon that fact. It was what I had expected of him from a somewhat long acquaintance with him—and I trust that he will allow me to be classed among his personal friends. I admire the Postmaster General for the position he took just as much as I have always despised Sir Wm. Mulock for the position he took. The Postmaster General was too big a man to offer to the electors of the riding this paltry bribe. Of course, it is barely possible that I may be complimenting the Postmaster General too highly. A burnt child dreads the fire, and the hon. Postmaster General had heard of the Trent Valley canal in West Durham the year before. But I am not going to say that that was the reason why he did not refer to it in North York; I say, with all sincerity, that I believe the Postmaster General is too big a man and too honest a man for such politics. A great deal is expected of the Postmaster General in his new office by the people of Ontario. And I say that also in all sincerity. I believe that the public accounts will never show such dealings with the electors of North York as characterized his predecessor, I can tell the Postmaster General that I quite agree with the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Grant) in some of the opinions he expressed in a recent interview. I agree with him that the Liberals of the province of Ontario welcome the addition of Mr. Alyesworth to the cabinet. I am not going to be so unkind as to say to my venerable friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) that he is too old and ought to get out as my hon. friend from North Ontario has said. Nor will I call from their quiet recesses, Hon. Mr. Scott and Sir Richard Cartwright, to tell them that they are too old for the positions that they occupy. In the absence of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) it is with regret I tell the House what the hon. member for North Ontario said of him—that he was one of the greatest stumbling blocks, on account of his connection with the Transcontinental Railway. This session has continued for over a week, and I am waiting to see the hon. member for North Ontario come into this House and have the manliness to stand in his place and express here the opinions that he has expressed outside. We heard of the hon. member this afternoon, when his name was read as signing a petition in favour of the Sabbath observance. The hon. gentleman has a right to come here in person and express his views—he need not address this House by signing his name to a petition. I hope he will come here and make plain his insinuations particularly against the hon. Minister of Justice.

Mr. DERBYSHIRE. I understand that he will be here on Monday.

Mr. BENNETT. Perhaps, in view of the way in which the hon. member for North Ontario has appeared before the House by petition this afternoon, he would prefer to have us accept this assurance of his ex-

pected appearance with the added expression 'D. V.' But the hon. member for North Ontario is not the only slumbering volcano among the hills of Ontario liberalism. Where is the hon. member for North Wellington (Mr. Martin) ? They held a meeting in that riding recently and that hon. gentleman joined with others in denouncing this government as most lavish in its expenditure. Yet, we are assured that hon. gentlemen opposite are a happy family, that there is no feeling of revolt, no demurring, no objecting.

I suppose I shall be expected to congratulate the Bench of Ontario upon the accession of Sir William Mulock. The members of the legal profession in that province will remember that the position of Chief Justice of the Exchequer Court has been dangled before the eyes of prominent members of the profession all over the province—all kinds and conditions and colours of men were mentioned for the office. It was said that that decayed politician, Hon. G. W. Ross, who had been made a lawyer by Act of parliament was to fall into the office. It was said that the place would be given to Mr. E. F. B. Johnston. But while people were looking here and there to see to whom the office would be given, there were those in the inside circle who believed that Sir William Mulock would take it after all. And why not ? It is well known that he had been made very uncomfortable in the cabinet for years. It was notorious that he was not all accord with his colleagues on the telephone question. Did the Secretary of State see eye to eye with him in the reforms he was trying to make with regard to the Bell Telephone Company ? Not by any means, if there is any truth in common report. It is a good thing that the Postmaster General has come into the public life of Canada. He has been waiting for a year. He was not coming in as a private member at the time of the general elections, but was coming in then as Postmaster General. But, Sir, if patience has been a virtue in his case, how shall we express our admiration of that virtue as exemplified by the hon. member for Centre York (Mr. Campbell) ? That hon. gentleman has been waiting, and watching and praying, year in and year out. And we see nothing coming to him even yet. Perhaps, as we scan the public accounts, we may find that he has been rewarded. I know not. But we will look. We will do one thing; we will sympathize with the hon. member for Centre York. I am looking forward to the advent of the hon. member for North Ontario next week whose presence is vouched for by my genial and hon. friend from Brockville (Mr. Derbyshire). We will all await with the greatest possible patience what he has to say about the hon. the Minister of Justice and his connection with the Transcontinental Railway. I think there may be, perhaps, a reference to the hon. minister in some other connection, but apparently from what he says in that interview he alludes to his connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. As to the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) and the hon. the Secretary of State (Mr. Scott), all I can say is that I hope they will be long spared in their positions because it will exhibit to the people of Ontario the long suffering and the patience of my hon. friend from Centre York and patience which my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Aylesworth) has exemplified in the past year in waiting for something, Macawber-like, to turn up. One thing I must say in all seriousness and it is that the hon. Postmaster General is welcomed to the cabinet by Ontario people in particular. He has had a high standing at the bar in the province of Ontario. He has been in the position of counsel for Liberals and Conservatives in election trials and his duty was first, last and always to his client. I say in all sincerity that I was one of those who was prepared to and did trust the hon. Postmaster General in that capacity and I say that the position held by the hon. Postmaster General in the province of Ontario in the past, particularly in the estimation of the legal fraternity, has been such that the people of Ontario will look to him for a higher state of affairs in the government of Canada during the years while he may continue to be a member of the administration.

REPORT OF NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY COMMISSION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton). Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that not only was I mistaken, but that he, himself, was mistaken as to the report of the Transcontinental Commission. I was urging that it be brought down and he promised that it should be brought down while it was here all the time. The report which my right hon. friend said would be brought down in a few days is here now.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am very glad.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I must confess that I do not understand how it was overlooked because I searched the Votes and Proceedings carefully and found no reference to it. It may have been omitted. I regard this as a report of similar importance to the report of any department of the government, and I would suggest that it should be annually brought down in printed form as is the Auditor General's Report or the report of any other department, but in the meantime, as neither the report of last year nor this report is printed would my right hon. friend accept a motion that they should be printed at once ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. With the consent of my right hon. friend I move :

That Rule No. 99 be suspended in reference to the two reports of the National Transcontinental Railway Commission and that the same be ordered to be printed forthwith.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Commissioner of Dominion Police for the year ended June 30, 1905.—Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux, for Minister of Justice.

SUPPLY—INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

House resumed adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier for the House to go into committee of supply.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). Mr. Speaker, when it was approaching six o'clock the other evening and when I made a motion to adjourn the debate there were a few matters mentioned by my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) which I wished to reply to. I will take them in the order mentioned by the hon. minister. In the meantime I must say that I regret to see his absence from the House especially as some of the matters which I intend to deal with must be a direct contradiction of statements made by the hon. gentleman when he was addressing the House. However, I cannot help it. If the hon. minister chooses to be away it is his fault and not mine. In order to illustrate what the Intercolonial Railway had to bear and the losses it sustained he mentioned the carrying of hay over the road to the maritime provinces. The amount carried was in the neighbourhood of 37,000 tons. The amount of rebate allowed by the government of this country, under the authority of an order in council, is in the neighbourhood of $125,000, or nearly $126,000. The amount of loss to the Intercolonial, according to the statement of the deputy minister, is in the neighbourhood of $140,000. I asked the hon. gentleman upon what authority he did this. He said by authority of an order in council. I asked him what business he had to do this by an order in council. He said he had the precedent of carrying coal to the cold, suffering people of Ontario a year or two before and that he just followed the precedent set then. I remember that one of my hon. friends from the city of Toronto asked what amount of coal was carried up free on the Intercolonial Railway and, en passant, I might mention that the hon. minister says that that sturdy pack-horse, the Intercolonial Railway, had to bear all the expenditure and all the loss of carrying this coal free and carrying this hay over the Intercolonial Railway and that it was right that we should give credit to it. According to the terms brought down in answer to the motion of my hon. friend, one of the members from Toronto, the total amount of coal carried to the province of Ontario was 496 tons and all for the city of Ottawa, not enough to supply the families of the fifteen ministers who at present reside in this city with coal during the year. The total amount of money would be received for freight for this 496 tons of coal must be less than $1,000. That is the heavy amount that is placed upon that sturdy suffering packhorse, the Intercolonial Railway. Now, what authority have they to do anything of the kind ? The returning of $125,000 of the charges for carrying freight over the Intercolonial Railway looks to me like an appropriation of public money. For the suffering farmers whose stock was dying for the want of this hay! If I am informed properly a great portion of this hay, or over 5,000 tons of it, was carried through to Sydney and went over to Newfoundland for speculators.

Another peculiarity about the carriage of this 37,000 tons of hay is that it occurred at a time when elections were going on in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. Now, Mr. Speaker, I protest that any appropriation like that $125,000, should first receive the sanction of parliament. It is not in the category of these matters which the Governor in Council can deal with. It is a matter which should have its first initiative in this House, or if such expenditure were made for the purpose say of combatting an epidemic and was absolutely urgent, there should have been a Bill of indemnity covering that amount introduced into this House. We all know that expenditure was not for the purpose of relieving suffering to any great extent in that locality ; it was for the purpose of benefiting a lot of speculators dealing in hay in that section, and more than all it was for the purpose of securing votes for the government in the election that was proceeding at that time. Enough upon that perhaps.

One of the things that the Minister of Railways grew eloquent about was the statement of the Montreal 'Gazette' with regard to the financial position of the Intercolonial Railway. You will remember that the Montreal 'Gazette' took the deficit on the Intercolonial Railway and added to it 3 per cent on the capital expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway, and figured that as the cost of the Intercolonial Railway to the country for the year. And the Minister of Railways grew eloquent about that. He told us that falsehood was carried to the Pacific ocean, reverberated back to the Atlantic until it was buried in its waves, and dashed again on the shores of Great Britain and Ireland.

Mr. BENNETT. The old story.

Mr. HAGGART. Yes, the old story. Fancy such eloquence from the Minister of

Railways on a simple financial statement contained in the Montreal 'Gazette' and which statement virtually represented the true position of the Intercolonial Railway. Why, according to the minister's own statement the capital expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway amounts to $85,000,000 and 3 per cent upon that is somewhere in the neighbourhood of $2,500,000. The amount added for interest by the 'Gazette' was a quarter of a million less, and perhaps I am too high in figuring at 3 per cent, but I noticed that the Prime Minister recently told us that the government is now borrowing money at rates varying from 3½ to 3⅝ per cent. At all events the statement of the Montreal 'Gazette' was well within the mark. If you make an expenditure of $10,000,000 say on a railway or on a public work, you first of all must get interest on that capital expenditure, and if you cannot earn the interest you charge it up against the concern. Capital expenditure may be made for the purpose of improving a property and it may be an asset to the investor, but who would ever think of that with regard to the Intercolonial Railway? Why, Mr. Speaker, if the Intercolonial Railway were put on the market to-morrow do you think any syndicate or any railway in Canada would pay for it, an amount equal to the amount that has been spent on capital account by this government from 1896 to 1905? After all your locomotives, and all your magnificent undertakings, does any one think it possible that you could get for that railway the bare sum of $25,000,000 which this government has expended on the Intercolonial Railway on capital account between 1896 and 1905 ? And, when the Montreal 'Gazette' stated it was a bankrupt concern it stated the absolute truth, no matter how much the Minister of Railways may deny it.

The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) and myself have on the one side disputed with successive Liberal Ministers of Railways, as to what should constitute capital account. That, I shall refer to again. But the Minister of Railways through his deputy has received a letter from Sir Thomas Shaughnessy on this subject, and although we have Sir Thomas Shaughnessy's letter in reply we have not the letter to which it is an answer. My contention has been that the charge for capital account should have ceased long ago upon the Intercolonial Railway, and in that I am following the policy laid down by no less a person than the late Hon. Alexander Mackenzie who said that the capital account on the Intercolonial Railway should cease; that anything less than that was falsifying the accounts and deceiving the people of Canada. I say that on the Intercolonial Railway which has been in existence for 40 years charges to capital should cease. It is true that in abnormal conditions like the acquisition of the Drummond County which cost us $1,400,000, or of the Canada Eastern which cost us $800,000, these sums would be a charge on capital, but on the old Intercolonial Railway proper which has been in operation since 1868, it is time the capital account should be ended. When that is done, and not until then, shall we have a true statement of what is the actual expenditure upon the Intercolonial Railway. I was dealing with the letter of Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, let me read it and comment upon it as I go along. Sir Thomas Shaughnessy says :

> Your letter of August 26, reached my office during my absence from the city, which accounts for the delay in replying to it. Below I give you our practice with reference to the charges that are made to capital and revenue accounts respectively in connection with the several classes of work about which you make inquiry.
>
> 1. When light rails are taken out of the track and replaced by heavy rails the difference in the weight of rail and weight of fastenings is charged to capital. No portion of the cost of labour, or of other expenses involved in making the change, is charged to capital account.

When I was in control of the Intercolonial Railway all the rails which were laid on that line for several years were charged to revenue and not to capital. In the first two years of Mr. Blair's administration he followed my example. In 1897 and 1898, a certain amount of rails laid on the Intercolonial Railway were charged to revenue, but the following year Mr. Blair got a vote for $500,000 on account of capital for the purchase of rails and that was the first introduction of the system. Those of us who were present at the examination of Mr. Pottinger in the Public Acounts Committee will remember that when he was asked why an expenditure of a million dollars had been charged to capital account, knowing it had been wrongly charged, Mr. Pottinger said: Because you voted it for capital account. And when the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) read that part of Sir Thomas Shaughnessy's letter in the House on Tuesday last, the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) said :

> That is precisely what I contended that you should do.

And Mr. Emmerson replied :

> That is precisely what I did on the Intercolonial Railway.

Is it possible that a member of the government of this country could make a statement of that kind, which I presume must be made in ignorance of the facts or because he has been wrongly informed by some of the officials ? A more glaring false statement was never made to this country or to the members of this House. I hope to be able to make that assertion so plain that no man in this House will deny it. You will remember that Sir Thomas Shaughnessy wrote :

When light rails are taken off the track and replaced by heavy rails the difference in the weight of rail and weight of fastenings is charged to capital. No portion of the cost of labour, or of other expenses involved in making the change, is charged to capital account.

If we look at the capital expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway, what do we find? We find a charge of $495,000. According to the statement of the Minister of Railways and Canals concerning the letter of Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, that would represent the difference in value between the weight of the rails taken off and the weight of the rails which supplanted them. If you look at the accounts of the Intercolonial Railway you will find that new rails were laid on 118 miles of road. The rails taken off averaged a weight of 67 pounds to the yard and the rails put on averaged 80 pounds to the yard, a difference of 13 pounds to the yard. Therefore, according to the opinion of Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, the amount to be charged to capital account is the cost of this difference of 13 pounds to the yard, with the difference in cost of the fastenings. On that basis, the amount charged to capital account for new rails would lay about 419 miles of track instead of 118 miles. I was anxious to see whether the accounts of the Intercolonial Railway as given in the Auditor General's Report would bear out the statements of the Minister of Railways and Canals, and I turned it up. It shows that in all $1,015,275 was expended for steel rails and fastenings. Now, mark what was paid for the rails. For the first 10,000 gross tons the price was $29.15, for the next 10,900 gross tons $31.50, and for the next 9,971 gross tons, $33, or an average of a little over $31 per gross ton. The account gives credits of 24,860 tons of rails taken off, at 67 pounds to the yard, at $20 a ton. The statement of the minister was that he had taken the actual weight of the rails and only charged the difference between those he had taken off and those he had put on. Does he know the difference? Did he ever see this account? Who furnished that false information to him? The total amount of the credits of steel rails and fastenings is $520,265 which, deducted from the expenditure of $1,015,275, leaves the exact amount charged to capital account at $495,009.89.

The Minister of Railways and Canals said:—

And that is precisely what I did on the Intercolonial.

Sir Thomas Shaughnessy says:

When light rails are taken out of the track and replaced by heavy rails the difference in the weight of rail and weight of fastenings is charged to capital account.

The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals only allowed $20 per ton for the rails taken out, while he was paying over $31 per ton for the rails going in, and the difference, one-third of the $1,000,000 odd that he expended on capital account, should be deducted from the $495,000. In other words, according to his own statements, he ought to have charged to revenue nearly $300,000 more than he has done.

Sir Thomas Shaughnessy goes on to say:

When a locomotive is destroyed or put out of service permanently, we replace it with another, charging the cost to revenue, although the new engine may be very much heavier and more costly, and we pursue the same course with reference to cars.

Upon which the Minister of Railways and Canals remarked:

Precisely what the Intercolonial Railway does.

Mr. BARKER. But the hon. gentleman surely does not mean to say—

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend (Mr. Barker) need not become impatient. If he will possess his soul in patience for a few moments I will read him a clause on the very point I know he has in mind.

It will be interesting to know whether the shops to be reconstructed in the place of those burnt down the other day and the cars and locomotives which are to replace those destroyed, are to be charged to capital or to revenue account. In my opinion they will no doubt be charged to capital.

Then the minister quoted again from Sir Thomas Shaughnessy's letter:

Air brakes, when originally applied in place of the hand brake, are charged to capital account.

And with regard to this he comments:

Precisely what we do in connection with these expenses on the Intercolonial Railway.

He went on to quote further from Sir Thomas Shaughnessy:

6. When an old station-house is replaced by a new and a larger one, we generally charge the difference in value to capital account, but this is not always done.

7. Our practice with reference to the replacement of old engine houses is the same as in the case of old station buildings.

8. If wooden bridges be replaced by others of the same material, the charge is against revenue. If a wooden structure be taken out and be replaced by permanent work in the shape of steel or masonry, or embankment, the charge is against capital. If a steel structure is replaced by a heavier and stronger one, the difference in weight only would be charged to capital.

What will the hon. minister say to this? He no doubt will say it is precisely what has been done in the Intercolonial Railway. Well, I had the curiosity to look up the accounts of the Intercolonial Railway with reference to the equipping and strengthening of iron bridges. I thought the statement of the minister must have been entirely wrong, from my recollection and here is what I find in the blue-book: I find an expenditure

of $264,242, charged to the Intercolonial Railway for the strengthening of iron bridges, and I do not find a credit of one cent for the bridges removed. Would you believe it possible that a minister of railways would, in the face of such a condition of things, have the nerve to tell the House that the accounts on the Intercolonial Railway are kept as they are on the Canadian Pacific Railway? Sir Thomas Shaughnessy goes on to say:

> If a steel structure is replaced by a heavier and a stronger one, the difference in weight only would be charged to capital.

But the hon. minister, in the case of the Intercolonial Railway, charges the full amount to capital without deducting one cent for the material replaced. What reliance, I ask you, can be placed on the statement of a minister who will make an assertion of that kind? Never has there been a concern more mismanaged in this country than the Intercolonial Railway. There has been continuously a fight between the opposition and the Minister of Railways regarding this abuse of charging expenditure against capital account. That account has been made an excuse for extravagance which ought not be permitted on any railway. As I have already said, the expenditure on the Intercolonial Railway should be confined entirely to revenue account. There should be no expenditure at all upon capital account. That railroad has been running for forty years through a section of country as favourable for railway construction as any other portion of America. Notwithstanding the statement of the hon. minister, I say it is a railroad that ought to pay, and would pay if properly managed. Yet for the last nine years—managed as it has been by the couple of gentlemen who have presided over it during that period—it has resulted in a loss of $24,000,000 to the people of this country. What excuse does the hon. minister give? He says it is the fault of the location of the railroad,—that the railroad follows military lines and political lines instead of the shortest commercial route. But we have not had from him the information as to how much shorter the new railroad contemplated from Lévis to Moncton will be than the present Intercolonial Railway. That information ought to be given to the people.

Then he said that for a number of years we have been subsidizing the Canadian Pacific Railway at the rate of $186,000 a year in order to have a short line to St. John and that the effect of this was to force the Intercolonial Railway to carry freight over a long haul at competitive rates which do not pay. Well, that may be a serious charge against the late government, but what would you think of a government which is placing a non-paying concern—a bankrupt railway as the Montreal 'Gazette' puts it—in a still worse position by building a line from Quebec to Moncton for the purpose of further competing with it. The hon. minister had no explanation to give as to that. What distance is he going to save by this next line? What are its gradients? If I am rightly informed, the Intercolonial Railway line from Lévis to Moncton is nearly as short and more favourable as regards gradients than any line that can possibly be got by any other survey between these same points. Yet notwithstanding that, we have this government pledged to build a railroad and transfer it over to a rival company which can only have the effect of greatly increasing the competition from which the Minister of Railways tells us the government railroad is now suffering because of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

It is somewhat strange how completely the hon. minister ignored the calamity which happened at Moncton the other day. We had down there a conflagration which nearly swept away all the government workshops. Yet not a statement have we had with regard to it from the minister. What is his policy in that connection? What amount of money will he require to renew those workshops and repair the ravages effected? What are the men who were employed in these shops doing at present? Are they getting the same pay as they did when working in the shops or are they simply engaged as labourers at labourers pay in clearing away the debris? What is the position? What does the hon. minister intend to do? Not a word have we had from him.

I have had information, which I believe to be correct, that he is not taking out any ties for the Intercolonial Railway this year. I am told that he proposes making a favourable showing in the last six months by putting in no new ties on the Intercolonial Railway. Well, it is well known that the life of a sleeper, made of soft wood, is but seven years. That consequently every year one-seventh of the entire quantity has to be renewed. Of course, if you strike out from the expenditure in any one year the outlay caused by the renewal of one-seventh of the ties, you will show a large saving, but it will be at the expense of the efficiency of the railroad. There is another way in which the minister might make a favourable showing for the last six months of the year. To what account are the men employed at present clearing the debris to be charged—to revenue account or to capital? If these men are kept on while the buildings are being repaired and the machinery being put into them, are their wages to be charged against ordinary revenue or to capital?

We would like to know it because if the accounts of three quarters of the men employed in the workshops at Moncton are transferred from revenue account into capital expenditure during the year, transferred to capital account, it makes an enormous difference in the financial statement of the road during the year. Not a word in reference to that, not a word in reference to the policy of the road. What

the minister is going to do is to have a more efficacious car service. He is going perhaps to increase the passenger rates, he is going to take power to increase the freight rates along the Intercolonial. The rates for carrying passengers and freight on the Intercolonial Railway, let me tell the Minister of Railways, were increased by Mr. Blair, and were made greater than when I was managing the road. I managed the road so that with less receipts for passenger rates and less receipts for freight rates the accounts balanced for the whole time I was in. I managed the road so that there was none or very little of this charged to capital account compared with what there is at the present time, yet the present minister and his predecessor glorify themselves upon taking the old Intercolonial Railway from travelling upon a back lane, putting it in a front place and showing to the world what a judicious expenditure for the purpose of improvements would do on the Intercolonial Railway. And what is the result? The result will be the same as long as the Intercolonial Railway is used as a political machine—not a pack horse but a pack hack, for the gentlemen who are in the government at the present moment, used for the purpose of furthering their political objects. The minister says, to a certain extent correctly, that you will not better affairs by putting the road in the hands of a commission. Commissions in certain respects are a farce. Does it remove the management of the Transcontinental Railway from the ministers of the Crown at the present moment? Are they not the directing parties in reference to it? It acts as a shield to a certain extent for iniquities committed by the commission under the direction of the gentlemen who are in power. It is possible to do it in a certain way so that it may be removed from that category. They have to certain extent done it in Australia. If it is possible to appoint an impartial commission let us remove the obloquy and stain for the people of Canada that that Intercolonial Railway has become at the present date. The people of Canada are disgusted at the management of the institution and the effect of it must be either to have it pass into the hands of a commission or as I stated before to have it leased to some road working it on a percentage of the receipts or some other way. Canada has had the best opportunity of any country in the world, of which I know, of elucidating the great problem of the ownership by government of corporate facilities, the ownership of telegraphs, the ownership of railroads, but this opportunity has been lost by the incapacity, the worse than incapacity, the stupidity and I might almost give a worse name to it, of the parties who have been ruling the road. We have the Intercolonial Railway from Halifax to Montreal, the government railway also runs the whole length of Prince Edward Island and it extends down to St. John. It was built as part of a pact, a solemn bargain, made with the people of the maritime provinces when we entered into confederation. We have earnestly carried out our pact or part of the bargain and what is the result? By the mismanagement of the people themselves, because it is a representative from that section of the country, backed by the nearly unanimous voice of the representatives of the maritime provinces, who controls the road, this state of affairs has arisen. The probability may be that a road that ought to be run in the interests of the people of that country may be removed from any jurisdiction which they could possibly exert over it either by their representative or any other person. It is in the interest of the maritime provinces and the rest of the Dominion to see that the men who manage these roads down there manage them economically, and in the best interests of the people. The people will be glad to see this, they like to see a man, although they may envy his position or would like to be in it, administer the affairs of a department of government economically. They like to see a government institution run on a proper basis. The management of that road at the present day is interfering with the solution of one of the serious questions agitating every country; that is: Is it possible at all that government institutions of that kind, railways and telegraphs, can be managed in an economical and proper way by the government of the country? I say it can. I say that a proper civil service, efficiently looked after by a proper head, may be a little more expensive in running a road, but that all the supplies for a government road can be bought as economically and as cheaply as they are bought for any other road in the country. When I was at the head of the Intercolonial Railway all supplies were bought as cheaply, if not more cheaply than they could be bought by any other road. People would rather deal with the government than with private corporations. They knew they would be fairly dealt with and if there was any difference of opinion between the government and the individual as to fulfilling his contract or as to the goods supplied being up to the standard required by the Intercolonial Railway, we had a ready way of settling it, we sent the article on which he tendered down to the School of Science at McGill University, Montreal, and asked their report. When we got their report there never was a kick from the party supplying it because he knew it was perfectly honest. I hope that the state of affairs which I inaugurated or which was inaugurated before my time on the Intercolonial will continue. The only hope for the road is an efficient control either by a commission or some other means than the present one, or to put in

a man that is not from the maritime provinces at all who will see that the road is efficiently managed. It is the only hope and the people of that section ought to insist upon it. There is such a feeling now in the Dominion that the people of this country will no longer keep paying on capital account for ordinary expenditure and continue running the road at a loss of $7,000,000 or $8,000,000 and the party which adopts a policy of removing the road from government control by some means or other will be the popular party in this country.

Then it is the duty of the representatives from the maritime provinces to insist on an economical management of that road. I have no faith in management by commission. I am a good deal in line with my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean). I believe that the time is coming when the strict control of railway freight and passenger rates will be an essential part of our public policy. Why not? We give corporate powers to certain powers; we do it in the public interest; but we have the ultimate and absolute control. When it is in the public interest that these things should be charged, the power rests with the people of this country and with the parliament that represents them to bring those changes into effect. And, if there is a wrong, it is the duty of those who possess the power to redress that wrong.

I do not wish to speak further, on this subject. I regret that the Minister of Railways is not in his place. I think the House had a right to expect that he would be here, and I think it would have been only courtesy to me for him to attend on this occasion when he knew I was to reply to his address. My criticism has been, to a great extent directed to the statements of the hon. gentleman. Some of those criticisms I would have made considerably stronger had he been here. For instance, his statement with regard to Sir Thomas Shaughnessy's letter, when he tries to mislead the people and this parliament to the belief that he is trying to carry out managerial policy and a method of book-keeping similar to that of the Canadian Pacific Railway, when his own books and the report of the Auditor General prove the very contrary. This is not an unimportant debate as one might infer from the fact that the hon. Minister of Railways is not present. What are the greatest questions that we have before us? They are the expenditures and deficits of the Intercolonial, the question of the Transcontinental Railway, and the general question of transportation. These latter two the hon. minister did not think it worth while even to mention. And he does not think it worth while to attend the debate even of those things to which he referred in his own speech. In my opinion he is not paying that attention to parliament that he ought to pay.

Mr. HAGGART.

Mr. HANCE J. LOGAN (Cumberland). Mr. Speaker, I shall crave the indulgence of the House but for a short time, and, as it has been some time since I sought that consideration before, I trust it will not be granted me ungraciously.

Sir, we have at last found out what is the policy of the Conservative party in reference to the great Intercolonial Railway which is so important to us, particularly to those who live in the maritime provinces. The hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart), who was Minister of Railways for so long a time in the Conservative government, is, of course, the mouthpiece of the opposition in reference to their policy touching that great railway system. Therefore, I presume, I must take what the hon. gentleman has said this afternoon as being that which is believed by the men who sit behind him—as an enunciation of the policy of the Liberal-Conservative party.

But, before I make any remarks in reference to the main points of the speech to which we have just listened, let me say that I think that the remarks made by the hon. member for South Lanark as to the absence of the Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Emmerson) are a little unfair. I do not think that he should complain of the absence of the Minister of Railways. The minister has always been attentive to his public duty. He was called away to-day by public business which he could not very well leave unattended. But I am sure that if the minister had known that the hon. gentleman (Hon. Mr. Haggart) would make the statemnt of policey he has made to-day, he would almost have been willing even to neglect public business to be present, to hear the Intercolonial, the government railway system of Canada, which was increased in mileage by the Conservative government, and which was to be extended to the Georgian bay, condemned in such strong language by the hon. gentleman, and to hear the hon. gentleman say that his opinions were even stronger than the language that he used. The hon. gentleman has spoken of this railway as a sinkhole. Yet this is the road which the hon. gentleman has proposed to extend hundreds of miles to Georgian bay.

The hon. gentleman spoke of the government using the Intercolonial to carry hay free into the maritime provinces to save a serious situation due to the famine in that commodity. He said that the government had no power to pass an order in council to carry this hay free. I am sorry to say that my hon. friend, in his speeches on the railway question, is always provincial—Ontario provincial. When we carried coal from the maritime provinces to the municipalities of Ontario free four or five years ago the hon. gentleman did not question the constitutionality of the order in council. We heard no word from him so long as free

freight was made to apply to the province of Ontario. But when a condition of affairs existed in the eastern part of Nova Scotia and the Island of Cape Breton, which demanded the attention of the government and the assistance of the government to save a great industry, the hon. gentleman rises to say that it is unconstitutional and should not have been done. Mr. Speaker, there are functions which must be performed by a government railway which would not be expected of a railway belonging to a private corporation. The Intercolonial is the means of communication between widely separated parts of this Dominion. It was never built as a commercial institution; it was designed as the first great means of cementing the provinces of the original confederation.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) has referred to the Intercolonial, this railway upon which we have spent over $80,000,000, as a bankrupt concern. In fact, he says, that we could not sell it to-morrow for $25,000,000. The hon. gentleman is not only inconsistent but he is blind to inconsistency as it must present itself to the eyes of others. His party have been preaching government ownership of railways. They went to the country a year or two ago upon that cry. And now he tells us that this government owned railway which has cost $80,000,000 could not be sold for more than $25,000,000. Let us be thankful then, for having saved this country from building a government owned railway which would probably be four or five times the length of the Intercolonial.

He quarrels very much with what is being charged to capital account and in that connection he enunciates another principle. Let it be heard from one end of Canada to the other that the railway expert of the opposition says we should not spend another dollar of capital on the Intercolonial ; that, if we cannot get the money out of revenue, we should not expend it at all. He also quarrels with the items in the capital account. But, if you take up the report of the Railway Department during the time the hon. gentleman was Minister of Railways, you will find the very same sort of items charged to capital account that are charged to capital to-day.

Read the report of the Minister of Railways as presented a few days ago, read the report of the General Manager touching the capital account, and read the same General Manager's report of twelve years ago and you find exactly the same items charged to capital account. The hon. gentleman knows as well as he is living that we must have a capital account on the Intercolonial Railway, and that as the country develops, as the country grows, as new branches, as new sidings, as new and better accommodation are required we must take the cost of these improvements and extensions out of capital account. That is the policy of every railway in Canada, government or private owned. My hon. friend says that we should not take any further money out of capital account and that we should not last year have spent any money on capital account. If we had not taken it out of capital account we could not have expended it at all. That is plain to be seen as our revenue did not equal our expenditure. Therefore it was his policy last year that we should not have expended any money on capital account upon the Intercolonial Railway. Well now, Mr. Speaker, if you will look over the items of expenditure on capital account you will wonder how we could have got along at all last year if we had not expended a large amount on capital account. For instance, we purchased last year on capital account about $1,300,000 worth of rolling stock. The hon. gentleman has not been down in the maritime provinces, he has not been in Nova Scotia or he would know that there is a continuous cry from one month to another along the line of the Intercolonial Railway for more rolling stock, for more cars. Men come into the offices of the railway and ask for cars to ship their hay and their flour. Men come into the offices and ask for cars to ship their coal. Mines are idle for weeks at a time on account of the difficulty of securing sufficient cars to carry the product of the collieries of Nova Scotia. We spent last year, I repeat, $1,300,000 on rolling stock. We need still more rolling stock to-day, but if my hon. friend had his way we should spend nothing on capital account, we should not have a single car, we should not have a single engine added, we should not have a single siding constructed ; in short, we should have none of the improvements enumerated in the manager's report made upon the Intercolonial Railway. I cannot think, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman can be serious in contending that as the country progresses we shall not spend any more money on capital account on the Intercolonial Railway.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not think I shall refer much further to what the hon. gentleman has said. His language, I am bound to say, was a little extravagant. He referred, however, to the fact that my hon. friend the Minister of Railways was not buying any sleepers. This is only in passing. The hon. gentleman, I am sure, is misinformed in reference to this matter as I know as a matter of fact that a large number of sleepers are being bought at the present day even though the hon. gentleman would lead us to believe that the minister is endeavouring to starve the road during the present year in order to make the best showing possible from the operation of the road. But, before I leave the hon. gentleman altogether I will allude to one remark which he made and that was that the Intercolonial Railway to-day is a political machine.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LOGAN. I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that those who know the facts will say 'hear, hear.' If they had lived along the line of the Intercolonial Railway about 1896 they would have known what a political machine really means. They would have known that at that time men were carried in train loads to vote at the general elections of that year. They would have known, as I know, that whole bundles of passes were handed out in blank. They did not fill them in and they even telegraphed ahead and said: I am sending you 2,500 shingles—meaning passes—for electors to be carried from one part of the country to the other to vote for the then government. And, my hon. friend was the Minister of Railways at that time. My hon. friend knows that this matter was investigated under oath after this government came into power and he knows as well as I do that the statements I am making were proved on oath to be absolutely true. He knows that all over this line from one end to the other passes were sent helter skelter in every direction, and men were carried from one part of the country to the other.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Did the hon. gentleman ever see that evidence?

Mr. LOGAN. I have not only seen the evidence but I have read it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have asked two or three times to have it brought down and laid on the table of the House but it never has been brought down.

Mr. LOGAN. I am bound to say that there must be some difference of opinion between my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) and myself because I have read the evidence. However, even if I had not read the evidence, everybody in the maritime provinces who lives along the railway knows that the statements I am making are correct—absolutely correct.

Mr. HAGGART. Whose evidence was it? I never heard of it before.

Mr. LOGAN. The evidence of Mr. David Pottinger, general manager of the Intercolonial Railway, Mr. Geo. M. Jarvis, the present superintendent and of other officials of the Intercolonial Railway. Why, Mr. Speaker, in the very town in which I live men have admitted to me themselves that in the old days books of passes were sent to them in blank to be filled out, 'Pass John Brown and 25 others' Yet, my hon. friend talks about a political machine!

An hon. MEMBER. Name.

Mr. LOGAN. I have represented a constituency for something over ten years through which the Intercolonial Railway passes, through which there is a very large mileage of the Intercolonial Railway both of the main line and the short line, and I am speaking with a full knowledge of the facts when I say that I do not know of one single pass of any kind or description having been issued by the Minister of Railways, either the late Minister of Railways (Mr. Blair), or the present Minister of Railways, to any friend of mine or to any friend of this government for the purpose of influencing him on election day or at any other time. I am afraid that sometimes people get the opinion in this part of the country that the road is a mere political machine. I want to say that the Intercolonial Railway is the most difficult railway concern to get any transportation from in the Dominion of Canada. No passes are issued as there were in days gone by. Passes are eliminated. I remember that the late Minister of Railways and Canals, about 1897, after he had been in office for a few months, told me one day in conversation over in his department that at least one-third of his correspondence at that time was in reference to transportation which had been issued by this road in years gone by and that he found that about half of the people were being carried free. Those days have gone by, and there is no such thing to-day as issuing passes at the request of any member of parliament.

Mr. HAGGART. How does the present hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, in his statement, intend to increase the revenue of the Intercolonial Railway by abolishing passes?

Mr. LOGAN. Well, Mr. Speaker, I should think that if a good Conservative travelled over the road in the old days on a pass from Halifax to Montreal and the railway received nothing, and if he travelled over the same road to-day and paid $25 the railway would be in receipt of that much more. I cannot see that it takes very much of an argument to convince any one of that proposition. Stopping the passes means stopping the leakage. It means more revenue to the Intercolonial Railway and this should be secured if possible.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But there is no leakage according to your statement.

Mr. LOGAN. I am not talking about the present leakages. My hon. friend knows that leakages did exist until the government closed up these leakages. Passing from the hon. gentleman's remarks in reference to a political machine, I say that we are to-day face to face with an agitation in this country the object of which is to take the Intercolonial out of the hands of the government. It is no use for us to shut our eyes to it; it is no use for us to say it is all moonshine, it is an undoubted fact that there is in this country to-day in some quarters a determination on the part of some people that the Intercolonial Railway shall either be handed over to a commission, or

that it shall be conveyed by lease or sale to one or other of the great private railway corporations. And a part of the game—if I may so call it—is, that certain gentlemen friendly to these corporations and certain newspapers friendly to them are ready upon all occasions to cry out that the Intercolonial Railway is a sink hole and that we are wastefully throwing the money of the country into it without geting any benefit in return. Well, Sir, the initial purpose of the Intercolonial Railway was well described by the Minister of Railways in his recent speech. In 1864 when we in the maritime provinces were endeavouring to form a maritime union—which we should have formed—we were approached by the representatives of Upper Canada who held out to us the olive branch of a great Intercolonial Railway. They said: Join the other provinces of Canada, come in with us and we will build a great people's railway in this country. And the people of the maritime provinces took these gentlemen at their word they believe in their representations, and joined in confederation. And, Sir, all that we in the maritime provinces now ask is, that the bonds which we entered into shall be respected and that the promises which were made to us shall be kept in their entirety. We in the maritime provinces have not benefited from confederation to the extent that we had hoped. In those days of old we had our big distributing houses in the different cities of those provinces; we had a large and growing trade. But to-day these distributing houses have been almost driven to the wall by competition, and competition from what source? Competition from the United States or from outside countries? No. Competition from the upper provinces of Canada. And how has that competition been made possible? It has been made possible by the low freight rates on the Intercolonial Railway. And when some people speak of the people of the maritime provinces being selfish; when they say we are sordid in our action in reference to these freight rates; I want to point out to these gentlemen that the lowest rates on the Intercolonial were not made for the benefit of the people of the maritime provinces, but were made for the benefit of people in other parts of Canada. Our trade has suffered to some extent by this keen and successful competition from the other provinces, but we are not complaining to-day. Our merchants have gone into other avenues of trade, and I am glad to say that their enterprise and energy in these other directions has reaped a fair reward. But, Sir, we insist that the Intercolonial Railway shall be maintained as a government railway, not that it is of any party advantage to us, because representing as I do a constituency in which there is a large railway mileage, I can tell my hon. friends that I would be thankful to morrow if all the government railway patronage were taken away from me. I believe that I would be stronger on election day than I possibly am now, had I not the patronage of the constituency. I would welcome the day when the patronage of the Intercolonial should be taken entirely and absolutely away from the members of the constituencies along the line.

Mr. LENNOX. Will the hon. gentleman explain what government railway patronage he has?

Mr. LOGAN. Surely my hon. friend must know.

Mr. LENNOX. It would be interesting to know.

Mr. LOGAN. The hon. member (Mr. Lennox) can very well answer his own question. He knows that, for instance, if a section man should unfortunately die or be removed, that the government would ask the member representing that constituency and who is in sympathy with the government to recommend a successor. Not that the man would be employed, because the member recommended him, but he would be given a trial as to his competency and if found competent for his work he would be retained.

Mr. LENNOX: Is that all?

Mr. LOGAN. The same would apply to some other positions on the road, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) knows as well as I do that the only way the government can secure men to work on the road is to ask for a recommendation——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, what about the C.P.R.?

Mr. LOGAN. Surely my hon. friends opposite are not surprised at that. Perhaps the less they say about getting favours from the Canadian Pacific Railway and securing accommodation from them along the railroad the better it may be. But let us not bring the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk Railway into this discussion, let us deal with the Intercolonial which is the question before the House. As I have said, the Intercolonial was built for the purpose of cementing confederation. I shall not weary the House by repeating the history of that railroad and how it was constructed around the Baie de Chaleurs and along the northern part of New Brunswick. We all know that it was built for political and military reasons, and not for commercial purposes, and so we must take the railroad as we find it. We have the long haul to contend with as compared with other railroads having a shorter haul to competitive points, and we have also the low rates to contend with when we attempt to make a good showing for the Intercolonial Railway. It no doubt will be asked as to how these low rates originated, and perhaps I can answer the question. Before confedera-

tion we had a small railway in Nova Scotia and another in New Brunswick, and when these railways were made a part of the Intercolonial, if there was no written agreement to the effect, there was at least an understanding that the then existing rates should be maintained in the future. And so it has been that from that date to the present, although the expenditure of the Intercolonial has necessarily increased, the rates have remained practically the same during all these years. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart) said that Mr. Blair had increased the rates. It is true that Mr. Blair did increase the rates on some comparatively insignificant items, but the truth remains that in general the rates on the Intercolonial Railway have not been raised since the railroad was built 30 years ago. The classifications may have been changed, but the rates have not been to any material extent increased. But, Mr. Speaker, do not let any one run away with the idea that these low rates are beneficial only to the people of the maritime provinces and to them alone, because as a fact the local rates are not considered excessively low. What is true is, that the excessively low rates on the Intercolonial Railway are directed towards the benefiting of interprovincial trade of which the western provinces reap a large benefit. Then again the Intercolonial Railroad has to meet water competition at almost every point along its route, and any one who knows anything about railway operation knows that water carriage is a most serious competition, and tends perhaps more than any other to keep railway rates down. Then also we have the Canadian Pacific Railway running in active competition with the Intercolonial Railway between Montreal and St. John, and we pay the Canadian Pacific a large annual subsidy for running that railway. In addition to that, there is a stretch on the Intercolonial Railway where we have almost an absolute dearth of any revenue producing traffic to the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. FOWLER. Would the hon. gentleman state the points along the Intercolonial between which, that great dearth of trade exists ?

Mr. LOGAN. If the hon. gentleman should travel from Rivière du Loup to Moncton he will find that out without my having to tell him.

Mr. FOWLER. All right, we will come to that.

Mr. LOGAN. I have spoken of some of the difficulties which the Intercolonial Railway has to contend with at the present day. My hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) has compared the condition of the Intercolonial Railway in 1896 with the condition of the Intercolonial Railway at the present day. Why, Sir, if that railroad were now in the same condition that it was in 1896 ; if we paid the same rate of wages to-day as he paid as Minister of Railways in 1896, we would have a handsome surplus on the operation of the Intercolonial Railway.

Some three years ago Mr. Pottinger, the general manager of the Intercolonial Railway who occupied the same position under the old government, stated that if the same rates of wages had been paid to the employees of the road in 1896 as were paid in 1903 it would be found that there was an increase in the aggregate paid of over $1,000,000 per year. Mr. Speaker, our friends talk about the excessive expenses on the Intercolonial Railway. Do they propose to lessen the wages paid to the men employed on that railway ?

An hon. MEMBER. Yes.

Mr. LOGAN. Some hon. gentleman says yes, I venture to say that he will not say that in the maritime provinces, and I venture to say that the leader of the opposition will not say it. Let me quote some of the wages paid in 1896 as compared with the wages paid to day. For instance, in 1896, the maximum rate paid to conductors was $2.50 per day and the minimum $1.90. To-day the maximum is $3.25 and the minimum $2.50. The wages paid to baggagemen, brakemen and trackmen have been increased in about the same ratio. In 1896 the total wages paid to certain trainmen and track men amounted to $255,000, whereas the total wages paid last year to the same class of employees was over $651,000 or nearly three times as much.

Now, there are only certain limits within which we can reduce the expenses of the Intercolonial Railway. Last year, we know, was a year of an entirely exceptional character. We had to contend with conditions which we probably shall never have to face again. The entire traffic of the road was tied up for over two months by tremendous storms. In other respects last year was an expensive year in the operation of the road. But when hon. gentlemen talk about cutting down expenses of the Intercolonial Railway, it must be remembered that we pay about $4,000,000 a year in wages. Those who receive wages along the line of the railway believe they are underpaid to-day. They certainly were under paid in 1896, when men were working for 90 cents or $1 a day and regular track men for $1.15 per day. To-day these men are paid from $1.30 to $1.50 a day. Does any one say that this wage, or the wage paid to any other class of employees on the Intercolonial Railway is excessive? Is the official staff, from the general manager down, overpaid ? I will guarantee that the salary of the general manager is the smallest paid to any manager of a railway in the Dominion of Canada which is over 500 miles in length ; and the salaries paid to the other officers are not excessive, and could not be successfully attacked whatever might be

the policy of economy with respect to the Intercolonial Railway.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. LOGAN. Mr. Speaker, before dinner I made reference to the fact that three years ago Mr. Pottinger, the manager of the Intercolonial Railway, made a report in which he stated that if the scale of wages paid in 1903 had been paid in 1896 to the same number of men there would have been an increase in the wages for 1896 of over $1,000,000—to be exact, $1,075,000. Since 1903 this wages account has been still further increased; so that, I think that the statement can be made reasonably and without fear of successful contradiction that if the same scale of wages which existed in 1896 had been paid last year, it would have meant a reduction of expenses of not less than $1,500,000. This accounts to a large extent for the considerable increase in the working expenses of the road. But I would like to ask these hon. gentlemen who say that there is extravagance on the Intercolonial whether, if they had the opportunity, they would reduce the wage schedule on the Intercolonial. It has been said that the Intercolonial pays extravagant wages. As one who has some knowledge of the wages paid on the Intercolonial I can deny that. Is $40 a month to a young man employed as clerk in a freight office an extravagant wage to keep himself, his wife and family? Is $1.50 a day an extravagant wage to pay to a trackman who works long hours—and the hotter the day or the wilder the storm the harder his work? Is it extravagance to pay trainmen as high as $3 and $3.25 a day, men who are liable to be called out at any hour of the day or night to risk their lives on railroad trains? Is it extravagance to pay $1.75 to $2 a day for skilled mechanics in the works at Moncton? If so, then, if I were Minister of Railways and Canals, I should be very glad to plead guilty to the charge of extravagance. But there is no extravagance in the wages on the Intercolonial from the top of the staff down to the trackmen who work on the roadbed, and it would be difficult to economize in the expenditures of the Intercolonial, so far as the wage schedule is concerned. The next largest item of expenditure is that paid for coal. We have heard a good deal of late in reference to coal and coal combines, and high prices paid by the Intercolonial for coal. Last year, I believe we were paying $3.15 a ton, not for run-of-the-mine coal, but for the very best screened coal, coal over which the government inspectors stand while it goes over the screens to see that it is the very best coal that can be produced by the mines. Private consumers pay $4 to $5 for the same coal. The Canadian Pacific Railway is not supposed to be influenced by outside considerations, yet that railway is paying about as much for its coal on the Atlantic division as is the Intercolonial. We have seen a good deal in the newspapers, and we have heard statements made about the Grand Trunk Railway getting its coal supply at Montreal cheaper than the Intercolonial gets its supply at the mouth of the mine. But, Mr. Speaker, there is coal and coal. The coal for which the Grand Trunk Railway pays is what is known as run-of-the-mine coal—that is, coal as it comes from the pit and is shoved into the car. The coal bought by the Intercolonial is screened under direct inspection of government officers. We ask for tenders for coal. All the collieries in eastern Canada are requested to name a price. Last year the government did not even accept their lowest tender, but offered so much and no more for the coal. The coal companies demurred, but finally accepted the price offered, although they claim, and say they are prepared to prove, that the price is less than that they received from private corporations. Therefore, I do not think that we can complain of the extravagance of the coal account. And what is that account? Why about $1,250,000 will be charged for coal this year. If the coal account is to be further reduced, I am fully convinced that it means only one thing, and that is a reduction in the wages paid to the miners of Nova Scotia. If our friends who are clamouring for a decrease in the price of coal are prepared to advocate that the miners of Nova Scotia shall be paid a less wage for going down into the bowels of the earth and risking their lives every hour they are away from the sunlight, I can only say that it is more than this government, which is a Liberal government, is prepared to favour. Outside of the two items of wages, about $4,000,000 and coal about $1,250,000 you have not got a very large margin for economy. You may say that we are paying too much for printing. I think that the printing bill is about $50,000 a year. I venture the statement that we do not pay as much for printing as do private railway corporations in this country. You can scarcely take up any country newspaper anywhere but you will find a long advertisement of the Canadian Pacific Railway—but, even admitting that there may be too much advertising, still, you have not a very wide margin for the exercise of economy within an expenditure of $50,000. We pay $140,000 rental to the Grand Trunk Pacific under an agreement made by this parliament. We are bound by that agreement and cannot reduce the amount. We pay about $70,000 for ferry services—not a very extravagant amount—not one that can be very much reduced.

And so it comes down to this, if there is to be a reduction in the working expenses of the Intercolonial, it must be made in the items bought by the stores department. You would imagine, to hear some people talk that the purchases of stores of the Intercolonial were simply handed out to the favourites of the government. I must agree with my hon. friend from South Lanark in what he said this afternoon, that every man wants to get the government as a purchaser. So anxious are they to get the government as a purchaser that they will actually tender for the sale of goods to the government at less than the prices at which they sell to private corporations.

I venture the statement again that there is no railway corporation in Canada that buys its general stores at a less cost than the Intercolonial Railway of Canada. They issue calls for tenders in all directions, in every town all over the country whenever they are about to expend money in getting supplies. Some of these calls are not published in the newspapers, but they are sent all over the country to firms in the different towns, inviting them to tender for supplies which are needed and you may be certain that the replies which are received to these notices of tender are favourable to the Intercolonial Railway. Where then, Mr. Speaker, is the extravagance on the Intercolonial Railway ? It is all very well for hon. gentlemen to get up in this House and as they have done and as they will do and talk about this being a sink hole and about extravagance. I want the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who speak upon this question to put their finger upon one single item and say : There is a leakage. Do not talk in loud generalities, do not say there is wide spread corruption; put your finger upon the item and tell us where we can stop the extravagance and where the leakage is.

Last year some train services were discontinued. Did we receive very much encouragement from our friends on the other side or the newspapers supporting them ? When the Minister of Railways discontinued the trains running into Sydney and when boards of trade were making the welkin ring with denunciations of the minister, did we receive any assistance from newspapers which support these hon. gentlemen ? It is a fact that the head lines were even longer than ever in denouncing the government for doing what the minister thought was in the very best interests of Canada. No encouragement was received from these sources. When the Minister of Railways discontinued other trains on the main line he did not receive any encouragement from them. The Minister of Railways has been exercising this policy since he has taken a firm hold of the Intercolonial Railway,—in other words since he has really been able to take charge of the Intercolonial Railway, because for a long time after he became minister he was not in a position, owing to the meeting of parliament and to other causes, including a general election, to take hold of the Intercolonial Railway as he would like,—but since he has taken hold of it with a new deputy, a competent deputy, where have these hon. gentlemen or the newspapers supporting them endeavoured to point out to him or show him where leakages could be stopped and give him credit when leakages have been stopped ? The present Minister of Railways, to my mind, deserves the support of the people of this country, not only of Liberals but of Conservatives. You heard the minister the other day make a statement in this House,—and I was pleased to hear him make it, I was pleased to know that every one else had maintained the same attitude that I had humbly maintained myself—that he had never in the six months since he had inaugurated this policy, had a single Liberal member protest or quarrel with him over the policy he had adopted. As far as I am concerned I want to uphold the Minister of Railways. When boards of trade meet and pass resolutions, I think the proper policy for us on this side is to say to these boards of trade and others : Give the Minister of Railways a free hand, see what he can do ; he has already almost worked wonders on the Intercolonial Railway. What are the facts ? During the first six months of the last fiscal year the deficit on the road was $482,755; during the first six months of this year that deficit has been reduced to only $71,259 and I believe the minister when he says that within a few months he will have the Intercolonial Railway where the income will equal the expenditure at least, and when he arrives at that point where there is not a deficit on the road I for one believe that he should go no further, that the Intercolonial Railway was never expected to be, was never intended to be, was never promised to be, a large dividend paying institution. I myself believe that the expenses and the revenue should be equalized, and toward that end I propose as a humble member of this House to give the Minister of Railways all the sympathy and support that lies within my power. But to make this road a large dividend paying institution I say would not be fair to the people of the maritime provinces and we should not attempt it any more than we should attempt to obtain dividends on the money we have put into the Canadian Pacific Railway. We gave them a completed line which cost us $30,000,000; we also gave them $25,000,000 in cash and 25,000,000 acres of land which at the very low valuation of $3 an acre would be $75,000,000 more or a total of $130,000,000. Are we claiming that they should to-day pay to the government any dividend on that large amount invested ? If it is reasonable for us to pay interest on the $80,000,000 odd invested in the Intercolonial Railway why

is it not just as reasonable that we should insist that the Canadian Pacific Railway, if we had the power to insist should pay us interest on the vast amount of $130,000,000 which this country has invested in that great railway. We do not ask them to do it, we do not want them to do it, because the money we put into the Canadian Pacific Railway goes to develop Canada. The money we put into subsidies to railways all over this country was given for what purpose? To develop the country, to make Canada greater than it was, to make us more independent of other countries, to make us a greater nation than we were and so I say that I can see no more reason to expect dividends from the Intercolonial Railway than to expect them from the Canadian Pacific Railway which runs across this continent. There is only one way in which we could pay dividends on the Intercolonial Railway, and it would be an easy way. We could increase the freight rates. It would not take long to do it. We could bleed the people out of that much more money and have a surplus on the balance sheet. But, Mr. Speaker, I contend as a representative from the maritime provinces that it never was intended that we should have the freight rates raised to that point which would make this road a large dividend paying institution.

The present minister, as I said, deserves our sympathy and our support. He has associated with him a young, active, energetic deputy minister. He has surrounded himself with men who are up-to-date railway men. He is doing more than that. He has put his finger upon the weak point of the management of the Intercolonial Railway that is upon the point of responsibility. In days gone by there never was any responsibility on the Intercolonial Railway except that the general manager was responsible to the deputy minister at Ottawa. To-day the Minister of Railways says to each one of the heads of departments—to Mr. Joughins, the mechanical foreman, to Mr. Burpee, engineer of maintenance, to Mr. Mackenzie, chief engineer and to other heads: Here is your work, you are responsible to me and to parliament for what you do and so it is that he has engendered the spirit of enthusiasm among the officials of the Intercolonial Railway, making them realize that they are part of this great institution, to make it greater and make its management more successful. When his new deputy was appointed the minister went over the Intercolonial with him, spent weeks upon it, looked into every station and freight shed, looked over every siding, went over that road from end to end, thoroughly and then he was in a position to know what was reasonably wanted for that road. The hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) was Minister of Railways for many years. There is a tradition down in the maritime provinces that upon one occasion he went over the road; but how did he go over it? He went over it with his car locked, travelling at the rate of fifty miles an hour most of the way. Was that any way to look over the interests of a great railway? The present minister spent weeks with his deputy, and was able when he saw a leakage to stop it, and when he saw he could economize, economy was practised. If he saw that a train was running which was not paying expenses, off went that train—boards of trade to the contrary and Tory newspapers to the contrary notwithstanding. My hon. friend has done this and has shown great strength of character in doing it. Under his management economy has been in fact the watch word of the Intercolonial Railway, and I believe will continue to be. It is our duty to assist the hon. minister in continuing the policy he has inaugurated in order that he may succeed in making the road at least self-sustaining.

What then may we expect of the Intercolonial Railway in the future? An effort is being made—whether by interested parties or not I shall not say—to induce the people of western Canada to loathe the very name of the Intercolonial Railway. It is time such efforts should cease. This railway was built as part of the pact of our great Canadian confederation. We in the maritime provinces did not get very much out of confederation but we are satisfied to stand by our agreement. Nobody of any standing in the provinces to-day would have a word to say in favour of our breaking up the confederacy. Every man down by the sea, whether he lives at Cape North or Cape Sable is as anxious to build up Canada as if he lived on the banks of the Ottawa. We are all true Canadians willing to bear our share of our country's burdens, willing to do our part in developing the great heritage which God has given us. We do not complain about the expenditure on great Canadian enterprises. Take the question of canals which has been brought up very often. I do not propose to refer to that question more than to say that we in the maritime provinces do not complain of the expenditure on the canals in Ontario if these canals are part of the great transportation system of this country. If it be necessary to construct the Georgian Bay canal and if the engineers and government are convinced that it can be built for a reasonable amount, you will never find men of any standing in the eastern provinces opposing that expenditure, provided it be in the best interest of Canada. But what we ask of the people of the west to bear in mind is the fact that the Intercolonial Railway system is as much a part of the transportation system of Canada as are the canals. We ask them to remember that the Intercolonial Railway was not built entirely for our benefit, that the freight rates in local sections are not very low, and that this line of railway was built as much

to develop western traffic as eastern trade. Two of the most expensive trains on that line, the fast freight from Montreal to Halifax and the ocean limited have been put on largely for the advantage and convenience of our western friends. The fast freight is particularly for the benefit of western manufacturers and wholesale men and the ocean limited fast train is for the purpose of carrying passengers down to seaside resorts along the St. Lawrence and on our maritime coast during the summer months. We do not want to be considered beggars at the treasury of Canada. All we ask is that we shall have fair-play. If there have been incidents of confederation which have worked detrimentally to the maritime provinces, we make no complaint but we demand that the Intercolonial Railway shall remain for all time the property of the people.

There are some who urge that it should be put under a commission. What better would it be then ? The government would still be responsible and the commission, which would have to be made autocrat, would not be responsible to the will of the people as the management of to-day is. There are many objections to a commission which I need not mention as they have been dealt with elaborately already. We know that other countries have tried that system and found it unsatisfactory. New Zealand had for a number of years its government owned railways under a commission, but that colony abolished the commission and to-day its government operates these railways. Australia is to-day trying the experiment of a commission, but it is only an experiment and likely to end as did the commission in New Zealand. Banish the thought that the Intercolonial Railway should ever pass out of the hands of the people into the hands of any corporation. You might just as well break up the entire bonds of confederation as the covenant made with the people of the maritime provinces that that railway should be built and maintained as a government road. The location of the road was perhaps not the best that might have been selected, but nevertheless the road exists as a part of the confederation and of the transportation system of this country. Instead therefore of discussing the question of handing it over to a private corporation, let us make up our minds that it must remain the property of the Canadian people and let us endeavour to uphold the Minister of Railways in his efforts to operate it in such a way as to make revenue and expenditure meet. And let us on the other hand endeavour to give this road our preference. I am sorry to say that on many occasions we find Canadians patronizing a private railway when they might just as well patronize the one which belongs to the Canadian people. I have frequently urged upon the government to make it a feature of their tariff policy that the preference to goods of Britain and colonies shall only apply when these goods are brought in through Canadian ports. When that policy is adopted, it will prove a great stimulus to our government railway system. To-day we are giving a preference to goods landed in American ports which might as well come through Sydney, Halifax, St. John, Quebec or Montreal. Last year we imported about fifty thousand tons of West India sugar on which we gave a preference and the great part of that sugar came in through American ports when it should have come in through Canadian ports. Let us adopt the policy I am suggesting, and you will soon find the receipts on the Intercolonial Railway rapidly increasing.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Might I interrupt my hon. friend ? On page 155 of the unrevised Hansard I find that the Minister of Railways and Canals made use of these words:

> Our first-class fares on the Intercolonial Railway are 76 p. c. of those on the Grand Trunk Railway ; our second-class fares are about 50 p. c. of theirs and our return fare is about 58 p. c. of theirs.

Will the hon. gentleman tell me why the people of the eastern provinces who travel on that railway should receive their fares at from 50 to 65 per cent of what we have to pay in western Canada to our railways.

Mr. LOGAN. The hon. gentleman will find, if he will compare the rates, that those charged by the Atlantic division of the Canadian Pacific Railway which competes with the Intercolonial Railway and also with water rates, are about the same, as far as passengers are concerned, as those charged by the Intercolonial Railway.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I regret I have kept the House so long ; I did not intend to do so. I believe that the hon. member for Lanark was unfair towards the road. I believe his remarks must have a bad effect as prejudicing this great national institution in the minds of the people. We do not want the western people or the people of Ontario to believe that this is a sink hole. We want them to believe that we have a great national asset in the Intercolonial Railway, that it is part of our national existence and that the minister's hands should be upheld in operating that road in an economical and efficient manner. Let those in Ontario not be saying that this great tax-burdened province is paying for the Intercolonial Railway for the maritime provinces, nor should we in the maritime provinces say that we are being unjustly taxed to maintain the canals in Ontario which were made free without a murmur — without even a murmur from the provinces down by the murmuring sea. Let us remember that these institutions are part of our great

Canadian confederation. Let us be broad Canadians, let us speak of Canada as a whole and not in reference to provinces and while we in the maritime provinces will uphold the hands of the government in developing the great west and in developing the great north land of this country, or in the opening up still further the great provinces of Ontario and Quebec let the other provinces look down to us by the sea and say: We will stand by the bond of confederation, we will maintain the Intercolonial in an efficient manner, we will give to the people of the maritime provinces an efficient train service and we will be at all times ready and willing to improve the Intercolonial Railway either in its equipment or its road bed.

My hon. friend from Lanark, in his concluding remarks, deprecated the fact that we have a minister of railways from the maritime provinces. Mr. Speaker, I am surprised that a gentleman who has occupied a position in the cabinet of this country should be so parochial and provincial. A minister from the maritime provinces knows the needs of the Intercolonial Railway and the needs of the people of the maritime provinces, and I maintain that he is the best man to be appointed Minister of Railways. If there is one thing more than another in connection with the Intercolonial Railway on which we can congratulate my right hon. friend the Prime Minister it is that he has had men, both in the persons of Mr. Blair and the present hon. Minister of Railways and Canals, who are thoroughly acquainted with the needs of this great national institution. We do not want to beg anything for the maritime provinces, but we want to insist that what we did get out of Canadian confederation shall be held.

Mr. G. W. FOWLER (King's, N.B.) Mr. Speaker, one who did not know the hon. gentleman (Mr. Logan) who has just taken his seat, or who did not know the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) and the pitiable exhibition he has made of his management of the Intercolonial would almost think that the deficits, which up to the present time, have existed upon that railway were due to the evil designs of Tory newspapers and the Tory party. Why, Sir, we would think that this railway, instead of having a deficit of nearly $1,750,000 this year had really a surplus to hear the hon. gentleman talk about the wonderful reforms that have been initiated by this paragon of a minister during the two years in which he has been in power. He has been in power for two years and yet this year is almost the record year for deficits in the history of the Intercolonial Railway. He has been in power for two years and during these two years on the ordinary working of that railway there is a deficit of about $4,000,000. Yet, this is the gentleman who has put his finger upon the sore spot on the body of the Intercolonial Railway, has diagnosed the disease and found a cure. The hon. member for Cumberland says: Why do we not all support him; why do not all you Conservatives do your duty as patriotic citizens and support this great Minister of Railways? He needs all the support he can get—I will admit that, Mr. Speaker. But it is pretty hard sometimes to make a man stand on his feet even if you hold him up. My hon. friend has put up two men of straw for the purpose of knocking them down and making himself a great fellow by the exploit. He has spent a lot of time in trying to argue that there is a strong feeling in the minds of some people in some portions of Canada in favour of handing over the Intercolonial Railway, that bond of union between the scattered provinces of this great confederation, to a private corporation. I want to say to my hon. friend that there is no such feeling in any portion of this Canada of ours, and that if this matter were put to the vote in any part of Canada the people of Canada would vote unanimously, or almost to a man, that the railway should remain the property of the people of Canada as it was designed and built, that the bond of confederation should be carried out in its integrity. There is no disposition on the part of any portion of the people to do that sort of things, and those papers that are putting out that kind of news are doing a great injury if they should by so doing get any person to lend their aid to that proposition. He has also made a great spread of the increase in wages on the Intercolonial Railway and he asked with a very dramatic action and gesture whether the people on this side of the House would say that $40 a month was too great for a working man to bring up his family and educate his children upon. Who, on this side of the House, has ever said a word against the raise of wages on the Intercolonial Railway? Not a man. We all recognize the fact that the cost of living has greatly increased in this country in the last 25 or 30 years. In the last ten years the cost of living has very materially increased and $40 a month would not go as far to-day as $30 a month would go 10 or 15 years ago. We are perfectly willing that the men who work on and operate the Intercolonial Railway shall be properly paid for their services, shall receive a proper day's wage for a proper day's work. The hon. gentleman asks: Would you alter the wage schedule? Not in the rate of pay, let me say, Mr. Speaker, but in the total of the wage schedule of the Intercolonial Railway, I would make a very material alteration. I want to say right here, I know whereof I speak, and when the time comes before the public accounts committee in this House, evidence will be produced

to prove exactly the words I am going to utter now, that in the wages paid in the city of Moncton there is all the way from $400,000 to $500,000 a year too much paid because there are to-day four men doing and badly doing the work of one. That is absolutely true. Men are tumbling over themselves. They have not room to work, there are so many of them. That is where great leakage occurs on the Intercolonial Railway. Then, this great physician who comes with the healing in his wings to heal the ills of the Intercolonial Railway goes down to Moncton and says that he touches the sore spot because he cancels a train running out of Sydney, Cape Breton. That is the wonderful thing that he does, but he does that while there are in the city of Moncton hundreds of men who are not earning ten cents a day let alone the $2 or whatever they may get. That is an actual fact and it can be easily proven. I do not care to follow the hon gentleman (Mr. Logan) in his wanderings east and west, north and south. He told us that these things were charged to capital on the Intercolonial Railway because the money was voted by this House on the capital account. Well, such an argument is not worth replying to. He talks about political machines, and he says there has been an end to political machinery on the Intercolonial. Sir, never in the history of the Intercolonial has political influence been so rampant on that road as at the present time. And, Sir, the present head of that railroad is the worst man that ever filled the portfolio of railways from that point of view. Political influence. Well, I should say so. Talk about shingles; its deals that come up now.

Mr. LANCASTER. And ties.

Mr. FOWLER. Deals and railway ties. Why, Sir, they have a company called the Eastern Supply Company—I believe there are some questions on the paper in regard to it—and that company is a mysterious product of somebody's clever brain. Incorporated, they tell me, away off in Newfoundland, this Eastern Supply Company supplies a great portion of the goods for the Intercolonial Railway. There is a gentleman who is very influential in that Eastern Supply Company, a very important gentleman in connection with that company, a gentleman by the name of Lodge who is the 'fidus Achates' of the Minister of Railways. Mr. Lodge is a very well known gentleman in that section of the province; a very well known gentleman indeed. He is a very well known gentleman in the city of Moncton and the city of Moncton knows only too well the sort of man this Mr. Lodge is, this great friend of the Minister of Railways, this gentleman who is the acting secretary of the Eastern Supply Company. And, Sir, when the Public Accounts Committee gets to work I think there will be some information required with respect to Mr. Lodge and with respect to the Eastern Supply Company. So much for political influence along the line of the Intercolonial Railway.

My hon. friend condemns government ownership, and well he might the example that is before his eyes. I do not blame people for being a little sceptical about government ownership when they see the unfortunate manner in which this railway has been handled by this government. We have been told from the other side of the House that management of railways by commission is an experiment in Australia. Well, it is an experiment that has been tried for three years with ever increasing success in that great colony. Surely we have men in Canada who can manage the railways of Canada as successfully as it can be done in Australia. Indeed, Sir, when the people of Australia were looking around for a railway man they came to Canada and got a Canadian, and he is managing their railways to-day with such success that they are dividend paying instead of being deficit making as they were before.

Mr. LANCASTER. He must have been a Tory.

Mr. FOWLER. Of course he was. We were told by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Logan) that the people were so anxious to sell to the Intercolonial Railway that they cut their prices down, that they made no profit, that they were falling over themselves in their anxiety to sell to the government railway. He told us the government called for tenders. Did they? Yes, they invited a favoured few who happened to be in the good books of the Minister of Railways. And we are told that no money has been spent for advertising. What a tremendous economy that is. Well, what they did was to send a letter to Mr. Smith and Mr. Jones and Mr. Robinson, we will say, who were friends of the government, and Smith and Jones and Robinson made an arrangement by which one tenders for one thing and another tenders for another thing, and they tender at prices that pay them mighty well. And as to passes. We are told there is a tremendous saving on that account. Why, to hear that hon. gentleman talk about economy, if all his economies were added together, the deficit instead of being a million and three quarters, would be turned into a large surplus. But the surplus does not appear. And as to passes, why they do not want to have any pass so many of them are carried free.

The hon. gentleman tells us we are going to have a surplus next year. I would like to know on what ground he makes such a prophecy as that. The Minister of Railways told us that the deficit was only $71,000 on the past six months operation. But never in the history of railroading in Canada has there been a winter so favour-

able to railroad operation as this last winter, and while other Canadian railways have been rolling up tremendous surpluses on account of the lack of snow and the facility of operation, the poor Intercolonial Railway has a deficit of $71,000. If it were an ordinary winter like the winter of 1904-5, I am quite certain that that deficit would be increased four fold at least and would amount to over half a million dollars for the year.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Logan) told us that if the Intercolonial were extended to the Georgian bay it would be still worse. Would it ? Don't we know that the government take great credit for the extension of the Intercolonial to Montreal ? Did not the Prime Minister go throughout the length and breadth of Canada stating that when he came into power he found the Intercolonial Railway ending in a field, and he brought it to the metropolis. Well, he may indeed with truth say now, that the result of his policy has been so splendid as to put the Intercolonial Railway into a bad financial hole. The Conservative party did not object to the extension of the Intercolonial Railway to Montreal. On the contrary the Conservative party favoured it. But the Conservative party did object to the immense expense that was entailed by the plan proposed by the government. Look what they pay the Grand Trunk Railway for running rights across the Victoria bridge and into the Bonaventure station ; a most outrageous, a most rascally price, and that is the only phrase by which it can be properly designated. We know that the first Drummond County Bill that was introduced by the government was held up in the Senate, and we know that the next bargain that was made was some three quarters of a million dollars better for the country than the first, a thing for which the country has to thank the Senate. But Sir, alas, the composition of that Senate has so changed by reason of the men appointed by the government, that a steal like that would go through the Senate for a million and a half dollars more than we ought to pay, just like goose grease without ever a clog in the way at all. Well, Sir, if the Intercolonial Railway had been extended to the Georgian bay so that it might tap the traffic of the great west, then the railroad would have a chance of earning a dividend.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Logan) told us that the Intercolonial Railway was not intended as a commercial venture and that it traversed a portion of the country where it could not possibly be made to pay. I was surprised to hear that statement. We have present to night the member for Restigouche (Mr. Reid) and the member for Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon). I see sitting on the government benches my friend from Gloucester who is so valiant and doughty a champion whenever the interests of his county or province are attacked. I am surprised that he did not rise in his place to denounce the member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) for making such a nasty insinuation against the magnificent agricultural county of Gloucester ; one of the finest counties in the whole Dominion of Canada, magnificent soil, beautiful level land, a splendid agricultural county and peopled by enterprising and honest farmers and fishermen. Even the west with its vast and rolling prairies cannot take the shine out of the county of Gloucester, but yet the member for Cumberland says that it can give no trade to the railway that runs through it. We have also here the member for Northumberland (Mr. Loggie), and I am surprised that every hair on his head did not rise straight up when the member for Cumberland said that there was no trade to be got for the Intercolonial Railway from the rich and noble county of Northumberland.

The hon. gentleman says this road does not run through a good agricultural portion of the province of New Brunswick. I say it runs through as good an agricultural country as there is to-day in the whole province of New Brunswick, not excepting even the magnificent valley of the St. John river. My hon. friend from Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon) will not deny that statement; neither will my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. LeBlanc), nor my hon. friend from Restigouche (Mr. Reid). Not only is it a splendid agricultural country, but there are some very fine and flourishing towns along that route. There are the towns of Campbellton, Chatham, Newcastle, Dalhousie, Nelson, Bathurst—all thriving industrial centres tapped by the Intercolonial Railway. There is a settled district for almost the whole distance from Moncton to the Metapedia. And yet my hon. friend from the province of Nova Scotia dares to asperse the province from which I come by saying that this railroad does not run through a good agricultural country and therefore has no local traffic. Are there no hon. gentlemen representing the splendid agricultural counties in the province of Quebec through which that road runs to rise in protest ? Why do they sit silent, or have they gone home at the week's end ? If they had been present when that statement was made, it would have been received with hisses or marks of dissent from these gentlemen. I say that the Intercolonial all the way from Montreal to Moncton runs through a magnificent agricultural country. There may be some portions of it which are not very good, but on the average it is an excellent agricultural country. We know that there are portions of the Canadian Pacific Railway which run through poor agricultural districts. Any one who has travelled on that line to the north of Lake Superior knows that for twenty-four hours the train runs through one of the most God-forsaken districts in the world; and yet that road pays. So the Intercolonial Railway could

be made to pay. It should get a portion of the transcontinental traffic. If it were managed decently and honestly, and were removed from political influence, it could be made a dividend-paying road. My hon. friend said it should not be a dividend-paying road. Why not? My hon. friend says we are not begging from other parts of Canada something that we are not paying them for. Then, why should we not wish the Intercolonial to be made a dividend-paying road. I do not ask anything of the kind. If the Intercolonial Railway, by charging fair rates for the services which it performs, could pay, why in the name of common sense should it not be made to pay? My hon. friend says, because the canals are free. I do not think that has anything to do with the case. I do not think the people of the province of Ontario or the people of the great west are so narrow that because this railroad does not pay now, they would advocate putting it into the hands of a private corporation. Not one per cent of the people in any part of Canada entertain that idea. My hon. friend is only putting up a man of straw when he makes that statement, and then says that under the bond of confederation you must stand by the Intercolonial Railway. There is growing up in this country a strong feeling in favour of the public ownership of public franchises. That feeling is widespread, not only in this country but all over the world, and in almost every country where public ownership has been tried it has been proved successful. Some of the experiments may not have been successful; but one swallow does not make a summer, neither does one failure of government ownership condemn the principle. That would not be common sense or human reason. In the great majority of cases where public ownership has been tried, it has been proved to be very beneficial and profitable to the people at large; and I believe it will be so with the management of the Intercolonial Railway when it is put upon a proper basis. I am in favour of managing that railroad by means of a commission so long as we have such incompetent ministers as we have in this government.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford) Mr. Speaker, before the motion is put, I desire to allude to a matter that concerns the constituency from which I come. I notice that the maps which accompany the minister's report do an injustice to the city of Brantford. I hold in my hand map No. 5, in which I find outlined the same old lines that have stood for forty years as the only means of entering Brantford by the Grand Trunk Railway, that is via Harrisburg. The Minister of Railways and Canals is not present. I wish, however, through 'Hansard,' to draw his attention to the fact that the main line of the Grand Trunk at present passes through the city of Brantford. If the minister wishes to go through to Chicago by the Grand Trunk Railway to-day, he will have to stop at the city of Brantford. Though that may be news to him, it is not new to all hon. gentlemen opposite. I think the Minister of Customs could have told him that the main line of the Grand Trunk passes through the city of Brantford, and, at this late date, that line should be included in this map which is sent broadcast by the Minister of Railways and Canals. It is now about three years since that road was put under construction, trains have been running on it for eighteen months, and the official opening took place last autumn, to which I think the Minister of Customs was invited. I merely wish, in justice to my constituents, to explain that the main line of the Grand Trunk now passes through the telephone city of Brantford. I do not wish to speak on the main question, because I do not qualify as a railroad man; but I must express my surprise at some of the remarks made by my hon. friend opposite (Mr. Logan) who is not now in the House. His statement in regard to passes, that they were passed out like bundles of shingles, is one so grosly exaggerated that when the hon. gentleman comes to read it in 'Hansard' I believe he will repent having made it. I trust that the day will soon come when the Intercolonial will be a paying proposition, as I think we all desire it to be. Government ownership is not always a failure. We have in Ontario a small road known as the Temiskaming Railway, which has been running for about a year, and which I believe has paid a handsome dividend upon last year's operations. I trust that when the Minister of Railways and Canals brings down his next report upon the Intercolonial Railway, he will be able to show a balance sheet that will reflect more credit upon his management than the present one does. I congratulate him upon the able speech he made in presenting his report; but I am sorry that I cannot congratulate him on the financial showing he has made. When he makes the Intercolonial a paying proposition, I believe every one of us will hold up both hands for this great national highway of which we are all so proud.

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

Archives, Agriculture and Statistics—Exhibitions, additional amount required, $75,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is intended for the exhibition at Milan, where there is to be this year a World's Fair. Canada has been invited to attend and we have decided to send an exhibit.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Who is in charge of the Canadian exhibit?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Hutchison, who was in charge at St. Louis and was very successful.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What will be the character of the exhibition ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The same as at Liège, Belgium, last year.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know that we have much information about that.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think a report was made. At any rate, according to the American papers, the Canadian exhibit was one of the best, if not the very best.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If we make an exhibit, which is supposed to be representative of the resources of Canada, we should make a creditable one. Did that in Belgium show the mineral resources of the country ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I saw a remarkable specimen of the resources of this country in the Imperial Institute in London about ten years ago. It consisted of a very few samples of a very few of the products of the different provinces. The province of which I have the honour to be a native, the province of Nova Scotia, was represented by about half a bushel of coal piled up in one corner of the room. It was a most exhilirating spectacle to any one from that province. I trust that if we exhibit at Milan, we shall make an exhibit worthy of the country.

Mr. PATERSON. The item No. 260, which we have allowed to stand, is intended to remedy the condition of affairs in London to which my hon. friend alludes. It will be taken up when the Minister of Agriculture is present and he will explain what is to be done in that connection.

Amount required to provide for expenses in connection with the royal inspection on insurance, $20,000.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I would like to call the attention of the Prime Minister to the fact that the Insurance Commission has been in session in this city two or three days, and so far the chief counsel engaged for the Dominion has not taken any important part in it. A very surprising thing took place to-day. While the superintendent of insurance was there to give evidence, he was suddenly withdrawn and another witness substituted. The counsel from Ontario, named by the Ontario government to represent the policy-holders, had to publicly protest against the way the commission was conducting its proceedings.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. On what ground ?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. He protested on the ground that he had not the opportunity of examining the witness who had been in the box the last two or three days. He protested publicly that this witness, who had been examined by the Dominion counsel, was swept away before the counsel representing the policy-holders from Ottawa had an opportunity of questioning him. If this commission is to give satisfaction, a somewhat different course must be adopted. We have had enough in the last two or three days to justify everything said in the direction of supporting a demand for a thorough investigation. I trust the government will see that the gentleman to whom they have intrusted the case of the people, shall attend to the case. He has not been there yesterday or to-day. That is not the way to give satisfaction to the policy-holders.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am not prepared to meet the strictures my hon. friend chooses to pass on the work of the commission. It seems to me they have done very good work up to the present and I am not aware of what has taken place to-day. Mr. Shepley has not been there the last two days but the investigation, which is taking place to-day, was only preliminary. Mr. Shepley has been given the task of carrying on the investigation, and he will no doubt do his duty thoroughly and fearlessly, but he cannot be expected to put aside all other interests to look after this alone. He has associated with him Mr. Tilley, who is quite competent and has done his work faithfully and well. At all events the commissioners have every confidence that they will do their duty satisfactorily.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would say to the Prime Minister that the senior counsel conducting this investigation for the government could hardly be expected to do that thoroughly and attend to his other law practice at the same time. I have some knowledge of the time and energy which a counsel has to put into a work of this character, especially into the work of investigating life insurance which has a great many technical aspects, and I am bound to say that I would not expect Mr. Shepley or any one else to leave the work to his junior counsel or others in order to attend to other professional matters if the investigation is to be thorough. I know nothing of the arrangement of the commission, I am relying on the statements of the Prime Minister. I think it is extremely desirable that the government or the commission or some authority should define the rights which counsel for the Ontario government or the Quebec government or any other government or any policy-holders should have before that commission. I think the Prime Minister will readily see, and I am sure the Minister of Justice will at once see, that it is absolutely necessary that these gentlemen should have their rights defined as to the examination or cross-examination of witnesses and if this is not done you will inevitably have confusion, you will inevitably have complaint and protest and you will

fail to satisfy the country. A systematic method of procedure must be adopted in the first instance. It may have been adopted, I do not know anything about the proceedings of the commission, but the statement has been made here by a member that protest was raised to-day by counsel for Ontario against the withdrawal of one witness and the substitution of another. If counsel for Ontario are to have a status before that commission it is right that they should be heard before any witness is withdrawn from the stand and another witness substituted in his place. That would be the ordinary procedure in a court, and I venture to think that the attention of the government, of the commission, of some persons having a right to regulate these matters, should be given to the subject at once if the statements which have been made are founded in fact.

Hon. CHAS. FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). The statements which have been made are not founded in fact. What occurred yesterday—and I have a stenographic report of the proceedings in my office—is this: Mr. Fitzgerald was under examination. He is the inspector of insurance and after he had been under examination for, I think, two days it was found that certain documents were required by the commission which Mr. Fitzgerald had not under his hand at the adjournment last night. Then at the adjournment it was decided that Mr. Fitzgerald would not be recalled to-day but that another official of the Finance Department connected with the Insurance Branch would be available this morning, the understanding being that the examination of Mr. Fitzgerald would be resumed after he had made the inquiry necessary for him to make. These are the facts as they occurred. Mr. Hellmuth, last night, acting for the Ontario government, made a statement to the effect that he thought Mr. Fitzgerald ought to be on the stand this morning. I understand that he first made that statement privately to counsel and this morning made it in open court, he thought that the examination of witnesses should be proceeded with continuously from day to day until such time as it was completed. There was some discussion on that and that was the whole difficulty.

As to the attendance of Mr. Shepley he was brought suddenly and unexpectedly into the inquiry and he had previous engagements elsewhere which necessitated his being absent from the proceedings yesterday and I understand to-day, but the intention and the understanding on the part of Mr. Shepley is that he shall be in attendance regularly hereafter, and he comes back to Ottawa on Tuesday for the purpose of assuming control of the proceedings before the commission. It was thought that if he had to absent himself the best time would be on the examination of these witnesses who will give formal evidence.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. As far as Mr. Shepley is concerned I think that is a satisfactory explanation, but my criticism is based upon the remarks of the Prime Minister which left on my mind the impression that Mr. Shepley would attend when more or less convenient to the matters investigated, and that he was to keep in touch with his other professional engagements all through the investigation. I would strongly object to that. I do not object to his being away these two days and leaving this preliminary examination in the hands of junior counsel who no doubt is fully competent to conduct it.

As far as the protest raised by the Ontario counsel is concerned, I think it desirable that the procedure should be so arranged that protests of this character should not be required, and I think it is due to the public that the commissioners should take that matter in hand and arrange their procedure so that there will be no difficulty of this kind in future.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It will be admitted I think that the investigation under the New York State authorities has been very complete, and while I have had no conversations with the commissioners I have had with Mr. Shepley, and I understand the intention is to have the same arrangements as at the New York State investigation.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. It is all very well to have these statements now but they are dragged from the government.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They are dragged by the incorrect statements made.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. It is a fact that Mr. Hellmuth has been asked since he went there to conduct his examination through counsel appointed by the government and an attempt has been made to have him state the questions which he wished to have asked through counsel appointed by the government. We all know that when a counsel is examining a witness the answer to one question may induce him to decide on one of several other questions which he would ask the witness. It would be a nice thing if counsel representing thousands of policyholders in this country should be asked to put his question through the counsel appointed by the government. It has been said that this was a mere matter of procedure but I shall read what Mr. Hellmuth had to say as reported in an evening paper:

Mr. Hellmuth, K.C., appointed by the Ontario government to look after the interests of the policy-holders in that province at once objected. He protested against taking away the previous witness, Mr. Fitzgerald, before he had had an opportunity of examining him. It was a most unusual course to examine a witness for two days and then withdraw him and substitute

another for him without giving other counsel an opportunity to examine him. He could not do justice to the interests of policy-holders if other witnesses were to be examined before Mr. Fitzgerald was recalled. He considered it a serious question if a proper elucidation of Mr. Fitzgerald's evidence could be made if his examination were not now concluded.

One of the chief matters of interest to the policy-holders was what duties were performed by the superintendent of the department, what duties he considered he should perform and what knowledge he had of matters under his control. He wanted to find out from the superintendent what knowledge of his duties he had before the investigation opened, not what he acquired during it or after it. As the highest officer in the Insurance Department, Mr. Hellmuth protested against other witnesses intervening before he found out for the policy-holders exactly the extent of Mr. Fitzgerald's knowledge.

It was not a nominal protest, it was a protest involving the whole procedure of the commission, and I say that it is necessary that public attention should be drawn to this matter in order that the procedure may be changed and that an ample opportunity may be given to examine all witnesses and that the fullest investigation may take place in connection with this matter.

Mr. LENNOX. Before this matter passes I would like to ascertain from the Prime Minister whether it is expected that this commission will make its report before the close of this session.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot say as to that ?

Mr. LENNOX. From what was stated by the chief commissioner at the time the committee assembled for organization purposes I would judge that it is very definitely in the mind of the chief commissioner and perhaps of the others that this is to be a long drawn out investigation. His Honour Judge MacTavish was particular in impressing on all the parties present and upon the public that every species of investigation would be pursued. That would be proper of course, but the judge went further than that and in fact invited all classes of people to come in and be represented by counsel. Everybody who wished to say anything could have counsel there to any extent. The whole thing indicated to my mind that the intention was not to have a return made during the present sitting of parliament. And this brings us again to what was was complained of here the other day, that is that on the eve of the assembling of parliament this commission was appointed, without waiting, as the government might well have waited, for the opening of the session. I can well understand that, if parliament was not to assemble for several months, the course taken by the government would be considered quite proper. But in view of the fact that parliament was to assemble in a few days, it was not right for the government to take the course it did. It would have been more proper and more consistent if the government had taken the country into their confidence and laid the matter before parliament. And no inconvenience would have resulted from the adoption of such a course. For one thing, it would have eliminated the difficulty with regard to Mr. Shepley. It might have been intimated to Mr. Shepley that he would be the counsel selected. And from a limited experience in matters of this kind, I venture to say—and I think I shall have the concurrence of older and more experienced counsel—that the beginning of an inquiry is the time when it is most important for the senior counsel to be present, in order that he may outline his work and determine the course the investigation is to take. I therefore, think it is very much to be regretted that we have not succeeded in expropriating the whole time of Mr. Shepley in the interest of the country. And I venture to say that the country will be very much surprised to learn that the government have not succeeded in making arrangements by which Mr. Shepley can remain here during the whole time of the investigation,

There is a more important matter to which I desire to call the attention of the government. During this session of parliament we are taking up a new condition of things. Whatever may have been said formerly, whatever may have been the arguments advanced against parliamentary committees, those arguments have lost their force in view of present conditions. Last session the government and the members generally determined that the sessional indemnity should be increased ; and the sessional indemnity having been so increased, surely members can now attend to their parliamentary duties without having their minds distracted, as formerly, by private concerns, I think the time has come when we should cease to farm out the work of parliament, and do the work ourselves. Royal commissions have not been very satisfactory in the experience of this country. Even when judges have been the commissioners,—yes even when they have composed the whole commission—commissions have not always proved satisfactory. And, in view of the fact that we have here assembled, upwards of two hundred men, determined to devote their whole time and energy to the affairs of the country, and in view of the fact put forward by the Prime Minister to-day, that we have in the House of Commons gentlemen who, by reason of sitting in this House become more efficient and more proficient in their practice as barristers, and so better qualified to become judges, I think it is clear that in matters of this kind we should endeavour to do our

own work. I have no doubt that, with the earnestness which should characterize this assembly as a working body determined to do the work of the people, it would have been very much better and far more in the interest of the country if we had had a parliamentary commission assisted and guided to a great extent by the many able counsel who sit on both sides of the house. I believe the country will not be quite prepared, when their attention is called to the matter, to endorse the action of the government, in still further adding to this practice of relegating everything to commission—this constantly growing practice of farming out to others the work that we should do ourselves. If we are not competent to do the work the people should know it, and they should send men who are competent for these duties? There is no good reason that can be advanced why the representatives of the people, who are paid for the work to be done here, and with the time available, should not do this work. And there are a lot of comparatively idle men in the other chamber also. There is no reason why the services of the two houses of parliament should not be invoked in the interests of the people in this matter of insurance, instead of making the country pay so dearly as they do pay under the present system. Here is a call for $20,000 to provide for expenses 'in connection with' this royal commission on insurance. This indicates that this is only a beginning—only the thin end of the wedge. And, though it does seem somewhat amazing that it should be so, I venture to say that $20,000 will not go very far to pay the expenses of this commission. I say I feel it my duty to call the attention of the government to the fact that whatever may have been the conditions formerly, whatever may have been the cogency of the arguments used on former occasions, the policy that should be adopted now is that of doing ourselves a greater proportion of the work than we formerly did.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) asserts positively that the work of investigating insurance is, and ought to be, exclusively within the jurisdiction of this parliament. I am not quite sure about that. That such work could well be entrusted to a committee of parliament, I do not deny. But that it should preferably be entrusted to a committee of parliament I am not prepared to admit. My hon. friend knows that, if there is any business that naturally should be within the jurisdiction of parliament, it is the investigation of everything that concerns its own existence. Yet he knows also, being an eminent lawyer, that many years ago, both in Canada and the mother country, the work of investigating the manner in which every member is introduced into parliament was taken away from parliament and relegated to the judges. There was a time when all controverted elections, all petitions against elections, were submitted to parliament. But this was found not to work smoothly, and, for good and sufficient reasons, which have never been questioned, the law was adopted that this work should be removed from parliament and entrusted to the courts of justice. Such an investigation as this insurance investigation, I repeat, might be carried on by a committee of the House. But would it have been better done than by the commission that we have appointed? I doubt it very much. My hon. friend started with the question, how long will this work occupy?—

Will the report be ready in time to lay upon the table of parliament before the prorogation? I have no means of information on that point; it is impossible for me to have any idea of it. But, suppose this work shall take three or four months. It might be, that if it were entrusted to a committee of parliament, the time of prorogation might arrive before the investigation was completed, and the work would have to stop. The commission is not limited in its time—it will take all the time necessary. My hon. friend is hard to please. He finds fault with the commission because the chairman at the first sitting notified everybody who wished to do so to be present and assured him of a hearing—that any man who had information to give or a grievance to bring forward would be heard by himself or by counsel. But if the commission had attempted to exclude anybody, I think my hon. friend would have come forward and protested against such a course. I am afraid that it is too much to expect that we can satisfy him. But I cannot but believe that, upon full consideration of the matter he will admit that the chairman started well by inviting everybody to appear who wished to do so. For my part I am satisfied with that course. My hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean) is also dissatisfied. I am less surprised at that because that hon. gentleman is very hard to please as a rule.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Very.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The hon. gentleman says there was a protest on the part of counsel before the commission today. I do not know if my hon. friend has ever been in a court house, but everybody who has been in a court house knows that it is not a matter of very, very infrequent occurrence to see counsel protest to the court when they are not satisfied with the manner in which the proceedings are carried on. That has happened before the highest courts and the ablest judges. Mr. Hellmuth was not satisfied apparently with the ruling. It would have been something very extraordinary indeed if all the counsel attending, whether on one side or the other

side, whether representing the policy holders, the government or anybody else, had been quite satisfied with every ruling of the judges. It is a thing we do not expect, but when protests are made before the courts by eminent counsel generally these matters are rectified, these protests are heeded and I believe this will be the effect of the protest by Mr. Hellmuth. Mr. Fitzgerald was not present this morning for examination. The commission gave a ruling upon this point which in my judgment does not have the effect pointed out by Mr. Hellmuth. Mr. Fitzgerald was withdrawn from examination simply to allow him to get some information upon a point which he is to testify and we will be called again and will testify.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I want to point out to the right hon. Prime Minister the excellent method that was adopted in the State of New York. They had a committee of the legislature, they employed eminent counsel to conduct the case and the result was that——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. A commission of the legislature ?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. A commission of the legislature and that commission has extended now to a committee of the House sitting in Albany, but the characteristic of that commission was its thoroughness, its expedition, the quickness with which the report was got ready and presented to the legislature and Bills founded upon it introduced.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. W. F. MACLANE. There is no reason, why, if Mr. Shepley is there attending to his duty, this inquiry should not go on from day to day, that it should not be thorough, that a finding should not be made and that, if legislation is necessary, it should not be introduced this session.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. We propose to have a fall session, but we are told that it is to be reserved for the tariff. I think it is worth the consideration of the government to see that the investigation goes on from day to day, that it is thorough, that the fullest opportunity be given to counsel who go there to represent policy-holders, to examine witnesses and that it be conducted in the fairest possible maner.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. If that is done I am confident that evidence will come out of this investigation that will justify those who believe that it is high time that the insurance companies in this country were disciplined and made to revise the system under which they are carrying on life insurance.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Possibly.

To provide for expenses in connection with the approaching visit of His Royal Highness Prince Arthur of Connaught, $15,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The committee is aware that Prince Arthur has been delegated by His Majesty the King to convey to the Emperor of Japan the Order of the Garter. We have invited Prince Arthur to visit Canada on his way back to England and in doing so he will sail directly from Japan to British Columbia. We are providing this sum of $15,000 for his reception.

Mr. HENDERSON. Some time ago I noticed in the daily press an account of the route which was laid down for His Royal Highness in passing through Canada, starting at Vancouver and leaving possibly from Halifax or Quebec. What I wish to draw the right hon. First Minister's attention to is that it seems rather an oversight that his visit to Ottawa would come in the midst of the Easter holidays when the great bulk of the members of this House will be out of the city at their homes. I think it is a pity that the visit of such a great personage should take place when very few of us indeed would have an opportunity of seeing him. I think some arrangement should be made by which the route will deviate somewhat from that laid down by the under Secretary of State, who, I understand, has charge of it, so that we will have an opportunity of seeing His Royal Highness when he passes through Ottawa.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sorry that the answer that I have to give to my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) is that which I had to give to my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean) ; it is never to trust too much to newspaper reports. The statement which has been published in the newspapers is not exactly accurate. The Prince is expected to be here on the Saturday before Easter. He is expected to spend a quiet Sunday here and to stay during the whole week in Ottawa—Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday. I hope my hon. friend will be back here on Tuesday and then he will have an opportunity of seeing the Prince.

Mr. HENDERSON. The route as laid down and to which I have reference provided that he should be here on the Saturday between Good Friday and Easter Sunday. It was at the end of the week he was to be here and not the end of the previous week.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. But he will not leave Ottawa until the end of the following week.

Mr. HENDERSON. No doubt the right hon. Prime Minister had an opportunity of seeing the route as laid down. I am sorry I have not it here but according to it he was to leave Ottawa forthwith.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. HENDERSON. Only remaining here some three days and going before many members would have an opportunity of returning.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. HENDERSON. Had the report stated that he was to remain here a week, certainly I would have had no reason to complain. Personally, as the right hon. gentleman knows, I shall certainly be in my place on Tuesday morning.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I forget exactly the time but I am satisfied he will be here Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday and perhaps Friday.

Mr. HENDERSON. Then we will attribute the mistake to the newspapers.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. If my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) goes to see the horse show in Toronto he will see a good horse show and a very fine Prince at the same time.

Contribution of Canada towards the relief of the famine sufferers in Japan, $25,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is an item that I do not think requires much explanation, as it has been already explained in the press and members of the House understand what it is for. There is a famine in some of the provinces of Japan and we have thought that in view of the good relations which now exist between Japan and the empire we would contribute $25,000 to be sent not in money but in the shape of flour.

Mr. DANIEL. It has been already sent, I understand ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Partly sent.

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics—additional amount required for renewing and improving Canadian exhibit at Imperial Institute, London, and assisting the maintainance thereof, $18,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will the right hon. gentleman explain what has been done.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I know that an arrangement has been made by Lord Strathcona to put an end to the disgrace in connection with our exhibit which my hon. friend has just spoken of. That arrangement requires this appropriation, but I do not know the particulars at this moment. I shall bring down the particulars next time we go into committee of supply.

Some resolutions reported.

ADJOURNMENT—COMMISSION ON LIFE INSURANCE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Do I understand that the government are to supply us with a stenographic report from day to day of the evidence taken before the Royal Commission on Life Insurance?

Hon. CHAS. FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). We cannot get it exactly from day to day, but I asked the chairman of the commission if he would not see to it that the stenographer should supply copies of the report of the evidence as rapidly as possible ; one copy to be supplied to the government and one to the House. I may say that Mr. Butcher, of Toronto, is doing the work, and I understand that he is very active and very expeditious, and that he will give us as rapidly as possible the material to communicate to the House. The point I had reference to was with respect to a special incident. I heard of the incident but yesterday and I asked for a special report of that special incident.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My suggestion is that copies should be struck off as rapidly as possible under the circumstances, and laid upon the table of the House.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 9.50 p. m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, March 19, 1906.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

INDEMNITY OF MEMBERS AND PENSIONS OF PRIVY COUNCILLORS.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No 18) to repeal chapter 30 of the Statutes of 1905, intituled, An Act respecting Annuities for certain Privy Councillors, and chapter 43, Statutes of 1905, intituled, An Act to amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The Bill is a very simple one. It proposes to repeal the two Acts passed last year, one dealing with indemnities and the other dealing with pensions. The Bill is introduced for that particular purpose. Whether it will carry or not I know not, but it will give every one in this House an opportunity to vote upon it and it will also give the government probably an opportunity to revise the pension Bill, an announcement to that effect having been made by the present hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Aylesworth). Whether that Bill will be introduced into the House I do not know, but I beg to introduce the Bill which is in the hands of the House and it rests with the House to deal with it.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN LAND GRANT.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN asked :

1. Did the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company become entitled to receive or select any public lands under any and what statute, or under and what contract with the government ?

2. To what quantity did it become entitled ?

3. What area of land was reserved in the first instance out of which the company was to select its branch ?

4. What were the boundaries of such area ?

5. Did the company dispose of its land grant or any and what portion thereof to any corporation, person or persons? If so, when and to whom, and upon what terms and under what agreement ?

6. If the company's land grant, or some portion thereof, was so disposed of, did the company in making such disposition assign or convey to the purchaser any particular area of land or land to be selected within some particular area, or did it assign or convey to the purchaser simply its claim against the government in respect of the whole or some portion of its land grant ; or how otherwise did it make the said disposition ?

7. Was the area for the selection of any and what portion of the company's land grant afterwards altered, changed or enlarged in any way?

8. Was the area for the selection of the land so disposed of by the company, altered, changed or enlarged by order in council, or otherwise ?

9. If so, at what date, by what instrument, to what extent and in what respect was any such change, enlargement or alteration made ?

10. How long was this after the company had made the disposition of its land grant above referred to ?

11. If any such change, enlargement or alteration in the area aforesaid was made by order in council passed in August, 1902, or thereabouts, on whose recommendation and at whose request, for what reason and upon what grounds was the said order in council passed ?

12. When was the passing of such order in council first communicated to the said company ?

13. Is the said company indebted to the government? If so, in what sums for principal and of interest respectively, and under what instrument or authority was such indebtedness created ?

14. Does the government hold any and what security for such indebtedness ? If so, what is the nature of the security, and what its estimated value ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. By the Act, chapter 60, of 48-49 Victoria, assented to July 20, 1885, the Governor General in Council was authorized to grant to this railway company, Dominion lands to an extent not exceeding 6,400 acres per mile of the company's railway from Regina to the navigable water of Long lake.

By the Act, chapter 23, of 50-51 Victoria, assented to June 23, 1887, the Governor General in Council was authorized to grant to this railway company, Dominion lands to an extent not exceeding 6,400 acres for each mile of the company's railway from a point near the northern terminus of the completed portion of that railway, at or near Longlaketon on the navigable water of Long lake, to a point at or near where the 52nd parallel of latitude crosses the South Saskatchewan river ; thence to a point at or near the elbow of the North Saskatchewan river with branches to Prince Albert and Battleford, about 325 miles.

	Acres.
2. For the portion from Regina to Long lake..	128,000
For the portion from the point at or near Longlaketon to Prince Albert..	1,497,344

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman might as well hand in his paper as read it in that tone of voice.

3. An area of about 258,228 acres was reserved for selection by the company by order in council dated December 30, 1884.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the House is entitled to the courtesy of a tone of voice that at least is meant to reach it.

Mr. OLIVER. Have I certainly the privilege of continuing, Mr. Speaker ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Certainly, you are answering the question.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You might use a megaphone.

Mr. OLIVER (reading) :

4. The area reserved comprised the odd numbered sections at the disposal of the government in the following townships :

Fractional township 26, the eastern third of township 27, and that part of township 21, north of the Canadian Pacific Railway belt and south of Long lake, in range 22 ; that part of township 21, north of the Canadian Pacific Railway belt, those parts of townships 22 and 23 west of Long lake, and the east half of township 26, in range 23 ; townships, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 29, and that part of township 26, west of Long lake, in range 24 ; townships 22, 23, 26, 27, 28 and 29, in range 25 ; townships 24, 25, 26, 27, 28 and 29, in range 26 ; and townships 25, 26, 27 and 28, in range 27, all west second meridian.

5. An area of 128,000 acres was assigned to the Land Corporation of Canada by assignment dated February 5, 1892. These lands have all been patented but one half section.

Applications for the issue of patents in the name of sundry persons were filed in the department by the company to the number of 117 for areas in each case of one section or less area between March 20, 1891, and September 5, 1902. These lands have all been patented.

A patent for an area of 2,240 acres was applied for in the name of Harvey Mat-

thews of White Bear lake, Minnesota, dated September 22, 1902. This land has been patented.

An area of 30,614.90 acres was assigned to Edmund Boyd Osler and Herbert Carlyle Hammond, of Toronto, and Augustus Meridith Nanton and Harry William Nanton, of Winnipeg by assignments dated November 30, 1902.

These lands have all been patented.

An area of 97,164·06 acres was assigned to Augustus Meredith Nanton, of Winnipeg by assignment dated December 30, 1902. These lands have all been patented.

An area of 839,640·97 acres was assigned to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company by assignment dated October 25, 1902. These lands are all selected and in course of being patented so far as surveyed.

An area of 239·92 acres was assigned to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company by assignment dated March 21, 1903. These lands are selected and in course of being patented.

6. In the case of each of the assignments or applications for patents referred to in the answer to question 5, the land assigned or to be patented was described in the document filed, except in the case of the two assignments to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, dated respectively October 25, 1902 and March 21, 1903.

The assignment dated October 25, 1902, conveyed to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company 839,640·97 acres of land more or less, being the lands set apart or to be set apart by the government of the Dominion of Canada for the vendors, the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company, as a land grant in respect of the railway of said Railroad and Steamboat Company as already located and constructed, under and by virtue of the provisions of chapter 60 of the Acts of the Parliament of Canada passed in the 48th and 49th years of Her late Majesty Queen Victoria's reign, and under chapter 23 of the Acts of said parliament passed in the 50th and 51st years of said reign and the orders in council passed in pursuance of said statutes, excepting therefrom the lands set forth in schedules 'A' and 'B' and 'C' thereunto annexed and the lands held, retained or reserved by the government of the Dominion of Canada as security under the subsidy contract between the government of the Dominion of Canada and the vendors, the said Railroad and Steamboat Company, and the 128,000 acres of land, portion of said land grant applicable to the first twenty miles of said railway from Regina heretofore assigned to the Land Corporation of Canada, and the land included in the right-of-way and station grounds of the vendors' line of railway as so located and constructed, subject to the conditions contained or to be contained in the grants of said land from the Crown and to the payment of ten cents an acre survey fees on said land and to the payment of all taxes which shall accrue or be chargeable against the said lands or any parts thereof, which survey fees and taxes are to be assumed and paid by the purchasers, their successors or assigns.

The assignment to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, dated March 21, 1903, was for an additional area and under the same conditions as those contained in the assignment dated October 25, 1902.

7. The area for selection by the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company of lands to satisfy its land subsidy was added to subsequent to the date of the order in council of December 30, 1884, by orders in council dated respectively February 4, 1901, June 10, 1892, and August 1, 1902.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the minister kindly inform me what point in the answer he is at now ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to follow the minister and I am very anxious to hear what he says. I want to know particularly if he is answering all the questions. I find it very difficult to follow him and I certainly could not hear his last answer. I am almost inclined to ask if he would repeat it.

Mr. OLIVER. Is it the wish of the House that I should re-read the answer.

Mr. BERGERON. The hon. gentleman had better hand it into Hansard if he cannot read so that we can hear.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I can assure the minister that it is absolutely impossible to hear him even where I am.

Mr. OLIVER. I submit I am not compelled to make myself a megaphone for the benefit of gentlemen who do not wish to keep order in the House.

Mr. FOSTER. You are doing better with your voice now.

Mr. OLIVER. (reading) :

8. The answer to question 7 answers this question.

9. The dates of the orders in council are given in answer to question 7.

The area added to the reserve made by order in council, December 30, 1884, by the orders in council referred to in the answer to question 7, was about 4,287,208 acres.

10. The latest assignment by the railway company of any portion of its land subsidy was as already given March 21, 1903. The latest order in council making any change in the land grant reserve of the railway company was dated August 1, 1902.

11. On June 11, 1902, Messrs. A. D. Davidson and George F. Piper wrote to the Dominion Lands Commissioner stating that they had purchased the entire land grant of the railway company and stating

that they expected the department to grant them the same area and privileges in the selection of these lands that had been previously offered to the railway company. The recommendation to council dated July 21, 1902, by the Minister of the Interior, which was approved on August 1, 1902, states as follows :

The undersigned has the honour to point out in connection with the land grant which was made to the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company many years ago and which the company declined to accept on the ground that the lands set apart were not fit for settlement, which subject he has devoted a considerable amount of his attention to in order to come to some settlement with respect to what has been considered a long standing difficulty, that to satisfy the company he some time ago caused an offer to be made which would permit the company to select lands to cover their land grant from any available Dominion lands in the province of Manitoba or in the Northwest Territories. The company, however, have declined to accept the offer, alleging that they were unable to procure sufficient lands of a satisfactory character, and have instituted proceedings against the Crown to compel the government to provide them with lands in accordance with the grant.

As the company has refused to accept the offer of the department to allow it to select any available lands in Manitoba or the Northwest Territories for the purposes of their land grant, the undersigned would now recommend that the area within which the land grant should be located should be confined to that portion originally set apart for the grant to the company and in addition those lands which are included in the schedule thereto annexed, and that the offer to allow selection in the province of Manitoba and other parts of the Northwest Territories be withdrawn. and that the lands so described be reserved for the purposes of such land grant.

12. On August 11, 1902, a copy of the order in council dated August 1, 1902, was mailed to Colonel A. D. Davidson, as agent of the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, which company was assignee of the railway company.

13. Yes, $1,154,457.74 of principal; $392,-047.08 of interest.

The Acts 48 and 49 Victoria, chapter 60, and 50 and 51 Victoria, chapter 23. The orders in council of June 26, 1889, the 31st October, 1890, and the 18th December, 1890. An agreement executed on the 5th August, 1889, by the late Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald as acting Minister of Railways and Canals and the late A. P. Bradley, as secretary of the Department of Railways and Canals, on behalf of the government, and by Thomas G. Shaughnessy and C. Drinkwater on behalf of the company.

14. An area of 493,269·34 acres is held by the government as security for the repayment of the unearned portions of the annual payments of $80,000 per annum payable to the company for twenty years under the provisions of the transport subsidy contract, dated August 5, 1889.

The government does not consider it advisable in this case to give an estimate of the value of the land, which has not been examined for the purpose of fixing a valuation.

TELEPHONE LEGISLATION.

Mr. INGRAM asked :

1. Is it the intention of the government to introduce any legislation this session affecting telephone companies ?

2. What amount was paid to witnesses and others for travelling and other expenses in connection with the inquiry made by the Select Committee on Telephone Systems last session, including all amounts paid for clerks, experts, expenses as representatives to telephone conventions, or for services performed for said select committee ?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I stated to my hon. friend the other day that he will have an answer to the first part of his question when the Minister of Railways and Canals introduces his Bill to amend the Railway Act. The answer to the second part of the question is as follows :—

Statement of expenditure to date.

1.	42 witnesses travelling expenses and maintenance while in Ottawa..	$1,089 50
2.	Reporting of evidence (stenographers)..	2,429 20
3.	Salary of technical adviser to committee, 10⅔ months from 20th March, 1905 to January 31st, 1906	2,363 70
4.	Clerical assistance, including typewriters, distribution of evidence, &c., &c...	1,966 50
5.	Legal expenses (Messrs. Chrysler & Bethune)..	800 00
6.	Translation of papers, &c. rereceived from foreign governments (in nine different languages)..	762 00
7.	Rental of room in city for distributing pamphlets..	110 00
8.	Travelling, &c., expenses of technical adviser to convention of United States Independent Telephone Companies at Chicago	100 00
9.	Envelopes for distribution of proceedings..	99 25
10.	Office stationery..	34 80
11.	Telephone books and magazines (subscriptions, &c.)..	22 06
12.	Sundries..	1 90
		$ 9,778 91
13.	Printing committee's daily proceedings and evidence, 240,000 pamphlets..	5,388 14
		$15,167 05

THE UNITED STATES HEAD TAX.

Mr. INGRAM asked :

1. Is the government aware of United States officials collecting two dollars per head from many Canadians who are crossing the boundary line between the two countries

2. Also, that in some cases those officials are collecting the above head tax while in Canadian territory, on account of their knowledge of the intention of the passenger to cross into United States territory ?

3. Has the government had any complaints along this line ? If so, did they communicate to the government of the United States this grievance ? If not, why not ?

4. If the government has had no communication with the government of the United States, will this government take action after being assured that there is a grievance in this regard ?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The government is aware that certain officials of the United States collect $2 per head from many Canadians who cross the boundary line between the two countries. It is not aware that in some cases these officials collect the tax while in Canadian territory, but the government has heard that in some cases United States consuls have appointed captains of steamers to collect the tax, as under the United States law the steamship company is liable. The government has had representations made to the United States with reference to this matter. In some cases the government of the United States has been informed of the facts, but generally has declined to interfere with the discretion of its officials.

WINTER COMMUNICATION WITH PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES asked :

1. Has the government or any department thereof, given a contract for the building of a steamer for the winter navigation of the Northumberland Straits, between Prince Edward Island and the mainland ?

2. If so, what will the said steamer cost, and when will she be ready for service ?

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

1. A steamer is now being built which will in conjunction with another steamer assist in the winter navigation of the Northumberland Straits.

2. $215,000. The 1st of July next.

MARCONI WIRELESS TELEGRAPHY.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN asked :

When does the government expect to have a Marconi Wireless Telegraph service across the Atlantic ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). The Canadian station is ready and as soon as the new English one is completed, commercial transatlantic work will be organized.

SALES OF LAND IN THE NORTHWEST.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY asked :

1. Since 1st July, 1896, how many sales of agricultural or grazing land, other than school land, affecting 5,000 acres or more at a time, have been made by the government in Manitoba and the Northwest ?

2. When and to whom were each of said sales made ; at what price per acre ; and what was the area and what the situation and boundaries of each block ?

3. What public document sets forth the conditions of each such sale, and where may such document be examined by members of this House ?

4. Was the land sold in odd or even sections, or both, in each case ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior).

1. Four.

2. On the 27th October, 1905, to the Grand Forks Cattle Company, Limited, at $1 an acre. Area sold 9,452·65 acres. Boundaries—townships 11 and 12, range 11; townships 11 and 12, range 12; and township 12, range 13, all west of 4th meridian.

On the 22nd January, 1906, to the Milk River Cattle Company, at $1 an acre. Area sold 5,831·90 acres. Boundaries—townships 2, ranges 9, 10 and 11, west of 4th meridian.

On the 21st January, 1902, to the New Walrond Ranche Company, Limited. Area sold, 6,113·10 acres. Price, $1.25 per acre. Boundaries—townships 10, ranges 1 and 2, west of 5th meridian.

In January, 1904, to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, Limited. Area sold, 140,253 acres. Price per acre, $1. Boundaries—townships 22 to 31, inclusive, in ranges 26 to 29, west of the 2nd meridian; and ranges 1 to 6, west of the 3rd meridian, all inclusive.

3. The regulations respecting grazing lands, and hay lands, under which the first mentioned two sales were made, are included in the Order in Council of 15th February, 1905. Printed copies of these regulations are now laid on the table for examination by members of the House. The sale to the New Walrond Ranche Company was made under order in council of 22nd April, 1903, a copy of which is now laid on the table. The sale to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, Limited, was made under order in council of 24th May, 1902, a copy of which is now laid on the table.

4. The first, second and third sales above mentioned included odd and even numbered sections; and the fourth sale included even numbered sections.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

Has any arrangement been made by the government since July, 1903, by transference or by sale, by virtue of which a large block of public lands in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta passed out of the possession of the government into the hands of private

individuals or corporations? If so, what quantity of lands were involved, what was the nature of the transaction, and the consideration involved?

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

DISTRICT OF KEEWATIN.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE asked:

1. How long was the district of Keewatin governed under the Keewatin Act?
2. When the new Northwest Territories Act passed the House last session, was Keewatin included within those Territories?
3. Has Keewatin, since the close of the 1905 session, been brought under the Northwest Territories Act by proclamation?
4. If so, what was the date of such proclamation, and what were the reasons for the change?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior).

1. From 7th October, 1876, to 31st August, 1905.
2. No.
3. Yes.
4. 24th July, 1905. To remove the anomaly of a separate district under a distinct government, completely dividing the western from the eastern half of the Northwest Territories.

GERMAN SURTAX.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked:

1. In what year was the German treaty with Great Britain denounced?
2. When was the surtax placed on German goods coming into Canada, and what restrictions did it impose?
3. What are the rates of discriminatory duties imposed by the German government on the following goods imported from Canada: wheat, flour, oats, bacon, hams, butter, cheese and apples?
4. What were our total imports from Germany for each year from 1896 to 1905, inclusive?
5. What were our total exports to Germany for each year from 1896 to 1905, inclusive?
6. What were our exports to Germany for each year from 1896 to 1905, inclusive, on the following articles: wheat, flour, oats, bacon, hams, butter, cheese and apples?
7. What steps, if any, have been taken to ameliorate the present conditions in favour of Canadian trade?
8. What are the present trade relations between Canada and Germany?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

1. In 1898.
2. In November, 1903. 'Articles which are the growth, produce or manufacture of Germany, when imported into Canada, shall be subject to a surtax over and above the duties specified in Schedule A. to the Customs Tariff, 1897, such surtax in every case to be one-third of the duty specified in the said schedule.'
3. Notice was given in the 'Reichsanzeiger' of June 14, 1898, fixing the date on which Canada ceased to receive most favoured treatment as the 31st July, 1898.

The provisions of the German general tariff on the articles referred to are as follows:

Wheat, 54 cents per 100 pounds; flour of wheat, $1.14 per 100 pounds; oats, 43·2 cents per 100 pounds; bacon, $2.17 per 100 pounds; hams, $2.17 per 100 pounds; butter, $2.17 per 100 pounds; cheese, $2.17 per 100 pounds; apples, dried, 43·1 cents per 100 pounds; apples, green, free.

Attached to supplement No. 8 of the German tariff is the following:

'Dutiable goods proceeding from states that treat German ships or products less favourably than those of other states may, in so far as existing treaties are not thereby violated, be burdened with a surtax varying up to 100 per cent of the tariff duty imposed on such goods. Goods free of duty in virtue of the tariff may under the same conditions be burdened with a duty not exceeding 20 per cent ad valorem.'

The actual percentage since added to each individual item is not shown.

4 and 5.

Years ended June 30.	Total Imports.	Canadian Produce.	Foreign Produce.	Totals.	Total Trade.
	$	$	$	$	$
1896	6,454,705	606,919	150,612	757,531	7,212,236
1897	5,785,546	764,589	280,843	1,045,432	6,830,978
1898	5,763,784	1,419,096	418,352	1,837,448	7,601,232
1899	7,382,499	1,310,373	909,196	2,219,569	9,602,068
1900	8,706,641	1,108,163	607,740	1,715,903	10,422,544
1901	6,679,264	1,374,716	766,836	2,141,552	8,820,816
1902	10,919,994	1,298,654	1,393,924	2,692,578	13,612,572
1903	12,127,867	1,618,517	479,182	2,097,699	14,225,566
1904	8,028,544	1,358,910	460,313	1,819,223	9,847,767
1905	6,642,139	1,123,586	23,068	1,146,654	7,788,793

6. If the hon. gentleman will move for a return for No. 6, I shall produce it immediately.

7. Correspondence and negotiations having been unsuccessful, the surtax was imposed. No other steps were open to the government.

8. The government have been approached through a representative of the German government with a view to a removal of some of the trade restrictions in both countries. The suggestions so offered will be taken into consideration by the ministers in framing the revised tariff.

CIVIL SERVANTS.

Mr. WALSH asked :

1. Are civil servants in the employ of the government at Ottawa permitted to engage in any occupation, business or work outside the performance of their duty ?

2. In how many departments is this permitted?

3. How many civil servants carry on any business or work outside of their official duties?

4. What is the policy of the government with respect to this question ?

5. What rule does the government enforce with respect to postmasters, customs officers and other officials in the outside service in this matter ?

6. Have any persons been dismissed, or threatened with dismissal, since the 1st of January, 1900, for this reason ?

7. Who are such persons, and in what position were they employed, what annual salary did each of them receive, and what is the date of their dismissal ?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs) :

1. Under the Consolidated Revenue and Audit Act (Sections 13 and 14) it is provided that no officer or person employed in collecting, managing or accounting for the revenue, receiving a salary at or exceeding the rate of one thousand dollars per annum, shall exercise any other calling, profession, trade or employment whatsoever with a view to derive profit therefrom, directly or indirectly, or shall hold any other office of profit whatsoever, except, in either case, with the express permission of the Governor in Council.

2. The rule in the Customs Department is as above stated.

3. There is no record in the Customs department as to how many civil servants in that department carry on any business or work outside of their official duties.

5. The rule as laid down in the Audit Act is generally observed by the Customs officers in the outside service.

6. No person has been dismissed or threatened with dismissal from the Customs service since 1st January, 1900 for transgressing this rule.

STONY CREEK ARMOURY.

Mr. E. D. SMITH—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

Is the government aware of the fact that the roof of the armoury at Stony Creek, Wentworth county, was damaged by fire, that officers of the Militia Department examined the building last fall, and that nothing so far has been done to repair the building; also that the clothing stored therein is in danger of being seriously damaged ?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). The government is aware that the Stony Creek armoury was damaged by fire, and that it has not been repaired ; also that the building was examined with a view to its being repaired. As regards the clothing stated to be stored therein, the only corps at Stony Creek is No. 5 Company, 77th Regiment. That Regiment has a central armoury at Dundas. Under such circumstances if the officer commanding the company has the clothing at company headquarters, he is responsible for its safety and the department is not under any obligation to provide accommodation for it.

SHERBROOKE CAMP.

Mr. TOBIN—by Mr. Bureau—asked :

1. Is it the intention of the government to hold a military camp at Sherbrooke this year ?

2. Is it the intention of the government to purchase or lease lands in or in the vicinity of the city of Sherbrooke for the purpose of holding annual camps ?

3. Have any orders been given or steps taken for the purchase or lease of such lands, or have any officials of the department been authorized to look over or select said lands, or to open negotiations with any individual or the city council of Sherbrooke to that effect ?

4. Have any other sites in the eastern townships, outside of the city or county of Sherbrooke, been examined and reported upon for the same purpose ? If so, where and by whom? If not, why not ?

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

1. and 2. It has not been decided whether a military camp will be held at Sherbrooke or not. The question is under consideration.

3. The officer commanding Quebec has been in Sherbrooke inspecting a site and advising with the local authorities.

4. Not yet.

NORTH ATLANTIC TRADING COMPANY.

Mr. AMES asked :

1. What amount was paid in bonuses to the North Atlantic Trading Company between 1st July, 1905, and 31st December, 1905 ?

2. What was the outstanding amount claimed as due the company on the 1st of January, 1906?

3. For how many settlers did the company receive or demand payment between the 1st of July and the 31st December, 1905 ?

4. What additional amounts were claimed by or paid to the same company during the aforesaid six months for advertising, literature and other objects ?

5. Has literature, prepared at the instance of the Canadian government, been furnished this

company for distribution ? If so, to what extent and value ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. $56,287.86.
2. No claim sent in by the company for that date.
3. Between dates mentioned bonus was paid on 11,566 persons.
4. $3,443.35.
5. No.

ORILLIA POSTMASTERSHIP.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

1. How long has the postmastership at Orillia been vacant ?
2. Is it the intention of the department to appoint an officer to such a position ? If so, when ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Postmaster General) :

1. The Postmastership of Orillia has been vacant since the 22nd October last.
2. The matter of appointing a new postmaster is under consideration.

POSTMASTERS' DUTIES.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

1. Is it the policy of the Post Office Department to compel postmasters to attend personally to the duties of their office, and not to engage in any other calling ?
2. If so, is regard to be had to the salary paid to the postmaster, or what rule, if any, prevails ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Postmaster General.) It is and has always been the policy and the practice of the department to require postmasters to give personal attention to the duties of their offices, and where a post office is sufficiently important to call for the full time and attention of the postmaster, and the salary adequate for his maintenance, it is considered undesirable that he should engage in any other business.

DREDGING IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN asked :

1. Is it the intention of the government to appoint a superintendent of dredging in Prince Edward Island ?
2. Has the Department of Public Works arranged for the location of dredges in Prince Edward Island waters for the season of 1906 ? If so, where are the same to be located ?
3. Is the government aware of the immediate necessity of dredging the channel at Crapaud Harbour, Queen's County, Prince Edward Island and will dredging be done there this season ?

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

1. There is already a superintendent of dredging for the maritime provinces, including Prince Edward Island.
2. The dredging program, for season of 1906, is now under consideration.

MAIL SERVICE—COLDWATER AND LAWSON.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

1. Who is the contractor for the mail service between Coldwater, Lawson and Lovering, either or both of same ?
2. What amount is paid therefor ?
3. Was the same put up for public competition ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Postmaster General). A contract for this service was let by tender in 1897 and awarded to the lowest tenderer, W. H. Lovering, at $130 a year. On its expiring in 1901 it was renewed with the same contractor at the same price for four years ending on the 31st March, 1905, and it was then renewed for another term of four years from 31st March 1905, with the same contractor at $156 a year.

RAILWAY CLERKS FROM NORTH YORK.

Mr. LENNOX asked :

1. How many railway clerks have been appointed from the riding of North York since 1896 ?
2. What are the names, and post office addresses of such, if any ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Postmaster General) :

1. Six, one of whom has since resigned.
2. B. J. O'Brien, Laskay, Ont.; F. Kavanagh, Queensville, Ont.; A. E. Cain, Newmarket, Ont.; J. A. M. Armstrong, Lloydtown, Ont. (since resigned); L. Wilson, Lloydtown, Ont.; J. F. Doyle, Lloydtown, Ont.

LAKE ST. LOUIS—HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS.

Mr. PICHE asked :

1. Are the hydrographic plans of Lake St. Louis now completed ?
2. If so, since when have they been completed ?
3. If not, when are they to be completed ?
4. At what date can the maps based on those plans be delivered to interested parties and to the public ?

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

1. No.
3. The surveys will be completed about the 1st of July next. The plans must be ready for delivery, on the 1st of May, 1907.
4. During the season of 1907.

LAKE OF TWO MOUNTAINS—HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEYS.

Mr. PICHE asked :

1. Is it the intention of the Government to have the hydrographic plans of the Lake of Two Mountains made ?
2. If so, when is that work to be commenced and how long will it take to complete it ?

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

1. Yes.

2. During next season. It will take two seasons to complete the work.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY LAND GRANT.

Mr. LAKE asked :

1. Has the Canadian Pacific Railway completed the selection of their land grant ?

2. Have patents been issued for all the land selected ?

3. If not, how much still remains to be selected or patented, in either case ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Yes.

2. Patents have been issued or are in course of being issued for all lands, except those as yet unsurveyed.

3. A total area of 1,541,585 acres remains yet to be patented.

OPENING OF INDIAN RESERVES.

Mr. LAKE asked :

1. What Indian reserves or portions of Indian reserves have been placed upon the market or opened for settlement since the 1st January, 1905, and on what terms and conditions ?

2. Is it the intention of the government to open up any existing Indian reserves or portions of them during the present year ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. The only Indian reserve, or portion of an Indian reserve, placed in the market since the first of January, 1905, was portion of the Assiniboia Indian reserve, comprising the southerly nine sections thereof which were offered for sale by public auction at Sintaluta, Sask., on Wednesday, the 14th ultimo. The lands were offered for sale in quarter sections for cash or one-fifth cash and the balance in four equal annual instalments with interest at 5 per cent. 34 quarter sections sold $35,345.45. Average price, $6.74 per acre.

2. It is the intention to open for sale the following lands, which have been surrendered by the Indians to be sold for their benefit :

a. A portion of the Stony Indian reserve Nos. 110 and 111, situated about thirteen miles south of Battleford, comprising 22½ sections, which have been duly subdivided for the purpose of sale.

b. A portion of Alexander's reserve, No. 134, about 25 miles from Edmonton, comprising 9,518 acres, which have been surrendered by the Indians to be sold for their benefit, and which will be subdivided as early as possible for purpose of sale.

c. A portion of the Cote Indian reserve, No. 64, situated at Kamsack, comprising about 32 sections, which have been surrendered by the Indians for sale and which will be subdivided for that purpose as early as possible.

POST OFFICE AT BLOOMING POINT, P.E.I.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN asked :

Has the Postmaster General received a petition from the inhabitants of Blooming Point, Queen's County, Prince Edward Island, asking for the establishment of a post office in the centre of the northern end of Blooming Point district, and for a tri-weekly mail service ? If so, what action, if any, has been taken in the matter ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Postmaster General). A petition was received on March 7, 1906, from Allan McDonald and others, praying for the opening of a new post office at a distance of two or three miles from Blooming Point, County Queen's, P.E.I. This petition was on the same day referred to the assistant inspector at Charlottetown, for inquiry and report. No report has yet reached the department.

BREAKWATER AT WOOD ISLAND, P.E.I.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked :

1. Is the government aware that a portion of the breakwater at Wood Island, Prince Edward Island, has been carried away, rendering it unfit for shipping ?

2. Does the government intend to immediately proceed with the repairs ?

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

1 and 2. A report has been received from the resident engineer on present state of this work, and it is now receiving the consideration of the department.

NEW DREDGE FOR PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked :

1. Has the new dredge for Prince Edward Island been completed and ready for service ?

2. If so, where is she first intended to work, and what harbours in Prince Edward Island is it proposed to dredge in the coming season?

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

1. The dredge is completed, but the trial tests are not yet made.

2. The dredging program for Prince Edward Island, season of 1906, is now under consideration.

DREDGING PINETTE HARBOUR, P.E.I.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked :

1. Has the government received a petition or report of a public meeting held in reference to the dredging of Pinette Harbour, Prince Edward Island ?

2. Has a survey been made or ordered to be made ? If the latter, what is the nature of the report ?

3. Does the government intend to proceed with the dredging of this harbour early in the coming season ?

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

1. Yes.

2. An examination has been made, but no decision has been had on the matter, which is receiving the consideration of the department.

GUN BOATS SUNK IN RIVER THAMES, ONTARIO.

Mr. KEMP—By Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. Has the attention of the government been called to the efforts on the part of a citizen of the United States to get possession of certain gun boats, which were ordered to be sunk by a British officer, in the Thames, near Chatham, Ontario, in the year 1813, for the purpose of removing same to the United States, to be exhibited as trophies ?

2. If so, what action does the government intend to take in the matter ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The government is now in communication with the British authorities in reference to this matter.

REDEMPTION OF WORN SILVER COIN.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked:

1. Does the government propose to redeem worn Canadian silver coin now in circulation, or do anything to abate the trouble caused by its circulation ?

2. Would its re-coinage entail any heavy loss on the government ?

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

1. Although the law contains no explicit provisions under which worn silver can be redeemed, small amounts have been redeemed from time to time. To overcome any difficulty it is proposed to introduce legislation providing for such redemption.

2. The cost of recoinage is comparatively small.

ADMISSION TO CONFEDERATION OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND BRITISH WEST INDIES.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked:

1. Has the government taken any steps, or has any progress been made with a view to unite Newfoundland and the British West India Islands with the Dominion of Canada ?

2. If so, of what nature ? If not, why not ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The government of Newfoundland is aware that we are ready to enter into communication with them at any time that they choose to discuss the subject of bringing the island into confederation. With regard to the British West Indies, we are prepared to extend our relations with them, but we are not prepared at this time to invite or encourage political union.

BARRACKS AT MONTREAL.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Has the government obtained a site for the erection of barracks at Montreal ? If so, what is the site that has been chosen ?

2. If the choice of a site has not been made, what is the cause of the delay, and what negotiations have taken place in this connection ?

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

1. Several sites have been offered, but no selection yet made.

2. The new site will be purchased with funds to accrue from the sale of St. Helen's Island to the city of Montreal, subject, of course, to a vote of parliament. The city is seeking authority from the provincial legislature to enable it to assess the required amount and hand it over to the Receiver-General. Meantime no further action can be taken by the Department of Militia.

USE OF WATER POWER, NIAGARA FALLS.

Mr. LANCASTER asked:

1. Has the government been informed of any communication sent by the President or government of the United States to the Imperial government, asking that the government prevent the use of the water of the Niagara river for developing electric energy, so as to preserve scenic effects at Niagara Falls ?

2. If so, will any provision be made to compensate any private or industrial interests which may be affected ?

3. What instructions, if any, have been given representatives on the commission on the subject ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I have to inform my hon. friend that the government is not aware that any representations of this character have been made by the United States authorities.

IMMIGRANT HOSPITAL, QUEBEC.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Has the amount of $30,000 voted last year for the construction of a hospital at Quebec, for treatment of immigrants suffering from trachoma, been fully expended, and how much did the site cost ?

2. What is the total amount expended to date in connection with the said hospital at Quebec ?

3. How many immigrants have been treated in said hospital during the past three years ?

4. What is the amount expended during the last two years for the maintenance of the said hospital ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

3. The number of immigrants treated at the Quebec hospital was :

For the fiscal year 1903-04	817
For the fiscal year 1904-05	1,422
To December of the fiscal year 1905-06	528
Total	2,767

4. Gross expenditure for 1903-04 was $6,025.76; deduct amount refunded by ss. companies, $1,606.60; net expenditure, 1903-04, $4,419.16; gross expenditure for 1904-05 was $15,277.27; deduct amount refunded by ss. companies, $13,143.07; net expenditure, 1904-05, $2,134.20; total net expenditure for 1903-04 and 1904-05, $6,553.36.

Right Hon. SIR WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) has answered only for his own department; the first part of the question has not been answered. For the Public Works Department I have to observe :

1. A contract has been entered into for the construction of the hospital. No site has been purchased, the building is to be erected on the site previously occupied by the burnt hospital.

2. The total amount expended up to date is $41,247.71, divided as follows :

On burnt building..	$34,731 22
On temporary quarters..	6,176 55
On new building..	339 94
	$41,247 71

GEORGIAN BAY CANAL SURVEY.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. What is the total amount expended to date upon the Georgian Bay Canal survey, undertaken by the present government ?

2. Is the survey terminated ?

3. Have any reports been made to the government by those in charge of the survey ? If so, what reports have been made, by what officers, and what dates do they bear ?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) :

1. $460,361.13.

2. Almost all the field work is completed and the staff is now engaged in the preparation of the plans, profiles, &c.

3. A progress report has been made by the engineer in charge, and will be embodied in the annual report of this department for the fiscal year of 1904-05.

MONTREAL POST OFFICE IMPROVEMENTS.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. What improvements have been made in the Montreal post office, with the sum of $25,000 voted by parliament last session ?

2. Is it the intention of the government to enlarge the Montreal post office, and provide better accommodation for the public ?

3. When will such improvement be carried out ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Postmaster General). Nothing has been done so far. The Post Office Department is waiting to see what effect the postal stations, established or to be established throughout Montreal, will have on the central post office, before making the proposed alterations.

Mr. OLIVER.

STEAMER BETWEEN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND AND MAINLAND.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN asked :

Is it the intention of the government to call for tenders for the immediate construction of a steamer for winter service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). A steamer is now being built which will in conjunction with another steamer assist in the winter navigation of the Northumberland Straits.

PROTECTION AGAINST GLANDERS.

Mr. STAPLES asked :

1. How many horses have been tested for glanders with mallein in the province of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, respectively, by officials of this government ?

2. Who were the owners of the horses ?

3. What was the name of the official, and date of application in each case ?

4. When were the horses destroyed in each case ?

5. When did the owners receive compensation in each case ?

6. How much did the respective owners receive, and what was the valuation in each case ?

7. What were the variations of temperature in each case, and the highest and lowest readings ?

8. How many cases have been quarantined who were the owners, and what was the period of quarantine ?

9. How many were re-tested, and what was the result ? Were any of those re-tested afterwards slaughtered ? If so, what compensation was paid, who were the owners, and what was the amount paid to each ?

10. In cases where they were slaughtered after being tested, were any post mortem investigations held ? If so, what was the result in each case, and who were the owners ?

11. Has the government any intention of changing its present system of dealing with glanders ? If so, what policy does it intend to institute ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). The information called for in this question will take two or three extra clerks from one to two months to prepare. If the hon. gentleman wishes to get the information he must ask for an order of the House.

PROTECTION OF LABOURERS ON GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC.

Mr. RALPH SMITH asked :

1. Has any provision been made for securing to the workingmen to be employed in the construction of the Transcontinental Railway the payment of fair wages, in accordance with the resolution of the House of Commons of March, 1900, and section 205, chapter 58 of the Railway Act, 1903, in the case of : (a) contracts already awarded or to be awarded by the commissioners, for the construction of the Transcontinental Railway ; (b) contracts already awarded or to be awarded by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.

2. Have any other provisions for the protection of labour been inserted in such contracts ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Labour) :

1. (a) The form of contract adopted by the commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway contains the following provisions in regard to the payment of fair wages to workingmen to be employed in the construction of the part of the road being constructed by the commissioners.

'All mechanics, labourers, or other persons who perform labour for the purposes of the construction of the works hereby contracted for shall be paid such wages as are generally accepted as current for competent workmen in the district in which the work is being performed ; and, if there is no current rate in such district, then a fair and reasonable rate, and in the event of a dispute arising as to what is the current or a fair and reasonable rate, it shall be determined by the commissioners, whose decision shall be final.

'This agreement is subject to the regulations now in force or which may at any time hereafter be in force during the construction of the works hereby contracted for, made under the authority of the Department of Labour and which are or shall be applicable to such works.'

(b) The form of contract adopted by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company contains the following provisions in regard to the payment of fair wages to workingmen to be employed in the construction of the part of the road being constructed by the Company :

'All mechanics, labourers or other persons who perform labour in the construction of the works hereby contracted for shall be paid such wages as are generally accepted as current for competent workmen in the district in which the work is being performed, and if there is no current rate in such district, then a fair and reasonable rate, and, in the event of a dispute arising as to what is the current or a fair and reasonable rate, it shall be determined by the Minister of Labour, whose decision shall be final.'

2. The form of contract adopted by both the commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company contains provisions to secure the full and prompt payment by contractors, of wages to all labour employed in or about the construction work ; to prevent the use of intoxicating liquors anywhere on or near the work; to compel compliance with the provisions of the Act respecting the preservation of health on public works, and of regulations made or to be made under the said Act ; to compel contractors at their own expense to make adequate arrangements for the medical and sanitary supervision of all their employees, and for that purpose to employ the necessary duly qualified medical practitioners, furnish and provide necessary medicines, surgical instruments and hospital accommodation; the duties of the medical staff to include not only the attendance on sick or injured men, but the inspection of the sanitary arrangements of all camps, dwellings or works, at least once a month or oftener if, in the opinion of the engineer, it is necessary; all of which provisions have been inserted for the protection of labour.

WRECKS ON PACIFIC COAST.

Mr. RALPH SMITH asked :

1. How many wrecks have there been on the Pacific coast in Canadian waters in 1900, 1901, 1902, 1903, 1904, 1905 and 1906, up to date, British and foreign ?
2. What was the number of lives lost in each wreck ?
3. What was the total financial loss of ships and cargoes ?
4. Has the government made any special inquiries into the cause of such wrecks ?
5. If so, what are the causes given for such wrecks ?
6. Have any reflections been made in the reports of such investigations, on the examinations of hulls or machinery, by the British Columbia inspectors ?
7. What was the port of registry of each vessel wrecked ?
8. What was the age of each ship ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). The information asked is voluminous and is now being prepared. It will be furnished later on in the form of a return, if the hon. gentleman would be kind enough to give notice of motion.

CONSTRUCTION OF QUEBEC BRIDGE.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. What is the total amount paid to date by the government of Canada for the construction of the Quebec bridge ?
2. What is the total amount of bonds guaranteed by the government in connection with the construction of said bridge ?
3. How far has the work of construction of said bridge progressed ?
4. What proportion of said bonds guaranteed by the government has been negotiated, and at what figure ?
5. Have any of the said bonds been pledged ? If so, to whom ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister. The total amount paid up to date is $334,353.03. The total amount of bonds guaranteed is $6,678,200. None of the bonds guaranteed by the government have been sold. Authority has been given to the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company to pledge to the Bank of Montreal and La Banque de Paris et de Pays-Bas for the purpose of raising money and a portion of the issue has been so placed.

DIRECTORS QUEBEC BRIDGE COMPANY.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. What three directors at present represent the government on the board of directors of the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company ?

2. Who are the other eight directors of the said company ?

3. Who is at present the president of the said company, and when was he elected to the said office ?

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

1. The three directors on behalf of the government are Messrs. Laliberté, Narcisse Rioux, and Dumoulin, manager of the Molson's Bank.

2. I do not know the names of the other directors.

3. The president is Mr. Parent.

POSTAL REVENUE OF BRANTFORD.

Mr. COCKSHUTT—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. What was the total postal revenue of the city of Brantford for each year from 1900 to 1905, inclusive ?

2. What was the value of postal notes issued at the Brantford office for the same years ?

3. What was the value of the postal notes redeemed at the above office for the same years ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Postmaster General :

1. Revenue.

1900	$26,550 78
1901	28,796 67
1902	32,349 07
1903	33,748 43
1904	36,773 56
1905	42,921 10

2. Value of Postal Notes issued.

1900	$2,641 24
1901	2,991 19
1902	2,818 15
1903	3,920 38
1904	4,862 49
1905	6,903 85

3. Value of Postal Notes redeemed.

1900	$ 9,328 21
1901	10,093 10
1902	10,927 02
1903	11,032 88
1904	15,427 51
1905	16,061 53

CUSTOMS REVENUE OF BRANTFORD.

Mr. COCKSHUTT—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. What was the amount of customs duty collected at the port of Brantford each year from 1900 to 1905, inclusive ?

2. What was the yearly cost of collecting the above duty ?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs :

	Customs duty.	Cost of collecting.
1899-1900	$178,540 10	$3,660 15
1900-1901	198,147 58	3,812 16
1901-1902	213,887 19	3,197 77
1902-1903	263,223 30	3,907 10
1903-1904	262,237 11	4,742 75
1904-1905	225,662 86	4,832 23

BRANTFORD POST OFFICE—SALARIES AND WAGES.

Mr. COCKSHUTT—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. What was the total amount of wages paid at Brantford post office to all employees for each year from 1900 to 1905 ?

2. What were the wages paid to letter carriers for the same years ?

3. What is the number of employees in Brantford post office at present ?

4. What is the salary at present paid to each ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Postmaster General :

1.

1899-00	$ 8,386 57
1900-01	9,342 28
1901-02	9,933 03
1902-03	11,335 02
1903-04	12,292 07
1904-05	12,909 15

2.

1899-00	2,595 00
1900-01	3,630 00
1901-02	4,203 75
1902-03	5,223 64
1903-04	5,462 91
1904-05	6,039 25

3. Twenty (20).

4.

Raymond, W. G., postmaster,	$2,000
Montgomery, J. C., asst. "	1,100
Tranmer, E. G., clerk	800
Tisdale, W. F., clerk	700
Taylor, G. D., clerk	700
Hartley, H. J., clerk	650
Nightingale, G. E., clerk	475
Heath, V. S., clerk	410
Mizener, A. S., clerk	300
Carlin, R. J., clerk	240

Letter carriers.	per diem.
Waddington, H	$2 25
Schuler, W	2 25
Lake, W	2 25
Aitken, A	2 25
Broatch, Geo	2 25
Cox, J. A	1 75
Adam, J. A	1 75
Lutes, C	1 75
Stevens, A. J	1 75
Ion, F. E	1 50

MONTREAL POST OFFICE—ABSENCE AND OVERTIME.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Are the post office employees at Montreal, whether in the inside or outside service, paid extra when obliged to work overtime ? If so, at what rate are they paid for such extra service ?

2. Is a deduction made from the salary of the employees of the postal department at Montreal when they are absent through illness, or from any other justifiable cause ? If so, at what rate is their salary reduced ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Postmaster General :

1. No.

2. Each case of absence is dealt with on its merits and pay is allowed or withheld

according to circumstances. When deductions are made the amount withheld is the actual salary, which, during the period of absence, would have been earned by attendance.

WHARF AT GRANDE VALLEE.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. What is the total cost of the wharf constructed by the present government at Grande Vallée, P.Q. ?
2. What income has been derived from the said wharf by the government for the year ending June 30, 1905 ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Public Works).

1. $57,488.13.
2. None ; the wharf was completed in the spring of 1905, only.

POST OFFICE AT MAGOG.

Mr. WORTHINGTON asked :

1. Is it the intention of the government to erect a post office in the town of Magog, Stanstead county, during the present year ?
2. If such a building is not at present contemplated, when is it likely to be considered ?
3. Has a site for such a building been selected in the town of Magog ? If so, where ?
4. If a site for the post office has been procured, from whom was it bought, and what was the price paid ?
5. Has any one residing in the town of Magog been authorized by the government to purchase or open negotiations for the purchase or acquirement of a post office site ?
6. If a site has been procured, are there any buildings thereon which will have to be removed ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for Minister of Public Works) :

1. Yes.
2. Plans are being prepared.
3. Yes. On Pine street.
4. Bought from Messrs H. N. Rivard and A. Tourigny. Price, $3,200.
5. Dr. Goyette secured the option from the owners.
6. Yes.

FLOUR SUPPLIED TO PENITENTIARIES.

Mr. STAPLES asked :

1. Were tenders called for flour supplied to the Kingston penitentiary, what quantity, and to whom was the contract awarded ?
2. Were tenders called for flour supplied to the St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, what quantity, and to whom was the contract awarded ?
3. Were tenders called for flour supplied to the Dorchester penitentiary, what quantity, and to whom was the contract awarded ?

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice) :

1. Yes, and nine tenders were received, 1,450 barrels. The Campbell Milling Company, Limited, Toronto Junction, their tender, $3.84 per barrel f.o.b. Kingston being the lowest.
2. Yes, and nine tenders were received, 1,000 barrels. The Campbell Milling Company, Limited, Toronto Junction, their tender $3.84 per barrel f.o.b. St. Vincent de Paul, being the lowest.
3. Yes, and eight tenders were received 700 barrels. The Campbell Milling Company, Limited, Toronto Junction, their tender $4.04 per barrel f.o.b. Penitentiary siding, Dorchester, being the lowest.

Mr. WILLIAM JACKSON asked :

1. How many officials of the civil service rank as deputy ministers, and what period of service and salary have they in each case ?
2. Are all such officials entitled to wear the Windsor uniform? If so, of which class ?
3. What are the names of the principal officers of the Senate and the House of Commons who have seats on the floor of either House, and what is the salary, length of service and relative rank in each case ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). There are 17 deputy heads of departments in the public service with one vacancy, that of the directorship of the Geological Survey as follows :

Name.	Service.	Salary.
		$ cts.
J. M. Courtney, C.M.G. I.S.O.	27 years.	5,000 00
Antoine Gobeil, I.S.O.	34 "	4,000 00
S. E. Dawson, Lit.D., F.R.S.C.	15 "	4,000 00
W. G. Parmalee, I.S.O.	30 "	4,200 00
E. L. Newcombe, K.C.	13 "	4,000 00
Frederick White, C.M.G.	37 "	4,000 00
Joseph Pope, C.M.G.	27 "	4,000 00
F. F. Gourdeau	45 "	4,000 00
John McDougald	10 "	4,000 00
R. M. Coulter, M.D	9 years.	4,000 00
L. F. Pinault, C.M.G	8 "	4,000 00
W. L. Mackenzie King, M.A	6 "	4,000 00
W. J. Gerald	39 "	4,000 00
G. F. O'Halloran	4 "	3,800 00
Francis Pedley	9 "	4,000 00
W. W. Cory	5 "	3,500 00
M. J. Butler, C.E	2 "	6,000 00

There are in addition to the above, five officers who have by statute the rank of deputy head, namely :

Name.	Rank.	Salary.
		$ cts.
A. L. Decelles, Lit.D., F.R.S.C	26 years.	4,000 00
M. J. Griffin, LL.D.	21 "	4,000 00
E. R. Cameron, K.C.	8 "	3,200 00
William Fitzgerald, M.A	21 "	4,000 00
Fred Montizambert, I.S.O., M.D	40 "	4,000 00

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The second and third parts of the question are not answered.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know what is meant by the question :

What are the names of the principal officers of the Senate and the House of Commons who have seats on the floor of either House ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Questions 2 and 3 of No. 61.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Oh, the Windsor uniform ! I am sorry to say that I am not up in those mysteries, and I cannot give any information.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. About question 3; there was an official document with the coat of arms circulated speaking of certain officers of parliament who were entitled to the floor of the chamber, and I suppose that is what the question refers to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sorry to say I cannot give any information.

ALIEN LABOUR ACT.

Mr. TAYLOR—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. Was an appeal made to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council from the judgment of Mr. Justice Anglin, with respect to the validity of the Alien Labour Act?

2. Has such appeal been heard ? If not, when is the hearing expected ?

3. Has any judgment been given on such appeal ? If so, what is the effect thereof ?

4. If no judgment has been given, when is judgment expected ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The government has no information upon this subject.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The government should have some information about it because it is in appeal.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). Leave to appeal has been granted, but the appeal has not yet been heard on its merits.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When is it expected it will be.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It ought to be heard before the first of July; leave was granted last August.

NATURALIZATION OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS IN WESTERN CANADA.

Mr. TAYLOR—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. Has the attention of the government been directed to the following passage in the recent report of Mr. C. V. C. Van Duesen, special examiner of the Department of Justice of the United States, relative to naturalization : 'A new phase in fraud in citizenship involving naturalization has developed since the establishment of the Republic of Cuba and the

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

wonderful development of the farming interests in the Northwest provinces of Canada. It is the dual citizenship maintained by naturalized citizens of the United States, who have taken the oath of allegiance to the republic of Cuba, but still retain their certificate of United States citizenship, which they are at liberty to use, and undoubtedly have done so whenever their convenience or necessity demands such use. It is conservatively estimated that 50,000 native and naturalized citizens of the United States, chiefly from the border states, have taken up the prolific wheat lands in Manitoba in the last five years, some buying railroad lands, but many entering upon government homestead lands as British subjects, while still retaining their certificates of United States citizenship, and exercising such rights when in this country.'

2. Has the government any, and what, information, upon the subject refrred to ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). This is the question as to which the government has no information.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For copies of all correspondence had with the Department of the Interior, or the Minister of that department, or any member of the government, including all statements, charges or information, made against or concerning Philip Wagner, at one time in the employ of the government.—Mr. Foster.

For copies of all Orders in Council, surveys, reports, options, agreements for the purchase or lease, letters, telegrams, correspondence and other documents of every nature and description, relating to the acquisition of land for the purpose of military training at Petawawa, in the province of Ontario, together with the names, occupations and addresses of all persons, firms and corporations from whom any such lands were purchased, leased or otherwise acquired ; the dates when such property was purchased, leased or otherwise acquired. Also a return showing the extent of the lands purchased, leased or otherwise acquired, from each person, firm or corporation, the consideration therefor, the amount of the purchase or rental, and all amounts payable in respect thereof, including any commission upon said purchase, rental or acquisition. Also the names of all persons civil or military, who acted for the government in connection with such purchasing, leasing or other acquisition. Also all letters, telegrams, papers, correspondence and other documents between the vendor or lessee, or any persons acting for them and the government, or any person acting for the government, including all protests of persons owning or claiming to own land in the vicinity ; and all correspondence between such persons and the government, and all correspondence between any person acting for the government, and any person or persons claiming to be interested in any such purchase, sale or acquisition. Also the names of all persons engaged in making the final or other settlement of any claims for the purchasing, leasing or other acquisition of any such lands, or for trespass upon or interference with any adjoining lands, or the persons residing thereon, and a full statement of all the amounts, if any,

paid to each such person engaged in making any such settlement, or in making any arrangement in connection with such claims. Also a statement of the amount and nature of all claims, for trespass interference, and of all sums paid or payable in respect thereof.—Mr. Worthington.

For a return showing all timber lands sold or leased by the Department of the Interior subsequent to the date of those included in Sessional Papers No. 39, brought down to the House on March 12, 1906; the description and area of such lots, the applications made therefor, the notice of advertisement for sale or tender, the tenders received, the amount of each tender, the tenders accepted, the name and address of the person or company to whom each lot was sold or leased ?—Mr. Foster.

For copies of all correspondence, recommendations, telegrams, petitions, in possession of the government, or any department or official thereof, with reference to the dismissal of Mr. Joseph McCabe, as postmaster at Iona, in Prince Edward Island, and the appointment of his successor.—Mr. A. Martin—by Mr. A. A. McLean.

For copies of all petitions, letters and correspondence relating to the change of the location of the post office at French Village, Prince Edward Island.—Mr. A. A. McLean.

For copies of all orders in council, reports, recommendations, correspondence, minutes or records of court of inquiry or investigation, evidence taken on such investigation, memoranda, telegrams, writings, orders and documents of every nature and kind, relating to the dismissal or removal from the militia of Canada, of Lt.-Col. Boulanger, of the Ordnance Stores Corps, Quebec, including all correspondence between Lt.-Col. Boulanger and the Militia Department, subsequent to his dismissal.—Mr. Worthington.

For copies of all orders in council, and documents, between the first day of July, 1896, and the present time, relating to swamp lands, and of all letters, telegrams and other documents and correspondence between the government of Canada and the government of Manitoba, during the same period, relating to such lands.—Mr. Staples.

NATURALIZATION LAWS OF COLONIES OF THE EMPIRE.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton) moved :

For a return (a) setting forth the various laws in the United Kingdom, and in the various dependencies and colonies of the empire, with respect to the naturalization of aliens ; (b) defining the effect of naturalization consummated in Great Britain, or in the various colonies or dependencies, respectively, when the person so naturalized becomes domiciled thereafter, in any other portion of the Empire ; (c) setting forth any efforts heretofore made by the government of the United Kingdom, or of any colony or dependency, or by any body or association, for the purpose of securing uniformity in the naturalization laws throughout the empire.

He said : Returns of this character are not usually asked for in this House, but they are not unusual in the British House of Commons. I have put this motion on the order paper for the purpose of asking whether or not the government could bring down a return of this character which would be very useful to us. The naturalization laws throughout the empire vary a good deal in character, and I think they sometimes conflict with each other. I do not know whether the government may object to bring down a return of this kind ; if not I would like to have it brought down. I would mention that in connection with question sixty-three on to-day's order paper, as to which the Prime Minister said the government had no information ; it seems to me that the statement set forth in the latter part of that section is one to which the attention of the government might very well be directed. The statement is made by a special agent of the Department of Justice of the United States in a report lately made by him to the President of the United States.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). It would be exceedingly convenient to the members of the House if we had in a compact form the naturalization laws to which my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) refers. The naturalization laws are administered by the Secretary of State and I will draw his attention to this motion. Referring to question sixty-three, we may perhaps be able to bring down the treaty between England and the United States which I think expired a year or two ago with respect to this question of naturalization. My recollection is that in that treaty provision is made as to the renunciation of naturalization by an American citizen who has become a British subject and who subsequently returns to his native country. In any event I will see that the information asked for in question sixty-three is covered by the return. It would be most convenient if we could adopt some method by which the conditions as to naturalization could be made uniform, and by which the effect of naturalization could be made uniform throughout the whole of the empire, if it is possible to bring that about.

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

Motion agreed to.

QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE & SASKATCHEWAN LAND GRANT.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to direct the attention of the Minister of the Interior to the fact that the twelfth paragraph of question 1 has not been answered. The answer related to something entirely different. I asked when the passing of the order in council was first communicated to the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company. The answer given was that it was communicated to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company under a certain date. I did not ask about

that company; I asked about the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company. I have put another question on the order paper to-day so that attention may be directed to it.

THE TELEPHONE QUESTION.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to read a letter I have received, and to put myself in order I propose to end with a motion :

The letter is as follows :

The Canadian Independent Telephone Association.

Officers :

President, Alpheus Hoover, Green River, Ont.
Vice-President, F. D. Mackay, Toronto, Ont.
Secretary-Treasurer, A. F. Wilson, Markham, Ont.

Executive Committee :

T. F. Demers, M.D., Lévis, Que.
W. Doan, M.D., Harrietsville, Ont.
John A. Sprague, Demorestville, Ont.
T. H. Estabrooks, St. John, N.B.
C. J. Thornton, Kirby, Ont.
Dr. Ochs, Hespler, Ont.
Richard Vigars, Port Arthur, Ont.
E. Hart, M.D., Brantford, Ont.
Levi Moyer, Beamsville, Ont.

Markham, Ont., March 17, 1906.

W. F. Maclean, Esq., M.P., Toronto.

Dear sir,—I am instructed by our president to write you regarding the position of the telephone inquiry by the special committee of the House.

Our association has been patiently waiting for some announcement from the government and we are at a great loss to know what action is to be taken by the committee of parliament and whether we shall have opportunity to present new facts and evidence before the committee, and if we shall be allowed to present the views of this organization, within whose membership are nearly all the independent companies of Canada. Without any early announcement we are unable to make proper preparation.

You are probably unaware of the full magnitude of the independent movement and the tremendous strides which it has made in Ontario, largely since the sittings of the committee ended last sesion. Rural companies have sprung up in great numbers and the older companies have extended to a greater degree their systems, doubled and trebled their subscribers, and invested large sums in pole, line and equipments.

According to the reports received by me up to date there is over $270,000 capital actually invested in these companies, and a conservative estimate places the total at about $750,000. These rural companies in Ontario are so numerous and so situated that in several parts of the province we have a hundred miles of connected line or more running into three or four ridings.

The Bell company have announced that during the last year they installed 12,000 new telephones, including all Canada and the cities. The independents in the same time have had 4,000 to 5,000 new subscribers and these for the most part in the townships and villages.

It is, we submit, due to the farmers that parliament should have a full knowledge of this great new evolutionary social movement spreading through all settled Canada, and that the full light of day be given to the impediments in its way.

Our companies find that legislation is required amending the Railway Act, modifying the onerous and altogether unnecessary conditions regarding the crossing of telephone lines over the railroad along public highways, &c.

So far as connections with railway stations—we find that it is impossible to obtain the consent of these public chartered common carriers to give twelve inches of wall to our phones. These companies will give no definite answers to our requests for terms, and frequently our letters are altogether ignored. The public are inconvenienced to a tremendous extent, and our association, representing the local systems, ask of parliament relief as a matter of public convenience and policy.

There are many other matters for the attention of the House, and we respectfully ask you, as representing a rural constituency, to bring our request for information as to our present standing before the House.

Yours respectfully,

A. F. WILSON,
Secretary.

All I have to say is that this is an urgent matter. I was glad to hear the Prime Minister announce to-day that legislation on the telephone question, was in contemplation and that the Minister of Railways would introduce it. I also read in the evening papers of to-day that legislation dealing with the matter is to be introduced; but as I received this letter this morning, and as it expresses the view of a great many people in the country that legislation should be immediately introduced and that parliament should take advantage of the large amount of information that was collected last session and the cost of which was announced in the House to-day, it is only fair that the Prime Minister should make an explanation as to what the real legislation is likely to be and when it is to be introduced. I move the adjournment of the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I have already stated to the House on one or two occasions that it is the intention of the government to deal with the telephone matter in a Bill which is to be introduced by the Minister of Railways. The Bill is on the order paper to-day—an Act to amend the Railway Act, 1903. I may say to my hon. friend that the Bill will deal with some of the matters referred to in the letter which he has just read. More than this I do not feel called upon to say to-day.

Motion (Mr. W. F. Maclean) negatived.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENTS.

On the order,

Second reading of Bill No. 8, an Act in further amendment of the Railway Act, 1903.—Mr. Lancaster.

Mr. LANCASTER. I am ready to go on, but in the absence of the Minister of Railways I do not care to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear. Stand.

On the order,

Second reading of Bill No. 9, an Act to further amend the Railway Act, 1903.—Mr. Maclean.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I am in the same position. I am ready to go on.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Stand.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

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

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We will take up the government Bills which are printed in both languages and are ready for discussion, and after that the civil service estimates.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, March 20, 1906.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 19) respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Guthrie.

Bill (No. 20) to incorporate the Canadian Bible Society, Auxiliary of the British and Foreign Bible Society.—Mr. Cockshutt.

Bill (No. 21) respecting the Huron and Erie Loan and Savings Company.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 22) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 23) to incorporate the Quebec-Midland Railway Company.—Mr. Bureau.

Bill (No. 24) respecting the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Railway Company.—Mr. McColl.

Bill (No. 25) respecting the Niagara, Queenston and St. Catharines Railway Company.—Mr. Clarke by Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 26) respecting the West Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Pardee by Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 27) to incorporate the Kamloops and Yellowhead Pass Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 28) respecting the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company.—Mr. Sloan.

Bill (No. 29) respecting the Vancouver and Lulu Island Railway Company.—Mr. Macpherson.

Bill (No. 30) respecting the Kootenay and Arrowhead Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 31) respecting the White Horse and Alsek Railway Company.—Mr. Macpherson.

Bill (No. 32) respecting the Nakusp and Slocan Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 33) respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 34) respecting the Columbia and Kootenay Railway Navigation Company.—Mr. Galliher.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE. Before the Orders of the Day are taken up, I wish to draw attention to a question which was asked in my absence to the following effect:

Mr. SPROULE—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. How many members of parliament have been appointed to positions of emolument from the Crown since the year 1896?

2. What are the names of such members so appointed, and what is the salary attached to each appointment?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). If my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) were here, I would remind him that I gave an answer to a similar question last year, and since then the only appointments that I am aware of have been those of Sir William Mulock to the bench, Mr. Peter Talbot to the Senate, and Mr. McKenzie of Cape Breton to the bench.

My only observation is that the answers to these questions should be as accurate as possible, and I can only imagine that these appointments have been so numerous that the task of keeping them all in memory was too great for my right hon. friend. I see by 'Hansard' that one Colin F. McIsaac resigned his seat in this House, and I believe he occupies the position of a government commissioner. There may be other cases which on the spur of the moment do not occur to my mind. I merely rise to say that these answers to be of any value should be correct. I notice in the very last issue of 'Hansard' that the following question was asked by Mr. Walsh:

1. Are civil servants in the employ of the government at Ottawa permitted to engage in any occupation, business or work outside the performance of their duty ?

2. In how many departments is this permitted ?

The answer is given for only one department, yet I am credibly informed that there are other departments to which the question applies. So that an answer of that character is of very little value.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY PASSES.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. We have had refrence in the House several times to certain evidence, which was mentioned the other day by the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) and previously by the Minister of Railways and Canals, I think—evidence of Mr. Pottinger or some other gentleman at Moncton, with regard to the issue of passes by the late Conservative administration. I think that evidence which is quoted in the House ought to be laid on the table of the House. If that evidence has been brought down, I have never seen it ; I would like to see it. If it has not been brought down, I would like it to be brought down. I have asked several times during the last three or four years that statements made on the floor of the House should be made good by evidence, or withdrawn, and I once more make that request to the government.

Mr. HANCE LOGAN. The evidence was taken a long while ago by Mr. McAlpine, K.C., of St. John, who was appointed a commissioner to inquire into certain charges. I was under the impression that the evidence had been brought down, because I am absolutely certain that I read it. If the report of Mr. McAlpine, with the evidence, has not been brought down, I would join with the leader of the opposition in urging the government to bring it down.

SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice) moved second reading of Bill (No. 10) to amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. FITZPATRICK moved that the said Bill be referred to the select committee appointed by this House to consider the Acts respecting the Senate and House of Commons.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Is it the intention of the Minister of Justice to bring under this Bill the practice by members of this House of pleading before Royal Commissions? There is a case on to-day in this city in which a member of this House is appearing and there may be other members also appearing before that royal commission.

Motion agreed to.

MONEY LENDERS ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 11) respecting money lenders (Mr. Fitzpatrick), read the second time and House went into committee thereon.

On the preamble,

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). This is practically in the form in which a similar Bill came from the Senate in 1900. I have the English Act of that year. Perhaps my hon. friend the leader of the opposition would like to look at it ?

On section 2,

The expression 'money-lender' in this Act shall include any person who carries on the business of money-lending, or advertises, or announces himself, or holds himself out in any way, as carrying on that business, and who makes a practice of lending money at a higher rate than ten per cent per annum, but does not comprise registered pawnbrokers as such.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. This will be allowed to remain in abeyance so that members may consider the advisability of using the word 'practice.' I find it vague and indefinite, but have not been able to find a better word.

Mr. FOWLER. Why make the limit 10 per cent ? That seems a very exorbitant rate.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not quite understand the object of the section.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is to define what a money-lender is. Any man who lends at a rate in excess of 10 per cent will be a money-lender, within the meaning of this section.

Mr. STOCKTON. Suppose he only makes one loan and that at the rate of 100 per cent would he come under this section?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, because he would not be a money-lender by practice.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. What about the banks in the Yukon who lend money at 2 per cent per month?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There is an exception permitting them to go on doing that business.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. By this section you are throwing the onus on the prosecution of proving that a man makes a practice of lending money at a higher rate than 10 per cent per annum. That would be pretty hard to prove.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In the English Act the expression 'money-lender' includes every one whose business is that of money-lender or who advertises or announces himself or holds himself out in any way as carrying on that business, but there is a considerable number of exceptions. For instance, persons carrying on the business of banking or insurance or any business not having for its chief object the lending of money, also certain registered societies empowered by Act of Parliament to lend money, also anybody exempt by order of the board of trade. I would think that the definition in this Bill should be less limited. Suppose, for example, one-third of the business of a money-lender was the lending of money at a rate exceeding 10 per cent and the rest at less than 10 per cent. There might be great difficulty in establishing whether he came within the terms of the statute. I agree with my hon. friend that the expression is altogether too vague. You would have to go into a general inquiry into all the past business of a money-lender before you could bring him under the purview of this government.

Section 2 allowed to stand.

On section 3,

Notwithstanding the provisions of chapter 127 of the revised statutes no money-lender shall stipulate for, allow or exact on any negotiable instrument, contract or agreement, concerning a loan of money, the principal of which is under five hundred dollars, a rate of interest or discount greater than twelve per cent per annum: and the said rate of interest shall be reduced to the rate of six per cent per annum from the date of judgment in any suit, action or other proceeding for the recovery of the amount due.

Mr. FOWLER. Why make it 6 per cent from the date of the judgment? You are increasing the amount a usurer can charge. The legal rate, at the present time, I understand, is 5 per cent, no matter what the stipulation of the bond or note upon which the suit is brought.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. This is unusual legislation, and interferes, to a certain extent, with private contract. Therefore, it was thought not improper, in this case, to allow six per cent.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know how it may be in the province of Quebec but, in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, on a judgment the lender gets the rate of interest allowed by the law, and, at present, that is 5 per cent. This Bill would have the effect of increasing the rate of interest allowed on this class of judgment, which, probably, it is not desirable to do, and which, one would suppose, it is not intended to do.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There are special reasons in this case. You are allowing a special rate of interest because this Bill to some extent, interferes with private contract. That is the only reason, so far as I know, why it is done.

Mr. FOWLER. But the contract does not govern the rate of interest from the date of judgment. No matter what the contract between the parties, as soon as one party has recovered judgment from the other the contract is at an end, the law having stepped in, and the law provides that the rate of interest shall be 5 per cent. But you are increasing it one per cent by this Bill. The Bill deals with the rate of interest after the judgment, not the judgment under the contract.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) had read the Bill, he would have known that the object is to allow the rate of interest under the contract to be reduced. Otherwise there would be no sense in the Bill.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the object of this limit of $500?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I understand that there are transactions, running into large amounts in which the rate of interest is far in excess of that allowed under this Bill, but with which it would not be well to interfere. The object of the Bill is to protect the class of small borrowers.

Mr. OSLER. It seems to me that there is danger in this clause as it is at present. There are cases, unfortunately, where poor people get into a position where they must have money or be sold out; and I do not believe that it would be possible for them, in many cases, to borrow money at ten per cent. The class of men who deal in that particular kind of security are not usually in command of a great deal of money, many of them are men of very little compunction. The effect of the Bill, I fear, will be to prevent many poor people from borrowing money; for the lack of it, they will be sold out, and the last state of those people will be worse than the first. I would ask what the provision of the English law is? This question came up in the House, where it was considered with enormous care. I do not recollect the provision of the English Act but I think that the limitation was nothing like the one here provided.

Mr. BOYCE. May I ask if the latter part of the section would cover the case of a contract under chattel mortgage? For instance the rate provided under a chattel mortgage may be 20 per cent, and the lender may enforce the security without recourse to proceedings in any court. Thus, there would be no judgment, and no period when the reduction here provided would apply.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The criticism of the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) is one that naturally suggests itself to one who considers this Bill. I must confess that the difficulty is one with which I do not see how to deal effectively, while this will operate as a relief to many people, it will also operate as a great hardship to many others. I have given the matter some consideration, and, as I say, can see no way to meet the difficulty. It may be that, under certain conditions, people can borrow money only at a high rate of interest, because of their straightened circumstances, and it would be a great hardship to provide that they must not enter into such transactions or that they enter upon them at their peril. That is one of the inconveniences that may result from the adoption of this measure.

I have at hand a copy of the English statute, and the section referred to by the hon. member for West Toronto provides as follows :

> Where proceedings are taken in any court by a money-lender for the recovery of any money lent after the commencement of this Act, or the enforcement of any agreement or security made or taken after the commencement of this Act, in respect of money lent either before or after the commencement of this Act, and there is evidence which satisfies the court that the interest charged in respect of the sum actually lent is excessive,——

And so on,—leaving it a matter of discretion on the part of the court to determine whether, under all the circumstances, the rate of interest is excessive. That would meet, to some extent the difficulty the hon. gentleman (Mr. Osler) has pointed out.

Mr. OSLER. I think that is quite worthy of consideration. Take for instance, the case of a bricklayer or some other workman who may be practically out of work during the winter months. He gets behind in his rent and has to borrow $10 or $20, or be sold out. If he borrows say $10 at the rate of 10 per cent per annum and borrows for three months, that would mean 25c interest. Well, you cannot conceive of anybody, no matter how philanthropic he may be, lending $10 for three months for 25c. I think the English Act would cover the difficulty. I am quite sure that the Act as at present drawn will work great hardship, perhaps even greater hardship than results now from the charge of excessive interest rates.

On section 5,

Mr. GALLIHER. If I understand this section correctly, it provides means of evading the rate of interest to be charged. For instance, one who is actually a money lender might set up a man of straw as a money lender in his interest, and the latter might charge a greater rate of interest than the one who really is the money lender. He discounts that, and is a bona fide holder. He could collect the full value of the loan and interest, and the only recourse the borrower could have would be against, as I say, this man of straw. The two could work together that way, the money lender could evade the Act by working through another person who would not be amenable. Could not that be done ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It might be done once, but I do not think it is likely to be done more than once, because the gentleman who attempted to operate that way would go to jail under a later provision of the Act.

On section 10,

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I intend to add provisions to this Act so that it shall not apply to the Yukon, and also that it shall be applicable exclusively to a loan made by a money lender not exceeding the original sum of $500 of principal money. With this explanation I move that the committee rise, and will move to-morrow that this Bill be referred to the Banking and Commerce Committee so that we may have an opportunity of considering it more fully. I shall endeavour, as far as possible, to adopt the provisions of the English Act, 63 and 64 Victoria, chapter 51.

Mr. SPROULE. I suppose that the Yukon Territory will become the paradise of the money lenders if we exempt that.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There are conditions in the Yukon which do not exist elsewhere, and which make it necessary, practically, to take it out of the operations of this Act.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Has the Minister of Justice any knowledge whether the law as it exists in England to-day is efficacious in stopping this exorbitant interest ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not know whether it has had that effect in all cases, but I understand that the English Act is broad enough not to interfere with any vested rights. I think the terms of the English Act are broader and more comprehensive, and are perhaps more satisfactory than the Bill we have been considering.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Under the English Money Lenders' Act, the judges sometimes make an order for allowing a judgment to be paid in small instalments extending over 75, 100 or 150 years. It might be desirable to embrace some power of that kind in this statute. It would be a salutary provision.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It would be worth considering how far we have power to do

that. We have power to fix the amount of interest charged, but whether we have power to regulate the payment of a judgment by instalments is another question. They can do a lot of things in England that we cannot do.

Committee rose, reported progress, and asked leave to sit again.

Mr. SPROULE. If you are sending this Bill to the Banking and Commerce Committee why did you ask leave to sit again?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I will have to move in the House that the Bill be called again and referred to the Banking and Commerce Committee.

SUPPLY.

House in committee of supply.

Civil government—Governor General's secretary's office, salaries, $8,662.50.
Contingencies, $14,525—

Clerical and other assistance, including salary of Miss Gilbertson at $550 per annum, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act	$ 2,025 00
Printing and stationery	1,500 00
Sundries	11,000 00
	$14,525 00

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is no increase in the salaries. In the contingencies there is a slight increase. The committee will remember that this is only an estimate for nine months.

Mr. FOSTER. Are these calculations made for just three quarters of the fiscal year ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, but in this instance my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) will see that the estimates for three quarters of the fiscal year involve a slight increase. I understand this is for the Governor General's orderly. For printing and stationery there is also an increase. I understand this is also necessary and is asked for by the Governor General's office. In sundries there is also a considerable increase amounting to some $4,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What is that for ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sorry to say that I cannot give my hon. friend very full information. I understand that it is required by the Governor General's office, that the expenditures of last year justify an increase this year.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course, it would be a very easy way of getting estimates through —the right hon. Prime Minister will very well see—if all he had to say in explanation was that it was required by a department or by an office.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. We are bound, I suppose, to be a little inquisitive and if there is a large item of increase like this—and it is a large item because it amounts to about $4,000 of an increase in one branch—I think we ought to know the reasons why.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The request of my hon. friend is perfectly reasonable. I cannot give the information to-day and I will let this item of contingencies stand.

Item allowed to stand.

Office of the King's Privy Council of Canada, salaries, $24,525.
Contingencies, $7,500.

Mr. FOSTER. I notice this is not in the Auditor General's Report. We have not the second volume down, unfortunately.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, but my hon. friend has not noticed that there is a decrease in this item. Therefore, he will not be so particular.

Mr. FOSTER. I have not noticed it at all ; I have just taken notice of the other fact.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The salaries are the same as last year excepting the statutory increases.

Mr. FOSTER. Who has gone?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. A second-class clerk, Mr. Baldwin who has been superannuated. I am not replacing him. His duties have been given to another officer.

Mr. FOSTER. Are there any increases in salaries ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There are no increases at all ; there are only the statutory increases.

Mr. FOSTER. Are these regularly given every year ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Just as they were last year and as they were in my hon. friend's time also.

Mr. FOSTER. Not as they were in 1897 and 1898 ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We have improved a little in that respect.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Sir Wilfrid Laurier moves that the resolution be amended by adding after the word 'contingencies,' 'notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act'.

Mr. FOSTER. But the word 'contingencies' is merely an indication of what the items are.

Mr. PATERSON. You will find in the details that these words are in, but they are not in the item under consideration.

Mr. FOSTER. The only place where it has a live man alongside of it is in 'cleri-

cal and other assistance'. You surely do not apply it to books, papers and envelopes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is in the book. You have it there as printed.

Mr. PATERSON. It is in details but not in the book.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall the resolution as amended, carry ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If it comes in anywhere it should come in after the word 'assistance' and not after the word 'contingencies.' I do not think it should come in anywhere in this resolution, but it is obviously improper to insert it after the word 'contingencies.' In the printed statement we have before us, these words are inserted after the word 'assistance.' If they are not so inserted in the written copy that the chairman has, they should be inserted after the word 'assistance.'

Mr. FOSTER. It is all right as printed, but it is wrong in the resolution which the chairman has.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Certainly.

Department of Justice—
Salaries $29,833 13
Contingencies.. .. .. 9,575 60

Mr. FOSTER. Any explanation about that ?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There is an amendment proposed.

That the said resolution be amended by adding after the word 'salaries' 'including allowance for private secretary to Solicitor General, notwithstanding anything contrary in the Civil Service Act.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is that to be added?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. After the word 'salaries.'

Mr. PATERSON. These words are in the details but not in the main vote.

Mr. FOSTER. Are there any increases or additions ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No additions. There is a promotion from the first class to a chief clerkship. One of the chief clerks of the penitentiary branch died, and Mr. Leslie, who has been in the department since 1872 has been promoted from the first class to the chief clerkship. Mr. Creighton, who has also been in the department for a long time has been promoted to take Mr. Leslie's place as first-class clerk.

Militia and defence, $42,900.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). There is no change whatever here, except a few statutory increases.

Mr. FOSTER. And new appointments ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. None.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you give them all the statutory increase, or do you confine it only to a few.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. All, I think.

Office of the Comptroller of the Northwest Mounted Police, $12,975.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is no increase, except statutory increases and a new clerk at $600.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the force larger ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No ; the same as last year.

Mr. FOSTER. Why the extra clerk ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The extra clerk is asked by the comptroller who thinks he ought to have more assistance, and as he is a very careful man, I thought he was entitled to it.

Department of Customs, $58,206.25.

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs). The commissioner and the assistant commissioner remain the same. The three chief clerks get their statutory increase of $50 each. The first class clerks who are not at the maximum get the $50 statutory increase. One junior second-class clerk is promoted to the second class.

Mr. FOSTER. You pay no attention now to the theoretical organization of the departments.

Mr. PATERSON. How do you mean ?

Mr. FOSTER. To have a certain number of clerks of each class.

Mr. PATERSON. This gentleman will be taken from the service.

Mr. FOSTER. What has led you to the conclusion that you should change your theoretical organization and have more second-class clerks than formerly ?

Mr. PATERSON. The commissioner deemed it necessary to have another clerk.

Mr. FOSTER. You could have another clerk, but it is not necessary to make him a second-class clerk The departments start out with a well considered plan to have so many chief clerks, so many first-class clerks, so many third-class clerks and so on. It is not necessary that you should increase the number of second-class clerks to get more help in the department, because in proportion as you raise your theoretical organization in the higher clases you are adding to the expense of the department. I have noticed that lately there has been a disposition to hitch them up as was considered best by the minister without thinking of the past arrangement as to the theoretical organization of the departments.

Mr. PATERSON. That is explained by the conditions of the department. We found for two or three years that extra work was

required on the inside, and men who have shown aptitude for the work have been drawn from the statistical branch, which comes under the vote for the outside service, and I presume that the new clerk who is being brought in is in receipt of a salary equal to what he will get as a second-class clerk.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister know that, or does he only presume that ?

Mr. PATERSON. I have every reason to believe it.

Mr. HAGGART. The minister may be perfectly correct, but the principle is this, which I think is required by the law, that the deputy head of the department shall report to the minister when a change in the theoretical organization of the department is required before the minister comes to the House for a vote.

Mr. PATERSON. We need not go over the old discussion as to that; but I may say that the deputy has proposed this change, of course with my concurrence, as being in the interest of the service.

Mr. FOWLER. Has there been any increase in the salary of the assessment commissioner ? It is now put at $3,000. I was under the impression that it was $2,800.

Mr. PATERSON. It was $3,000 for 1905-6.

Mr. FOWLER. Is that the maximum salary he can receive ?

Mr. PATERSON. There is no maximum. It was advanced to $3,000 last year or the year before.

Mr. DANIEL. In last year's estimates the salary of the assistant commissioner was put down at $2,800.

Mr. PATERSON. Perhaps the $200 was added in the supplementary estimates. Then, there are twenty-two juniors instead of nineteen; that is an increase of three; but there are two fewer third-class clerks than there were. It is intended to promote two from the third-class to the junior second.

Mr. FOSTER. There again you are increasing your high grades very much.

Mr. PATERSON. Well, I suppose the hon. gentleman does not object to an advance when there is merit. That is considered desirable and necessary by the deputy, in which I concur. Of course, all the statutory increases are advances as well. I think it is the deputy's opinion now, and has been for some time, that when there is merit the promotions should go on as high as the second class, but that unless there is some special merit, they should not go beyond the maximum of that class.

Mr. FOSTER. I cannot see the reason underlying that.

Mr. PATERSON. There is a pretty good salary at the maximum of the second-class, but it is not very great until that point is reached.

Mr. FOWLER. Do all the clerks get the statutory increase or are certain ones selected ?

Mr. PATERSON. All who are not at the maximum and who are deemed worthy.

Mr. KEMP. Under what head do the officers come who are in the United States getting values ?

Mr. PATERSON. They come under the outside vote. They do not come under this.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understand that the gentleman who occupies the position of assistant commissioner acted at one time as private secretary of the minister. May I ask, is he still the private secretary of the minister ? I notice an allowance for the private secretary of $600 a year.

Mr. PATERSON. He does not get that. Two ladies in the service of the department act as private secretaries and share in the vote. The assessment commissioner does not receive any part of that. The amount for the private secretary is divided between them. They work long hours, are very busy, and are not overpaid. The assessment commissioner—while I have not appointed any other in the office as my private secretary and while he does such work—is not paid anything extra. He discharges the duties of assistant commissioner and does it well but gets no portion of that amount.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understand the only private secretary the minister has is the assistant commissioner ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, there are Miss Cram and Miss Dawes who are engaged as private secretaries. They are clerks but are doing the private secretary's work.

Mr. FOWLER. Is the assistant commissioner private secretary as well ?

Mr. PATERSON. To the extent I have said, yes.

Mr. FOWLER. He holds the honorary position and these ladies do the work.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, they do the work.

Department of the Interior, $128,224.94.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). This is for salaries. It includes a revote of $197.44 to adjust the salaries of four clerks promoted to the junior second class on September 20, 1905, so as to make their promotion date from July 1, 1905, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.

These were third-class clerks. It was intended to promote them to second class

and they were required to pass the promotion examinations. An order in council authorizing a special examination was passed the 22nd July, 1905. The examinations were held the 20th September, 1905, from which date the promotions took effect. Their salaries had been provided for the full year to date from July, 1905, and the sum asked is to pay their salaries from 1st July to September, 1905. It is a revote.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister is voting a salary to clerks for a portion of the year who are during that portion entitled to it. They were not entitled to promotion until they passed the examination. They had not passed it the 1st July and did not pass it until September. Consequently they were not eligible to be in the rank of second class until September, so that you cannot pay them the salary of that rank except from September.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand the minister had a vote.

Mr. FOSTER. He had a vote but you cannot give a salary to a person for a portion of the year when he was ineligible. These clerks can only be paid the increased salary from the time they were promoted.

Mr. OLIVER. They cannot be paid unless the House votes the money.

Mr. FOSTER. Parliament is not enacting legislation to contravene the Civil Service Act to this extent that you can promote people before they pass the promotion examination.

Mr. OLIVER. The fact of this vote appearing now is because of a precedent which appeared in the votes of last year and to which parliament assented without any question. As that vote passed last year without any question, and as an exactly similar condition arose this year, it was thought proper to deal with the matter in exactly the same way as it had been dealt with last year.

Mr. FOSTER. Surely the minister will not press the point that because an illegal thing was done last year without attracting the attention of the House—slipped through—therefore we are to make it a fixed condition of things. The minister might as well say that, if parties had passed the promotion examination in the middle of the year, it should be all right to date back their promotion two or three years. Of course, parliament can vote anything, but there are some things that parliament ought not to be asked to vote.

Mr. OLIVER. The vote last year did not 'slip through.' The attention of the House was drawn to it and identically the same explanation was made as is made this year.

Mr. DANIEL. There must be a misprint here with regard to the number of first-class clerks. The number given in the margin is seventeen, but, when you count them up there are eighteen. The number in last year's estimates was sixteen. So, there appears to be an addition of two first-class clerks.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. As I understand the point taken by my hon. friend for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) it is that the promotion is made retroactive, that it is from the first of July, and these officers did not qualify until the end of September?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON. It is just as the same as adding to a vote the words 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.'

Mr. FOSTER. It is far worse than that. The vote was taken and they did not pass for three or four months after.

Mr. PATERSON. They were qualified. They had not passed then, but they have passed now.

Mr. FOWLER. You might as well make it work back two years as three months.

Mr. PATERSON. Not at all. We had the money, but the parties did not pass the examination until two or three months after the commencement of the year for which the money was voted. I am not saying whether parliament ought or ought not to pass such votes, but, as to the ability of parliament to pass them, it seems to me it is in the same category as the votes passed with the proviso, 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.'

Mr. HAGGART. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) says that this amount was voted for these officers in the estimates of last year. It does not appear in the estimates of last year.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The point, I understand, was in relation to the general vote. For some reasons these four parties did not qualify until the month of September. And the objection is that their promotion is made retroactive as from July 1. The point is well taken.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Daniel) calls attention to the fact that there are really eighteen first-class clerks, although the number is stated at seventeen. If so, there is a promotion there——

Mr. DANIEL. There were only sixteen last year.

Mr. OLIVER. I am informed that that 'seventeen' is a typographical error.

Mr. FOSTER. And there really are eighteen?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Then an explanation is due as to why you have two additional this

year. And this seems a proper time to call attention again to the slipshod way in which these estimates are prepared. We had trouble last year—quite a deal of trouble, over one or two very important points. And now we have the same thing this year.

Mr. OLIVER. I am informed that there is no change in the number of first-class clerks since last year.

Mr. FOSTER. How many were there last year ?

Mr. OLIVER. Eighteen.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. member for St. John (Mr. Daniel) has stated that he has the estimates of last year before him, and that the number of first-class clerks is stated as sixteen. In the margin of the estimates before us it is given at seventeen, and the total is really eighteen. Why do we waste time over mistakes of this kind if there is no change ? Why are not the estimates properly prepared ?

Mr. TAYLOR. And if the minister will count the number of second-class clerks, he will see that they number twenty-four although the total is given as twenty-five. Then, the number of third-class clerks is given as thirty-one and the number is only twenty-five when you count up the number of salaries to be voted. Either there is something radically wrong or there has been carelessness in preparing the estimates.

Mr. FOSTER. I find by the Auditor General's Report that only sixteen first-class clerks were paid last year, and that is a pretty close analysis. Have not the others passed these promotion examinations ? And have any second-class clerks died during the year ?

Mr. OLIVER. One second-class clerk resigned, but none died.

Mr. FOSTER. There is somebody missing, you will have to send out the bellman to find out where he is. Because I find there were 28 second-class clerks paid last year; you have only 25 here, if one resigned, that would be 27. Where are the missing 2 ? I am afraid the minister's department got disorganized when he was out west.

Mr. OLIVER. The Auditor General's Report does not tally with the information given me by my officers here. That being the case, I must have an opportunity of revising the statement I have here, and ask that the item stand.

Department of Indian Affairs—	
Salaries..	$50,537 50
Contingencies..	11,548 13

Mr. OLIVER. The estimates for Indian Affairs have been framed to meet the expenditure during nine months ending March 31, 1907. For all services under which the expenditure is continuous through the twelve months the reduction has been made. This applies to expenses of management, school grants, food supplies, medical attendance, travelling and miscellaneous charges, implements, live stock, &c. But there are certain subheads under which the reduction could not be made, as the expenditure takes place early in the year, amounts, for instance, which are all paid after the 1st of July, as supplies which are delivered under contract for annuity payment, and which must all be available between certain dates, and services which must be met before winter sets in, outside work on repairs and buildings, which must be done during the summer.

Mr. HAGGART. Have you given the clerks the statutory increase ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. How is it that the amount you are asking is just the same, without any decrease in the number of clerks at all ?

Mr. OLIVER. The total amount is not the same as last year, the statutory increases make a difference.

Mr. FOSTER. Remember this is only for nine months.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In making out these estimates it would have been a great convenience to the House if you had presented a third column showing what the total would be for twelve months. I think we should have to ask each minister when he goes over every item to state exactly what the total would be for twelve months.

Mr. OLIVER. I have the figures here in detail for the twelve months, but not the total.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would the minister tell us what the chief clerks would amount to for the whole year ?

Mr. OLIVER. $13,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And the first class clerks ?

Mr. OLIVER. $10,337.50.

Department of Finance and Treasury Board—	
Salaries..	$47,336 26
Contingencies..	9,000 00

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The same as last year.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Does that include the insurance branch ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, but not the commission.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Campbell). It is proposed to amend this resolution by adding after the word 'contingencies,' the following words 'notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act.'

Amendment agreed to.

Department of Inland Revenue—
Salaries.. .. ..$37,107 50
Contingencies.. .. .. 5,250 00

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR. The number of employees is the same as last year. Three junior second-class clerks have been promoted from the third class.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the salary of each of these third class clerks ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Two were getting $700 each, and the other $650. A junior second class-clerk gets $800. We promoted them because they had passed the promotion examination, and as they were good clerks we thought it would be well to promote them to the junior second class. My hon. friend knows that the salary of a third-class clerk is very small. We thought, after consulting the deputy minister, that it was one of those cases where we could give a small increase of $100 each.

Mr. FOSTER. The reason the minister gives does not appear to be very conclusive, and does not seem to be a sufficient justification. The whole aim seems to be to shove persons in lower branches of the department up into higher classes, and so to add of course, not to efficiency, but to the expense of your department. Now, if it is really a fact that third-class clerks, with the changed condition of things, are not paid as much as they reasonably ought to be paid then, it seems to me, that it will be the duty of the government to take the matter into consideration and see whether that scale of salaries should not be raised. I think myself there is something to be said in reference to Civil Service salaries. Whilst the expenses of living have very largely increased rents, food, clothing, the whole scale of life, it seems to be particularly hard for the class of people who are kept down to stated salaries and who have not what you might call an elastic method of gaining a livelihood. If they have to get along with the heightened prices that have come into existence within the last three, four or five years and the scale of salaries is below what reasonably clerks of that description ought to live upon, that would be a very good reason for revising the whole list and seeing whether or not a reasonable salary was appropriated to each class of clerks. But, to get over it by picking up here one and there another, putting them from one class into another and so giving them a higher salary in that way does not seem the proper method. I quite agree with any person who would maintain it that a young man who is eligible for good, keen work and is expected to get on with $400 or $500 of a salary has a mighty hard time of it in a city like this with the expenses of living as they are here. Having said it before I say it again that if the scale is not high enough I think it would be better to go to work and see that it is put right and then keep to it in the different grades and classes. But, certainly, it does not seem to be a good reason to say that simply because the promotion examination has been passed you will therefore jump a clerk from $600 to $800 or give a person a higher salary.

The CHAIRMAN.

Mr. BRODEUR. It was thought by the deputy and myself that these clerks were receiving pretty small salaries because they were only getting $650 and the two others were at the maximum of their class. It was not therefore unjust to give them a similar increase and to make them junior second-class clerks. Perhaps they could have been appointed junior second-class clerks at the beginning, because they had passed the examination, but having passed the qualifying examination it qualifies them for the position of junior second-class clerks. While two of them were at the top of their class, two others were receiving $650 or $50 less than the maximum of their class. Having passed the promotion examination and taking into consideration the fact that they had to live on this small salary in the city of Ottawa, the deputy minister and myself believed that we were justified in recommending that they should be promoted to be junior second-class clerks.

Mr. FOSTER. Are not the three that were left good clerks ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, but they have not passed the examination. Those who were promoted have passed the examination.

Mr. DANIEL. Were there any additions made in the supplementary estimates of last year to salaries in the Inland Revenue Department ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. I notice that all the salaries provided for here amounted, last year, to $50,310. Three quarters of that would amount to more than $37,107, so that the hon. minister is getting along with less salaries for the ensuing year than last year.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, that is right.

Mr. FOSTER. How does he do it ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am informed by the deputy minister that it is on account of the fact that he is trying to do with a less number of third-class clerks than were employed last year.

Mr. FOSTER. You have 3.

Mr. BRODEUR. Last year we provided for six third-class clerks and this year we are only providing for three.

Mr. FOSTER. But if you provided only for three third-class clerks—that is three less than last year—you provide for three more second-class clerks and at a higher salary.

Mr. BRODEUR. My private secretary, Mr. Garneau, who was in the service last year was not replaced. He was a second-class clerk. His position is really taken by some one else in a lower class.

Mr. FOSTER. Was Mr. Garneau in the Inland Revenue Department ?

Mr. BRODEUR. He was, but he is not now in the Inland Revenue Department.

Mr. FOSTER. Well then you should have one clerk less.

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. FOSTER. But you have exactly the same number.

Mr. BRODEUR. We have the same number of clerks, but one clerk who received a salary of $1,200 or $1,300 is replaced by a third-class clerk.

Mr. FOSTER. Then he gets the private secretary's salary or allowance ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Department of Agriculture—
Salaries.. .. ..$63,798 76
Contingencies.. .. .. 16,312 50

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There are no changes. It is exactly the same as last year.

Mr. FOSTER. Except statutory increases ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Except statutory increases.

Mr. HAGGART. The same argument as I applied it to the Minister of the Interior a short time ago, applies here. If you give statutory increases, I do not see how you arrive at that amount.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The item last year was $84,820. For this year a three quarter vote would amount to $63,798.76. Please remember particularly the 76 cents. If it were for twelve months we would not require $84,820 but we would ask for $85,065.01.

Mr. HAGGART. But you have only taken three quarters of $84,820.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. HAGGART. In the $84,820 there are no additions for statutory increases.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There are.

Mr. HAGGART. No, that is what the vote was last year.

Mr. FOSTER. There is about $200.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Here is my arithmetic : We ask for $63,798.76 for nine months. If we asked for twelve months we would require $85,065.01.

Mr. HAGGART. The statutory increases only amount to $400 for the year.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, to $245.

Mr. HAGGART. That is an extremely small amount for 63 clerks.

Mr. FOSTER. Some of them have got up to the maximum ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The thing is very peculiar. I could not understand it until it was explained to me. The explanation is that Col. Jarvis has a salary of $2,412.50 and another officer has a salary of $1,962.50. This is the explanation given by the accountant. He has prepared the figures very carefully and the statutory increases just bring the total up to $63,798.76 for nine months. For twelve months amount would be $85,065.01. The figures are all right.

Department of Marine and Fisheries—
Salaries.. .. ..$63,762 50
Contingencies.. .. .. 14,362 50

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is proposed to amend this item by inserting after the word 'salaries' the following, 'including Mrs. M. Lamouche at $850 notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act.'

Mr. BRODEUR. The number of clerks has been reduced from 57 to 55. Mr. Halkett who has been in the service since 1873 and Mr. Kent who is in charge of the fishing bounty and who has been in the department since 1875 have been promoted to chief clerkships. These gentlemen deserve promotion. In the technical branch the number is reduced from 8 to 5 ; Mr. Tyrwhitt died and Mr. Lindsay resigned. The reason of the other reduction is that Mr. Cunningham who is in charge of the fish culture was through an error included in last year's estimate as a technical officer, when strictly speaking he is not. There is a reduction of 16 to 13 in the junior second class clerks. I propose to make Mrs. Lamouche a junior second class clerk. She has been in the service of this department since 1879 and previous to that was employed in the Department of Finance. Every year her name is coupled with the phrase 'notwithsanding anything in the Civil Service Act,' and I think it better to put this lady in the position of a second class clerk. Mrs. Lamouche is a very good officer and she is at all events above the age of 35, because she has been in the service since 1879.

Mr. HENDERSON. You should give her a pension.

Mr. FOSTER. If the minister never does anything worse than to put Mrs. Lamouche among the civil servants, it is all right.

Mr. DANIEL. Are these technical officers all educated as professional men ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes. There is Mr. Creighton who is in charge of the tidal survey ; Mr. Fraser who is the assistant

engineer; Mr. Stewart, chief surveyor; Mr. Anderson, hydrographic surveyor, and Mr. Fraser commissioner of lights.

Department of Public Works, $53,437.50.

Mr. FOSTER. There is a long correspondence in the Auditor General's Report with reference to a matter which I consider very important and I want to bring it to the attention of the minister. It would seem that Mr. Gobeil the deputy minister, gets placed upon certain arbitrations in connection with the affairs of his department and for each of these arbitrations he is paid $400. That is paid to him by virtue of an appropriation for arbitrations, in which there is stuck that iniquitous phrase 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.' When the first payment came to the attention of the late Auditor General he did not think that Mr. Gobeil, the deputy minister, should act on arbitrations and draw special pay, unless he had been appointed for that purpose by order in council. Mr. Gobeil, who was of course an interested party, fought his own case, and he thought because of the words 'notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act' being inserted in the vote it was perfectly legal he should draw the pay when he did the work. The Auditor General pointed out that the proviso was inserted to cover say, over age in the case of a person the government desired to make a clerk, or, the case of a person who has not passed an examination, but that it did not apply to the case of a deputy minister drawing extra pay. The Auditor General held strongly that the proviso did not cover a case where you could take a general vote for any department, and that the officers of the department from the deputy down could mingle in arbitrations in connection with their own departmental matters and draw pay for so doing. I believe that the contention of the Auditor General is perfectly right in that respect. But whether it be legally right for Mr. Gobeil to draw this money or not, there is a phase of the case which is more important than the legal aspect. I notice that Mr. Gobeil fought the Auditor General for about 13 months on the point, and that the new Auditor General leaves the contest sweating at every pore somewhere about the latter part of January, 1905, with the point still unadjusted. Now, even though it may be technically legal, it is a very reprehensible principle to allow any deputy minister or any superior officer in any department, under cover of a general vote, to act as arbitrator and draw pay for it unless he be specially authorized thereto by order in council. I call that to the attention of the Minister of Public Works. I believe that such a system will have the effect of disorganizing the whole civil service if it is permitted. If one superior officer can do it and add $400 or $800 to his salary, why cannot every other superior officer in every other department claim from his minister the right to do the same? Besides, it connects the officers with disputes in his department in which he had not better mingle. These had better be referred to arbitrators who would not have the special interest in them that the officer in the department has.

Mr. HYMAN. It is quite true that there is a vote in the estimates providing for the payment of arbitrators, a vote which I found there when I came into the department. The reason given for the vote was this, that there are numerous cases involving disputes between contractors and officers of the department, the settlement of which sometimes takes a great deal of time; and the officers of the department, other than those concerned in the dispute, were thought probably the best persons to thoroughly investigate all the details. This vote has been used for the purpose of paying for the overtime of certain officers of the department who act as a board of arbitration. If that board had not been in existence, some of these cases would have been referred to the courts at a very large expense to the department, and I question very much if the public interest would have been as well served in that way as it has been under the conditions that exist. There are, I believe, four officers on the board—the deputy minister, the chief engineer, the chief architect and one of the other chief technical officers. I can only say that my experience of the working of the board has been that it is decidedly in the public interest. They have gone most carefully into their work, which of necessity has to be done after hours. It cannot be done during the working hours of the department, otherwise each of these officers would have to be absent from his other duties, which is an impossibility. I am including in the estimates of this year an item of this character, and when it coms before the House I shall be glad to give all the details of the work, which I have not before me at the present time.

Mr. LENNOX. I think this is a very good time to call the attention of the House to this question of arbitration. The evil is becoming epidemic; it seems to pervade almost every branch of the government service. We have had an abuse of the judiciary in connection with it—a flagrant abuse. It was said last session that that that abuse would cease, but it has not ceased. We were promised that we would no longer have judges acting as arbitrators. The policy we have been endeavouring to adopt is that we shall expropriate all the time and services of these gentlemen in the public service in return for the salaries we pay them. We understood that to be the case with the judges, but we find that they have a divided allegiance all the time—that they

serve the country for their judicial salary, but take up arbitrations on the side. The officer we are discussing receives a salary of $4,000. That may or may not be enough. If it is not enough, let us know it, and pay him more; but let it be understood that he is to devote his whole time to the service of the country. The argument of the minister may sound very plausible. He says that these services are rendered when the officer is consuming the midnight oil—that it is overtime work. But if he is paid a salary for devoting his entire energies to the service of the country, do not pile any more work upon him; let him rest during the hours usually devoted to rest. He cannot efficiently perform his duties as arbitrator and be fit to perform his regular official duties the next day. I venture to say that this is a pernicious practice which is being developed in the departments, of allowing officers to act as arbitrators, and it should cease. In this connection I may say that even the cabinet ministers are not contented to confine themselves to their duties as such, and to give their whole time to the service of the country. It is time that we had it understood clearly and distinctly that we are prepared to pay enough, directly, squarely and openly, for the services of judges, ministers of the Crown, deputy heads and other officers of the departments, but that they must confine themselves to these services. We cannot, I think, impress it too strongly on this House that this is a growing abuse, and that effectual measures should be taken to stop it. The opposition have been protesting in vain since 1900 against the introduction of that vague phrase 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act,' and it is only now, as we look over the Auditor General's Report that we ascertain to what extent that phraseology is invoked for the purpose of covering up a lot of more than doubtful transactions which should not be sanctioned by the government.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think the minister's treatment of this matter was adequate. He does not seem to realize how far this kind of thing may go if it is allowed to continue. I had hoped that we would say that it had been tried, but that he had come to the conclusion that it was not wise to continue it. Look at the state of things. The minister must rely upon his deputy for advice. They come together, the estimates are brought down for the different branches of the service, and the appropriations are decided upon. The minister is the responsible head and under him his deputy supervises the work. Payments are made out according to the advice of the deputy minister, concurred in by the minister, after proper supervision by architects, foremen and so on. There comes a point when the minister decides what is to be paid. But the contractor does not agree in that decision, and the deputy head is called upon to arbitrate. Well, the very fact that the deputy head is in a position to add $400 to his salary in this way shows the folly of the practice. That is a position into which you should not put your officer. You should pay your officer for his legitimate work; and if he attends to it, he will have all he can do and have no more time left for rest and recreation than he ought to have. But if you are going to distract his attention and distribute his efforts in this way, you are not going to get the full value of his services. The minister says it would require more time and expense to have these disputes arbitrated in another way. Even so, it would be better to take the longer time and incur the greater expense and relieve your own official of duties he ought not to have to perform.

Mr. HYMAN. I would like to explain the way in which this arbitration works. In the first place, there can be no arbitration without the sanction of the minister. When there is a dispute between a technical officer of the department, such as the chief architect, and a contractor, it comes before the minister. There is no way in which the minister can make himself better informed than by having his deputy act in conjunction with the technical officer who has the particular work in charge.

Mr. LANCASTER. Why is he paid extra ?

Mr. HYMAN. I shall explain why. When there is a dispute between a contractor and a technical officer, the matter is brought to the attention of the minister. The minister decides whether it should be investigated by other officers of the department than the technical officer. Should he decide to have an arbitration then the board has power to send for witnesses and obtain information which the minister could not very well otherwise obtain. The reason why extra pay is given is because the Department of Public Works cannot very well have practically four of its chief officials absent during office hours. Then the report of the arbitration comes before the minister, and the minister is responsible for whatever recommendation he may make.

Mr. FOSTER. Who are the other arbitrators ?

Mr. HYMAN. The chief architect of the department, the chief engineer of the department, and one of the chief technical officers.

Mr. FOSTER. Are they paid extra ?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes. I have always taken into consideration the time they have spent on these arbitrations and asked that a certain amount be paid these officers for their work.

Mr. FOSTER. Then it is three times as bad as I thought it was.

Mr. HYMAN. I do not agree with the hon. gentleman. I am sure, from the way the matter has worked out and the information obtained by the minister, it is distinctly in the public interest.

Mr. OSLER. How much were they paid last year ?

Mr. HYMAN. As this discussion came up incidentally on Mr. Gobeil's salary, I have not the information asked for.

Mr. LANCASTER. Do I understand that these are claims made against the government which are arbitrated in this way ?

Mr. HYMAN. It is not always a question of claims, but often of interpretations. In the many contracts, there are bound to arise disputes between the technical officer of the department and the man doing the work.

Mr. LANCASTER. There must be two parties to the dispute. The contractor is one, who is the other.

Mr. HYMAN. The government.

Mr. LANCASTER. Then you have a deputy minister, before whom come any number of claims against the government, on which he has to report, and you put him in this position that he knows that if he resists those claims, he will be appointed to arbitrate on them and in this way be paid special fees in addition to his salary. We are all human. I do not think any deputy minister should be put in this position. It seems to me that the matter only needs to be stated to win the unanimous vote of this House—perhaps excepting the cabinet—condemning this system.

Mr. HAGGART. The principle involved in this matter was threshed out long ago, and I had not supposed that there was in existence such a board as the Minister of Public Works has mentioned. When Mr. Page was the Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals, the same extraordinary system existed. A contractor might have his quantities certified to by the deputy minister. But, not being satisfied, he would make application for a reference to arbitration. The case was then referred to the arbitration of Mr. Page alone. But the anomaly was that he sat in review of the judgment which he had previously given in the case in the course of his regular departmental duties. I think that is a bad principle altogether. It was proved to be a bad principle and was condemned in the case of Mr. Page. It was thought to be an anomaly which ought not to exist. And judging of the thing from the statement of the Minister of Public Works himself, it seems to me that no such arbitration should continue. If contractors have claims against the government either for wrong measurements or for any other reasons, they should not go to the same man who has already given judgment, to have him revise that judgment.

Mr. FOWLER. I would ask the Minister of Public Works if the finding of this court of arbitration as he calls it—or rather, miscalls it—is final, or whether it is revised by the minister, and if the minister is final arbitrator ?

Mr. HYMAN. The finding of the arbitration is always sent to the minister. It is not final until it is passed by the minister—in fact, it is not final then, because it must go to the council, and after that, to the House.

Mr. FOWLER. How can you call this an arbitration when it is simply an investigation ? The term 'arbitration' is used as an excuse, as a cloak under which you pay these men for services more than they ought to be paid.

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. gentleman is stating the case most extremely. This is not a cloak or an excuse for anything ; it is simply a method adopted by the Department of Public Works and thought to be in the best interest of the public. When matters of this kind arise between the technical officers and some one doing work for the department, it goes to the minister in order that he may become conversant with all the details. The board of arbitrations and awards, with its power to cite witnesses and examine them under rules enables the minister to become thoroughly conversant with the matter before passing upon it.

Mr. FOWLER. Then, this so called arbitration is simply an investigation not an arbitration at all, and it is a misuse of the term to use it in that connection.

Mr. FOSTER. It should not be paid out of that vote.

Mr. FOWLER. The vote does not cover investigations but only arbitrations, and it is only an investigation of which the minister speaks. Such investigations should be carried on by the public officers under their regular salaries, and the minister, I submit, has no right to use this money in this way to pay these officials extra salary.

Mr. FOSTER. I will read the vouchers—

Mr. HYMAN. Would not the hon. gentleman wait until a vote for this service is up, and then I will have full information about it ?

Mr. FOSTER. This will be a piece of information for the minister.

Arbitrations and awards, including payments authorized notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act, $5,000.

That is from the Supply Bill. All this is for what is known as arbitration and award.

We are told now that it is not arbitration and award——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The point is an important one and deserves discussion, but it does not come properly under this item as the minister pointed out. He has an item covering this item and when that is before the House the whole subject can be discussed.

Mr. FOSTER. And it may not come up before the tail-end of the session.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No fear of that.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Department of Public Works—
Salaries.. .. ..$42,187 50
Contingencies.. .. .. 11,250 00

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the resolution passes I would like to understand a little better the policy of the government with regard to such matters as those we have just been discussing. It appears that the deputy minister of Public Works has acted in an investigation, or arbitration—I do not know what is the proper term to apply to it; and he has received the sum of $400 in one instance, or more than one instance, and $500 in another. Now that is either a matter which is connected with and should form part of the duties of his department, or it is a matter altogether outside of his duties. If it is a matter which is connected with and forms part of the duties of his department, it is unnecessary to say that he should receive no additional remuneration beyond the amount of his salary as deputy minister of Public Works. As I understand it, the Minister of Public Works takes the ground that it is outside of and apart from the duties of his office. Well, then, it would be convenient for us to understand what the policy of the government is in connection with such matters. I have under my hand a reply of the Postmaster General, who states :

Mr. H. D. Talbot, formerly postmaster at Cannington, Ontario, was relieved of his office on January 12, 1906, for the reason that he was, under the name of another man, carrying on a mercantile business in the village in competition with others in the same line of business, though the salary and allowances connected with the post office seemed sufficient to maintain the postmaster.

The salary of the postmaster, if I recollect rightly, was in the vicinity of $1,000. He was removed from his office because he had the temerity to be interested in a business carried on in the name of another person. Well, if the government sees fit to adopt what I should regard as an extreme policy of that kind in connection with the outside service, how does it happen that the same policy is not applied in the inside service to a gentleman who is in receipt of a salary four times as great as that of the postmaster at Cannington, and that this gentleman, the deputy minister should be paid very large sums of money for work altogether apart from the official duties for which he is paid by the public the salary of $4,000 ? It seems to me that if this principle should be applied to the outside service, it should be applied as well to the inside service. If it is competent for a deputy minister to engage in business, or work, outside of and independent of his departmental duties, for what reason do you apply a different principle to men in the outside service, even removing a postmaster because, not in his own name, but in the name of another person, and without any interference whatever with his official duties, he is seeking to eke out what would seem to be rather an insufficient salary which he derives from his position as postmaster ? I must confess that I do not yet understand what the policy of the government is with regard to such matters. Now, I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works in what respect did the act of the postmaster at Cannington create any detriment to the public service ; and if it did create any detriment to the public service, how are you to distinguish that detriment from a similar detriment which in that case must necessarily arise to the public service from the performance by Mr. Gobeil of this work outside the duties which he is called upon to perform under his engagement with the Crown ? What is the policy of the government with regard to both the inside and outside service, and for what reason have they adopted a different rule in the one case from that which they seem to adopt in the other ?

Hon. CHARLES HYMAN (Minister of Public Works). I acknowledge that I fail entirely to see any connection or any possible likeness between the case of the deputy minister of Public Works who is acting upon a board of arbitration on a matter concerning his own department, and the case of the postmaster at Cannington. I understand that the reason of the removal of the postmaster at Cannington was that he was performing duties outside those of his office, performing work which came into competition with others, and work which was outside of his office. I do not know the details of the case; I have no doubt that when the matter is brought before the House the Postmaster General will be prepared to defend his action in that matter. But I can see no similarity between the two cases.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Do I understand the Minister of Public Works to take the position that this work performed by the deputy minister of Public Works is entirely uncon-

nected with those duties ? Which position does he take ?

Mr. HYMAN. The duties which he performed arose from the fact of his being deputy of that department and having special knowledge of the work of the department, which knowledge made him more competent to act in that capacity. I do not say that the duties were entirely outside the Department of Public Works. The hon. gentleman understands my meaning, I am sure. There were technical disputes between officials of another department and those of the Department of Public Works, in the way of contracts or other matters, and the deputy minister of Public Works acted as arbitrator. I think both Mr. Tarte and Mr. Sutherland, when heads of that department asked this House for a vote for this very purpose, a vote to pay officials of the department who were called upon to act as an arbitration committee—the wording of the vote will show what it was for. They acted as an investigating committee for the purpose of investigating these matters as a board, of investigating them, not as deputy minister of Public Works, or as chief engineer, or as chief architect, but as a board composed of gentlemen within the department having knowledge of the matters in dispute. The board acted as ordinary officials of the department with those having claims against the department. I repeat that after two years of this system being in force, I have found it work with the best effect. Often matters of this kind are settled and adjudicated upon in the department, instead of their being referred to a court of law outside, which would naturally have far less technical knowledge of the matters in dispute, and be a less competent body to settle them.

Mr. FOSTER. How long has this been going on ?

Mr. HYMAN. I think this is the third year, I think this vote has been three years in the estimates.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not think the minister will relieve himself from difficulty by suggesting that there is another department in which another policy was carried out. This government is supposed to be responsible for a policy of some kind in connection with all the departments so far as that policy relates to similar matters. I suppose that the policy with regard to the outside service would not have been adopted except for some good reason, and I am bound to say I have not received much assistance from the Minister of Public Works thus far. I presume that the cabinet in adopting a principle must have had some reason in their mind, and I think they should be able to announce that reason to the House at the present time, if not through the mouth of the Minister of Public Works, through the mouth of some one else. It is idle to tell me that there is another department. I know there is another department. There should be one policy upon which the government should act in respect to matters of this kind in all the departments. What I respectfully ventured to inquire was, what detriment does the public service sustain by the act of the postmaster at Cannington which it does not sustain by the act of the deputy minister of Public Works ; and again I have no assistance whatever from my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works. The hon. gentleman says that it is very plain—that it is exceedingly plain. He says that his officer does not perform these duties as Deputy Minister of Public Works. Well then he is permitted to go outside and engage in an occupation which does not form part of his official duty. That seems to me to follow logically from what the hon. gentleman said. I do not know whether he will agree with me or whether he understands his own words in that way.

Mr. HYMAN. I understand the words but I do not understand the similarity between the two matters. I may be very stupid, I know, but I do not.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman seems to be dense.

Mr. HYMAN. Very dense indeed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. He seems to be remarkably dense. The difference is that one has to do with the Post Office Department and the other with the Department of Public Works. There is that difference but I do not see that there is any great difference outside of that.

Mr. HYMAN. There is some.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, the hon. gentleman has not made it very plain to us so far. He admits that the deputy minister of Public Works is paid $4,000 a year for performing his duty as deputy. He says that he does not do this work as deputy, that this is work altogether outside of the performance of his duty as deputy. He is permitted then to engage in outside work or an outside occupation. What difference is there between the case of the postmaster of Cannington, and the case of the Deputy Minister of Public Works ? In one case a man carries on, without any interference with his official duties, a business in the name of another person at Cannington. Upon the premises with which I started he performs his duties as postmaster at Cannington satisfactorily to the public. The ground assigned for his removal was that he was engaging in business in the name of another person. He performs his service to the country well. The Deputy Minister of Public Works performs his service to the country well. The one is paid a salary of $1,000 a year and the other is paid a salary

of $4,000 a year. One of them is a postmaster and he supplements his salary by engaging in business in the name of another person. The other is permitted to make $1,000 or $1,500 a year extra.

Mr. HYMAN. I do not think he makes that much; I think the hon. gentleman is overstating the amount.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not say that he makes that much. How much does the minister say ?

Mr. HYMAN. I have not the details. I have promised the committee all the details when the matter comes up.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If I am in error in regard to the figures I do not wish to insist upon the amount. My hon. friend beside me gave one case in which he received $400 and another case in which he received $500.

Mr. FOSTER. That is right.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know whether that is correct or not. I mention $1,500 or $1,000. I withdraw the $1,500 if I am in error. However, it does not make much difference as to the amount; it is the question of principle I am discussing. The hon. Minister of Public Works has pointed out with a great deal of seriousness that one question occurred in the department of the Postmaster General and that the other occurred in his own department. It does not seem after all that that fact affects the question or the general principle as to which I am endeavouring to ascertain the policy of the government. I am bound to say still, notwithstanding the vague statement of the hon. Minister of Public Works, that I am not very much enlightened as to the policy of the government.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not think that my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) has exerted his powers of discrimination at all because otherwise he would have found readily the answer which he is endeavouring to get. I would not think of discussing at this moment the Postmaster General's Department; it will come up in a few minutes, but I think I can assign the reason why the postmaster at Cannington was dismissed. My hon. friend knows that in the country post offices the salaries generally are not very large. The post office is given to a trader sometimes and there is great rivalry between traders and traders. Sometimes one, who, in addition to his own business, keeps the post office, is very apt to create some resentment in his own community and strong exception is taken to this fact that the postmaster will carry on with the business of his office another business. If the salary is ample to recompense the postmaster for the performance of his duties dismissal will sometimes take place. But sometimes a man will get $40 or $50 or $100 under which circumstances he is allowed to carry on some other business. Something of that kind was taking place in Cannington. It was supposed by his neighbours that the salary of the postmaster was ample to command all his time and that he should not be permitted therefore to carry on another business. That was the whole reason for his removal. It is a reason which is not new to this House, it has been heard of more than once, and therefore, when we come to the discussion of the Postmaster General's estimates, we may have the reason given why this postmaster was dismissed. There is no parity at all between this case and the case which is mentioned. The case which is mentioned is a different one. I do not know whether this policy was initiated by my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works or by his predecessor, but at all events the Minister of Public Works has initiated a new policy; that is to say the policy of having a board of his own officers to investigate claims which are in dispute in his department. It is a matter of notoriety, of common knowledge, that the adjustment of accounts in all the great spending departments of the government is always a subject of controversy. The proper officer will pass upon an account. It may be that the architect or the deputy minister himself will pass upon an account. Then, the creditor of the government is not satisfied with the judgment of the officer. He appeals to the Minister. The Minister, instead of dealing himself at once with the creditor, has thought it advisable—and there is a good deal in that policy—of having a board of his own officers to look over the account, to look into the matters in dispute and to make a report to him as to how they stand. This, I think, it will be admitted, is a wise policy. There is only one thing as to which there may be some ground for dispute or contention. Whether or not the officers who are called upon to perform these duties should be remunerated or not may be open to question. That is the only point and in my judgment it is a subject, and a proper subject, for discussion. I do not pass any judgment upon it at this moment. It is a purely departmental matter, but, at all events objection has been raised against the policy of remunerating these officers and there is a good deal to be said in favour of the point taken by hon. gentlemen on the other side. As I said I am not prepared to pass any judgment upon it. But, it seems to me that this discussion is altogether premature.

Mr. FOSTER. No.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, and I will tell my hon. friend why. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works has,

as he informs me, in these very estimates we are discussing, an item to provide for the remuneration of this board. This discussion will come up properly when we discuss that item. The remuneration which is to be paid to the deputy minister, as to which exception has been taken by my hon. friends opposite, cannot be granted out of anything which is to be voted at this moment under the resolution under discussion. If it is to be paid at all it must be paid only out of the vote which is asked for that particular purpose, the item will come up later on and then we can have a discussion upon this whole question. If the committee refuses to pass this special item, Mr. Gobeil will have to perform these duties without extra remuneration. Under the circumstances the present discussion is altogether premature. The Minister himself says : I am not prepared to discuss the item at this moment ; I have not the information you ask for. You ask me how much has been paid to Mr. Gobeil and I cannot say, but I will have the information at the proper time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister began by saying that he would make the matter extremely clear and he has ended up by making it extremely hazy.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, you will see the difference.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I venture to say that the facts are not at all as he states them. He describes the duties to be the duties of a board of investigation performed by officers of the department. The Minister of Public Works takes issue with the Prime Minister. He tells us that Mr. Gobeil was not performing these duties as deputy minister of Public Works. The Prime Minister says that he was. The minister says that this is a board of investigation outside of the business of the department.

Mr. HYMAN. Therefore he is one of the board.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Prime Minister and the Minister of Public Works will have to settle their difference of opinion as to that between themselves. I tell the Prime Minister that if these gentlemen are doing this work as officers of the department, it is my humble opinion a misuse of public money to have paid them for this work. Under what statute is any bonus of this kind allowed to the deputy Minister of Public Works for the performance of this duty ? I do not know of any, and I have not heard of any.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will tell my hon. friend in a moment.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am sorry the Prime Minister did not tell us before when he undertook to make the matter so extremely plain. As I understood the right hon. gentleman, the reason the postmaster at Cannington was not permitted to carry on business was that he came into competition with other people.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I did not say that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If that is not the meaning of what the Prime Minister said, then I must plead, as the Minister of Public Works did, that I am very dense this evening. If that is a good reason in the case of the Cannington postmaster why is it not a good reason in the case of the deputy Minister of Public Works ? When he undertakes these arbitrations is he not entering into competition with people who have not a four thousand dollar salary. If the Cannington postmaster is not allowed to supplement his somewhat meagre salary because he entered into competition with other people, then why do you not prevent the Deputy Minister of Public Works with his salary of $4,000 from entering into competition with people who are no doubt just as competent to perform this work as he is. The Prime Minister has certainly not made the matter abundantly clear. I repeat, that, from the Prime Minister's own statement, there was no justification whatever for paying the Deputy Minister of Public Works one single dollar for his services.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sorry I did not make myself clear, but I am afraid my hon. friend is not a very willing pupil.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is the teacher's fault.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This money was paid to Mr. Gobeil under the Supply Act voted last session and the two previous sessions. This is not found in the statute which defines the duty of the deputy Minister of Public Works, but it is found in the Supply Act in which an item was introduced for the very purpose—

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will the right hon. gentleman read the item to which he refers.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is a similar item provided in this years estimates, and when we come to it, it will be a legitimate subject for discussion as to whether or not officials should receive special payment for these duties. At page 57 of the estimates will be found the item : Miscellaneous : Arbitrations and awards; including payments authorized notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act, $5,000. When we come to that item it will be a proper subject for discussion. For my part I say frankly that there is a good deal to be said in favour of the view taken by the other side that

the officers should be called upon by the minister for all the services they can be called upon to discharge without special remuneration being given. The minister has reason to believe there may be exceptions to every rule, and this may be a proper exception.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In regard to that item from the estimates, I thought the right hon. gentleman had long ago admitted that this was neither an arbitration nor an award, but an investigation by the officers of the Public Works Department.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That matters not.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, if it matters not, you could apply this $5,000 to anything and it is left entirely to the sweet fancy of the Minister of Public Works. Both the Prime Minister and the Minister of Public Works seem to agree that this is absolutely out of the pale of arbitrations and awards, and therefore I repeat that there is no authority, statutory or otherwise, which justifies this absolute misuse of public money.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I admit that the expression 'arbitrations and awards' is not proper.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the expression in the Supply Bill is not proper then the appropriation has been misused.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. When the matter was brought up in the House explanation might have been asked as to that.

Mr. FOSTER. I venture to say there was not a syllable uttered in this House which would lead any one to believe that the purpose of that vote was to pay the deputy minister or the chief architect or any other of these officers.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The discussion may have been insufficient. At all events the same vote is in the estimates this year and there is now plenty of notice and we shall have a proper discussion on it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What about the question of competition ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We can discuss that question then.

Mr. OSLER. The Prime Minister emhpasizes his opinion that this is not the proper time to discuss this question, but our experience in the House is that these items that are a little delicate are brought in at the end of the session when everyone is weary and then there is no chance of discussing them. I say this is the proper time to discuss such a question. The Prime Minister says there is no analogy between this case and the case of the postmaster at Cannington who was dismissed because he was competing with other merchants in the town, and thereby causing jealousy as between himself and the other merchants. I say there is an absolute analogy, because while the other merchants were jealous of the postmaster, it is human nature that the other civil servants should be jealous of these other officials in the Public Works Department who are getting very large additions to their salaries for doing very little work.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER: They are doing good work.

Mr. OSLER. Even if they are it is work that belongs to their department, and if there are not enough officials in the department to do the work then others should be engaged.

You have picked out three civil servants to whom you are going to give what may amount to more than double their salaries. I do not say that it has been that, but under these conditions it may amount to that or more. The effect of that must be to cause jealousy and heart-burning on the part of all the other heads of departments in the service, because human nature is as strong among these people as among others. The system may have worked well, but the principle is absolutely and entirely vicious, and if it should continue to be acted upon from year to year, you might ultimately get a condition of affairs under which the deputy heads of the departments might agree with each other that in every case there should be a disagreement with the contractor and a reference to the board of arbitration, with a division of the fees among them. This matter reminds me of an incident which occurred in the days of the old bank of Upper Canada. In the investigation which took place into its affairs it was discovered that the manager of one very important agency of the bank had agreed with the solicitor to pay half the notarial fees on every note that was paid at maturity, the two sharing the fees between them. A similar condition of things might occur in the departments, under an agreement between the deputy heads to refer disputed matters to arbitration, and to share the fees which they would get in addition to their salaries. I do not think anything of this kind has happened. As the Minister of Public Works has said, thus far this system has probably worked well, but I say without any hesitation that it is a vicious one, and in the interest of the civil service and of the public it should not be continued one day longer.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Let me appeal to my hon. friend, who is a business man. My hon. friend says the system is a vicious one. I say it is an excellent one. My hon. friend objects to the payment of these men for the work they do as ar-

bitrators. I admit that there is room for a difference of opinion on that point—not for the reason he gives, that there might be heart-burning or jealousy on the part of other officials, or that there might be collusion between an officer and a contractor, but because the principle has been affirmed here more than once—and there must be strong reasons to justify a departure from it—that a man in the civil service should give all his time to his duties without any extra remuneration. That is a right principle, and I say at once that it will take strong argument to convince me that there should be an exception to it. But, I say again, this is not the time to discuss this principle. At present the question before us is the vote for the salaries of the deputy minister, architect and other officers of the department. No exception is taken to this vote. The objections raised by my hon. friends opposite are directed to the question whether Mr. Gobeil should receive extra remuneration, and I think the proper time to discuss that will be later on.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a matter of opinion. I prefer to discuss it now, when we have a chance to discuss it. I am quite aware how matters of this kind slip away to a happy hereafter, and we hear no more of them.

Mr. PATERSON. Not when you are around.

Mr. FOSTER. I may not be around at that time. We have had the opinions of two ministers who have not agreed very well. I wonder what will happen when we introduce a third. I understood that there was a well established principle upon which the Postmaster General acted in reference to the Cannington postmaster. I understood that the principle was, not that attention should be paid to the jealousy of some grocer or scrivener because a postmaster was earning a little more than his bread and butter. I did not suppose that was an impelling motive to induce a minister to say whether the postmaster at Cannington should or should not continue to earn his living. I supposed that the reason was this, that a man whose office was sufficient to occupy his whole attention ought to give his whole attention to it. What did the Postmaster General say the other day about that? Was it that John Jones was jealous of the postmaster of Cannington because he sold groceries and infringed on his trade? Not at all. The Postmaster General went straight to the point, he said:

> It is and has always been the policy and the practice of the department to require postmasters to give personal attention to the duties of their offices, and where a post office is sufficiently important to call for the full time and attention of the postmaster, and the salary adequate for his maintenance, it is considered undesirable that he should engage in any other business.

That I think is an intelligible ground, but do not let us base the policy of a department on the fact that John Jones may be jealous of his neighbour because his neighbour infringes a little on his grocery line or his chicken preserve. The Postmaster General hit the nail on the head. This man had enough work to do to attend to his office; his salary was sufficient to pay him for his work, $950 per year, and the Postmaster General decided that he should give his time exclusively to his office or leave it. Apply the same rule to Mr. Gobeil. Will the First Minister say that Mr. Gobeil has not sufficient work as deputy minister to take up his time and attention? There can be only one answer to that question. Then, applying the rule laid down by the Postmaster General, Mr. Gobeil has enough work in his office and gets enough salary, and, therefore, he ought to attend exclusively to his office and leave that outside business alone. I am confident that there was not a man in this House at the time who had the least idea that the vote was one under which you could smuggle a payment to a deputy minister contrary to the Civil Service Act. Had that been known and understood when this vote was passed, there would have been a stiff fight over it. You may contend that you may take a vote for awards and arbitrations and then tack on to it those little words, 'notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act to the contrary,' and then pay any permanent officer in the service whatever you like out of that vote in addition to his salary. I say you cannot do that. I say that before the money could be paid to Mr. Gobeil the vote should have passed by order in council at the very least. It may be that the council had the power by an order to allocate a portion of that vote to a permanent officer, but the minister himself had not that right nor had the department. That is the strong ground which the Auditor General took. He did not pass those two accounts, but reported them to the Treasury Board. Get a supplementary vote, he said, for these gentlemen, and then have the addition made to them by virtue of an order in council. Mr. Gobeil promised to do that, but took good care not to do it. Time slipped by and up to this date he has not implemented his promise to the Auditor General that he would have the matter disposed of by the Treasury Board. The Auditor General did his duty. He sent it to the Treasury Board, and it lies there yet for all I know. But outside of all that, this work is either work that pertains to the duties of the deputy or it does not. If it does, let the deputy minister do the work. And if his salary of $4,000—which is the same as the other deputy ministers get—is not sufficient, let it be increased, but increased in a manner fair and aboveboard,

and not surreptitiously in this way. Does the First Minister not remember what took place in this House not so many years ago? What was it that led to the investigation we then had into the civil service? It was this very practice of making overtime payments to civil servants outside their regular salary, and it was just on that point that hon. gentlemen opposite, then in opposition, made their strongest attack on the late government. Now these same gentlemen are slipping again into the civil service in the dark that same miserable, deteriorating, disorganizing and disintegrating method. If the deputy minister and the chief architect and another officer, all of whom are paid good salaries, are to get an extra $500 or $400 every once in awhile, do you think that the rest of the service do not know it? Is not that a temptation to the rest of the service to get some side show which will add a little to their salaries? That cannot fail to be the result, and the service will become disorganized.

Mr. HYMAN. My hon. friend seems to labour under the impression that this matter was smuggled through the House and that the House did not fully understand the vote it was passing. Well, I have the debate on this very item in the Hansard of 1903, which I shall have to inflict on the House:

Arbitrations and awards, including payments authorized notwithstanding anything contrary in the Civil Service Act, $5,000.

The mere fact of the addition of these words 'notwithstanding, &c.,' is tantamount to stating that a portion of the vote will be paid to civil servants who would otherwise not be entitled to receive it. Here is the debate on this item:

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. This is to enable the department to pay the expenses of investigation and necessary arbitration in connection with claims. We find that we can often settle claims by having some of our own officials or outside experts to arbitrate between the parties, and in that way save a great deal of money.

Mr. LANCASTER. What is the reason of this reference to the Civil Service Act ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Some of the officials of the government might be more competent to undertake this work than outsiders, and out of this money we will pay their expenses when they are sent away from headquarters.

Mr. LANCASTER. Extra pay besides their salary ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Hardly extra pay. If these disputes can be settled by our own officials it will be very much cheaper to use them than to engage outsiders.

Mr. BLAIN. Are there any cases pending at the present time ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. I am sorry there are some claims. These are often small matters, but they give a good deal of trouble. There are continually disputes between the architect, the engineers in charge and the contractors. I am sure that by having an item like this, we shall save a good deal to the country.

Mr. WILSON. Does this cover the commission to investigate ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. A small commission will be paid out of this.

Mr. LANCASTER. What is the nature of the dispute ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Questions of constructions of contracts and specifications. My hon. friend will know from experience that difficulties are continually arising, and it saves a great deal of trouble and expense to have these matters amicably settled.

Mr. MONK. If that is not to be a gratuity to the civil service, but merely to cover expenses, when they are employed on investigations, why do you insert the words 'notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act' ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Very often the disputes are left to the decision of a man of experience in another department, and a small allowance would not be out of the way for the trouble and expense.

Mr. MONK. Will this amount of $5,000 be paid to nobody else but civil servants ?

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. Occasionally we may go outside the service. The contractor might think that a government employee was biassed, but we find it less expensive to employ a civil servant when the contractor will consent.

Mr. MONK. For my part, although this is a vague vote, I would not object to having it employed in remunerating the civil service if necessary.

The MINISTER OF PUBLIC WORKS. We have the same vote every year in the Railway Department, and we find that it has worked to advantage.

I simply read this for the purpose of proving that when that vote was discussed in 1903 there was no desire or intention on the part of the then Minister of Public Works to in any way deceive or mystify the House or allow the House to remain under any misunderstanding as to the purpose of the vote. It is very plain in the explanation given by the then Minister of Public Works, and the vote has been used since that time for the purpose indicated. I can only say that the one objectionable feature—one that I have always seen and one the possibility of removing which I will take into serious consideration between now and the time the other vote is taken up—is the question of extra pay. The work of this committee or board has been of a great deal of service to the department. The only objection, I think, is to the extra remuneration.

Mr. FOSTER. If there is extra expense, of course, there is no objection to paying that.

Mr. HYMAN. There is that to be taken into consideration. I will give my best attention to the subject. The vote is now a part of the estimates and must come up. If hon. gentlemen wish to get at it quickly, we shall be very glad to have the other items go through until this one is reached.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not think the matter is so plain as the minister suggests—

Mr. HYMAN. It is on 'Hansard' and I think it was pretty plain.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the hon. gentleman will let me have 'Hansard' I will look at the passage he quoted. If I caught it correctly as he read it, the suggestion was that one department might use the services of an officer of another department. Outside of that, I think, the only money to be spent was to pay expenses.

Mr. HYMAN. I do not think that is the meaning to be taken out of it, perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) will read it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The question was asked the Minister of Public Works of that time first about expenses, and he says that there will be expenses.

Mr. MONK then asks :

If this is not to be a gratuity for the civil service——

That shows how he understood it.

Mr. HYMAN. But read what Mr. Monk said afterwards.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mr. Monk said :—

If this is not to be a gratuity to the civil service, but merely to cover expenses when they are employed on investigations, why do you insert the words 'notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act' ?

The object of the question is very plain. I draw attention to the answer of the Minister of Public Works of that day as indicating why he thought it necessary—and the only reason why he thought it necessary—to make these payments. He said :—

Very often the disputes are left to the decision of a man of experience in another department, and a small allowance would not be out of the way for the trouble and expense.

Mr. HYMAN. That contemplates a payment.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I venture to think, notwithstanding the dissent of the Minister of Public Works, that what I suggested as the meaning of the explanation would be regarded by most people as the real explanation. However, we will have the question discussed later on, and I do not wish to take up the time of the House further at this time.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I would like to say a word before this question is dropped. As one person is impressed by one idea and another by another idea, I venture to speak because I think the most important point has not been touched upon. I am glad the Minister of Public Works has promised to take the whole matter into his consideration. The point that seems to be important is a simple one. This vote is an amount for arbitrations and awards, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act. We all understand the meaning of these latter words to be that an official in the employ of the government can act as arbitrator notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act. But, from the statement made this afternoon, there is no arbitration. The statement made by the former Minister of Public Works was evidently along the line of arbitration.

Mr. HYMAN. I think the word 'investigation' is used by the then Minister of Public Works in discussing the matter before the House.

Mr. NORTHRUP. 'Investigation and arbitration' are the words used.

Mr. FOSTER. That is not in the vote.

Mr. NORTHRUP. The vote is for 'arbitration and award.' The explanation given by the minister is investigation and arbitration, the investigation being preliminary to the arbitration, I presume. It strikes me that the difficulty the government is in, if the House votes the amount for arbitration and awards notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, is that this would authorize the government only to pay their employees who act as arbitrators and make awards. But, according to the explanation, there has been neither arbitration nor award but merely investigation. It seems to me that the minister would be as much justified in paying a part of this money to the man who blacks his boots as in paying it to a man who carries on an investigation. I think the minister had better consider whether the votes passed by parliament have been applied as voted or whether this money has been used without justification.

Mr. PATERSON. It seems to me that this is in line with the minister seeking the judgment of the heads of the department—

Mr. FOSTER. They are there for that purpose.

Mr. PATERSON. I was about to point out that in the administration of a department questions will necessarily arise, which it is not easy for the minister to settle. Take, for instance, the Customs Department. Some of the business community represents that a certain article should be admitted at twenty-five per cent duty. The collector at that port may demand a duty of thirty per cent. The matter has been reported to the commissioner, and the commissioner might decide the matter one way or the other. But, at times, very nice questions arise, questions in which the commissioner himself would like to have the benefit of consultation and argument with the heads of branches—the head of

the checking branch, the Dominion appraiser, and so on. So, we have the board of customs constituted, which meets at intervals. Questions arising may be held for their decisions, questions in which the commissioner himself would like to have their judgment. In old times, the commissioner of customs was paid $2,800 a year as commissioner and $800 as chairman of the board of customs. I changed that when the other changes were made, and an advance was given to the deputy, but the distinction between the two payments was done away with. But I can understand that the Minister of Public Works finds it very useful, in the administration of the affairs of his department, to get the advice of three or four of the leading experts in difficult cases. That is the reason why we have a board of customs, which is provided for by law and which is continually having questions referred to it. When they report a decision upon a point which they may differ with the business community and this goes before the minister, if the minister's judgment coincides with theirs, he signifies his approval and then the decision has the force of law. The minister feels strengthened by the fact that not only has he the judgment of his deputy minister but he has the combined judgment of the other leading men of the department. And I can understand that it must be a benefit to the Minister of Public Works that he should be able to avail himself of the board which he has established. I recognize at the same time that there is a point in what hon. gentlemen opposite say, and in saying that they are performing part of their regular duty. However, it seems to me that there is wisdom in employing the services of your leading expert, as is done in the Department of Customs, to confer with others upon some particular matters, to bring their combined judgment to bear, and to advise the minister after full discussion. It does seem to me that that is in the interest of the public service.

Mr. LANCASTER. I am thankful to the Minister of Customs for strengthenthe argument I made before six o'clock. I find that the Minister of Customs strengthens what we have said on this side of the House, and that the Minister of Customs seems to think it is a help to his department when his employees undertake to disagree among themselves if by so doing they can get extra pay, and he thinks they should get it. Now it strikes me that when we pay civil servants to exercise their judgment upon matters coming within the purview of their department, they should try and exercise a correct judgment, and do it for the salary they are getting, and they should not have the inducement placed before their eyes which the Minister of Customs now clearly shows they have, to disagree among themselves so that they may be called together and asked to give the benefit of their combined wisdom, and obtain additional remuneration for doing so. The Minister of Customs instances several cases in his department which all confirm what I said before six o'clock, and that is, that there is clearly an object, even in his department for his officers to disagree as to what they ought to do in regard to matters brought under their notice. He says they might disagree, and then they would have to be called together to settle their disagreement, and in that case they are supposed to get extra remuneration. Either these officers are competent to perform the work they have to do or they are not; if they are not competent, they should not be employed in the department, if they are competent and are not paid enough salary for performing their duty, they should get an additional salary.

Mr. DERBYSHIRE. Do not lawyers disagree ?

Mr. LANCASTER. I never heard of a statute being passed to make it an object for lawyers to disagree. I can well understand that the Minister of Public Works wants the help of the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Derbyshire); but I would ask the member for Brockville to cite one instance, either in this parliament or any other legislature, where a statute has been passed providing that officials of a department may disagree among themselves and be called together to act as arbitrators and get a second remuneration therefor. If my hon. friend from Brockville were to propose such a statute, he would be laughed out of the House. I understand from the Minister of Customs that this practice prevails in his department, and that public servants whom we pay a salary for doing the work they are employed to do, may at the same time go outside of their functions, that they may disagree among themselves and be paid an additional salary for settling their disagreements under the guise of arbitrators. That is, in effect, the argument of the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Customs, and if my hon. friend from Brockville can put it in any better way than that, I hope he will do so and thereby relieve this government of the difficulty in which they have put themselves. I think the people are not satisfied with that kind of thing, they are not satisfied with it, even in Brockville, if they know anything about it. Now I want to repeat again what I said before six o'clock, that the Minister of Public Works is holding out an inducement to Mr. Gobeil, the deputy minister of Public Works, to find fault with contractors on claims and so on, that he and other experts of that department may be called together to settle those claims and get additional remunera-

tion. That is the effect of the policy of this government, if you can call it a policy. They undertake to say that in disputes arising between the contractors and the government, the officials of those departments may take different views upon those questions in order that they may be called together and settle those disputes and be paid additional remuneration therefor. Then the Minister of Customs takes their advice and comes in and says that these things have been done in the interest of the Customs Department, and therefore it is all right. If it is, then I say so much the worse for the Customs Department. If the minister has employees in his department who do not know how to classify goods, and who, by disagreeing as to how goods should be classified and charged for, by simply disagreeing among themselves as to what rates of duty should be charged against the importer, they can get together and get additional remuneration, by settling their disagreement, then I say the sooner the Minister of Customs reorganizes his department the better it will be for the country.

Mr. PATERSON. I may tell the hon. gentleman that I do not propose to reorganize the Customs Department on the lines he suggests, nor do I acknowledge that he is entitled to draw from my remarks any such conclusion as he has just stated. Neither the present Minister of Customs nor his predecessors can be blamed for the policy which at present prevails in the department. My hon. friend is a lawyer, and he ought to know something about the laws that are passed in parliament. Does he not know that parliament passed a statute that there should be a board of customs in the Customs Department ?

Mr. FOSTER. Why, that is not so.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman surely knows that, and knows that it has been in operation, I suppose, twenty years or more, and has been administered by every minister at the head of that department. Now the hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) without knowing what he is talking about, jumps into this discussion and wants this whole thing done away with. Why, Sir, this statute has been administered by Sir Mackenzie Bowell and by Mr. Wallace before it was administered by myself, and they have found it to be an absolute necessity. Then he talks about the officials agreeing among themselves to disagree, saying that the collector at Montreal may disagree with something, that the question may be sent up to Ottawa and submitted to Mr. McDougald, the commissioner, and then Mr. McDougald will get the other officials together and all these things will take place which his fancy has invented. Why, Sir, the present statute is necessary to the working of the Customs Department, recognized to be so, and has been decreed by the parliament of Canada. Questions are continually coming up of that kind in administering a tariff such as ours, in which there may be diversities of opinion, where one man might think a certain article should come in under a certain range of duty while another man might think it should come in under another. There must be some tribunal to determine these differences of opinion, and the law provides that it should be done by a board of customs who report their decision to the minister, and if he approves of it, then it has the force of law, and is only subject to appeal to the Governor in Council. Therefore, I hope that my hon. friend will not insist upon abolishing the board of customs, but let us keep it a little longer.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does that include Mr. Gobeil and those men in his department ?

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman is getting away from the question. It does not. But right on that point let me say that the board of customs might be constituted by others than those constituting it, but the minister of the department who is administering it now has, in his judgment, changed some of the members of the board. There used to be assistants brought from different points. It necessitated expense. I did not think their judgment was better than the judgment I have close at hand and therefore we have appointed a board within the department every one of the members of which is right there. They meet together. The commissioner of customs has difficult questions to decide. He will have merchants backed by able lawyers like my hon. friend there, coming up and saying : There is the law; that is the clause which it ought to come under, and the commissioner, not being able to decide off hand, has he to run to the chief clerk of the check department under whom a great many of these things come to get that particular question solved ? Or has he to run to the Dominion Appraiser's branch and ask Mr. Breadner : What do you think about this ? Mr. Wood thinks so and so, the assistant commissioner thinks so and so—what do you think ? That is not the way it is done. You cannot administer a department in that way. But, he takes occasion at stated intervals to summon these officers and they sit down together and determine these questions. I can understand the Minister of Public Works to be in the same position. A question of contract comes up. Whom does he get to adjudicate upon it ? He does not get outsiders. He says : Here are men, experts in their own departments. One is an architect, another has experience in another way and he brings them together in the form of a board and they discuss these questions. There is the question as to whe-

ther extra pay should be allowed to these men or not and that is all there is in it.

Mr. FOSTER. May I ask my hon. friend a question and that will settle that part of it? When he calls in his men and when they take these matters up and come to a decision about them does he have a special vote for his deputy 'notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act' and does he use this vote as a gratuity to give to those who perform this work, or is this a regular part of their work for which they get regular pay?

Mr. PATERSON. They do the work without extra pay. A special amount used to be paid to the commissioner of customs. He used to be paid so much as commissioner of customs and so much as chairman of the board of customs, but when the salaries of the deputies were being raised I thought it was better to do away with that and have the sum voted to him as commissioner including the other duty that is placed upon him.

Mr. OSLER. The amount is a fixed amount for the whole year's service? It is not contingent?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, a fixed amount. The point I lay weight upon is this, and it applies to the Department of Public Works as well as my own, that you can understand that when you are getting the combined judgment of officers, one having knowledge on another point, you are getting something which must be of help to the minister. There is the question in dispute as to whether these officers should be remunerated and my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works himself has said that it is a question which is worthy of consideration.

Mr. BARKER. It seems to me, after listening to the hon. Minister of Customs, that he has pretty well convinced the committee that the system ought to be abolished all around. He tells us that he abolished this very bad system in his own department. He used to pay the commissioner separately for this distinct work, but he abolished that system because he thought it was not a right system and he says the fact that it once existed in his own department is a justification for its going on in the Department of Public Works.

Mr. TAYLOR. Before the item passes I would like to say a word and I will try not to occupy more than half the time occupied by the hon. Minister of Customs who tried to drag a herring across the trail. In the discussion a few minutes ago I understood the right hon. Prime Minister, in answer to the leader of opposition, to say that there was no comparison between the question now under discussion and the discharge of the postmaster at Cannington. He laid it down as the policy of the government that sometimes they do allow postmasters to draw salaries of $25, $50 and $100 and to engage in other businesses but that if they go above a certain amount they must be dismissed. I want to know if it is the policy of the government to dismiss every postmaster who is engaged in mercantile business and who is drawing a salary above $100. In reading the Postmaster General's Report I find postmasters all through the country, some of them drawing much larger salaries than that of the postmaster at Cannington, engaged in mercantile businesses. I want to know if it is the policy of the government that every postmaster who is drawing a salary equal to the postmaster at Cannington is going to be dismissed?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is another herring across the trail. We will come to that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question, question.

Mr. FOSTER. No, I am afraid I will have to interject another question. After this rather heavy, tragic one this will appear a little more like comedy, but it is important also and it is in the same minister's department. I find that the Auditor General had a bout which was as little successful in bringing a solution as was the preceding one and the controversy shuts off with a pathetic statement by the new auditor on the 18th January, 1906, that he has not yet got an answer to his repeated questions and letters. This has reference to travelling expenses. I take the items from the Auditor General's Report. Mr. Gelinas is, I understand, secretary of the department and not the secretary of the minister?

Mr. HYMAN. No, secretary of the department.

Mr. FOSTER. I find that Mr. Gelinas has a penchant for travelling, but with a very good idea of not over exposing himself too much he makes short trips. All his travelling appears to be done between Ottawa and Montreal excepting that in a few cases he extends his journey from Montreal to the old historic city of Quebec.

The Auditor General says:

> The sum of $1,096.80 is charged as the cost of 28 trips between July 1, 1903, and June 30, 1904; 25 trips being to Montreal and return, and 3 to Montreal and Quebec and return. The time consumed was 82 days or parts of days. The charges for letters, telegrams, telephones, have been entered together each day in gross, at sums which appear too round to represent actual transactions; and they are also much larger than those claimed by any other government officer within the range of my memory.

This was the old Auditor General. His memory ranges back to the time of confederation.

> For 79 days the entries for these services are 3 days at $2.50 2 at $2.75, 31 at $3, 1 at $3.25, 42

at $3.50, 4 at $3.75 5 at $4, 1 at $4.50, total, $265.75.

An admirable crescendo, as the hon. minister will see, all for letters, telegrams and telephones. All of the said letters, I suppose, in the main you may say, coming to this department without any extra charge for postage, all telegrams. I should suppose, coming to his department also 'collect' and as to the telephones, I suppose these would have to be paid for if they were not charged up.

Similarly, the charges for 'cabs and street cars' in Montreal and Quebec are in round sums of unusual size. For 50 days the entries for these services are: 1 day at $2.50, 1 at $3, 1 at $3.25, 19 at $3.50, 2 at $3.75, 17 at $4, 7 at $4.50, 1 at $5, 1 at $5.50.

The 'letters, telegrams and telephones' for these few months total up to $265.75. The 'cab hire and street cars in Montreal and Quebec' for these two months total up to $192.75. Over and above that, Mr. Gelinas charges for cab hire in Ottawa from office to house and station, and from station to house in connection with the above mentioned 28 trips, the sum of $59. His other charges for cab hire in Ottawa during the year amount to $404, the total cab hire for the year being $463. This is much larger than any sum charged before during the whole experience of the Auditor General; and the Tory government was in while he was in power for several years, and it was said they were very extravagant.

Mr. HYMAN. He excepts the ministers.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, yes, he keeps him within his rank. The Auditor General says:

There should be a statement from Mr. Gelinas that only tariff rates were paid and that the service to the government could not have been efficaciously performed by using the street cars.

And here is a neat little touch:

The directory gives Mr. Gelinas' residence as 582 Lisgar street, only two and a half blocks from the Somerset street car line.

Then, from July 1 to October 1, 1904, a period of four months there were 13 trips from Ottawa and the sum of $464.50 was charged; twelve trips being to Montreal and return and one to Montreal and Quebec and return, the time consumed being 33 days or part of days. The charges for letters, telegrams and telephones' amounted for the 30 days to $110.20 as follows: One day at $3.20, two days at $3.50, three at $4, four at $4.50. The charges for cabs and street cars in Montreal and Quebec amount in 22 days to $84, as follows. One day at $2, two days at $2.50, six at $3.50, five at $4, eight at $4.50. Details are given for $20 additionnal cab hire in Montreal, being twelve trips at $2.50 and one at $2. Mr. Gelinas is a remarkably great traveller, at short distances of course. Then the Auditor General says:

Mr. FOSTER.

Cab hire in Ottawa, July 1 to October 31, 1904—cab hire to and from house and station in connection with trips out of Ottawa amounted to $31.75; other cab hire in Ottawa during the same period, $62.50; total for four months now under consideration, $94.25.

To make a long story short the cab hire of this gentleman for one year was $225.50 and the travelling expenses $794.50. If he keeps on at the rate of the last four months for this current year it will be something like $1,200. Now, it seems in one respect like small business to talk about cab hire.

Mr. HYMAN. I do not think it is small business; I think it is a very serious matter.

Mr. FOSTER. In some respects it is more important than large expenditures. I look through this Auditor General's Report now, and I have looked through it for a great many years, and I think no unprejudiced person can look through it without seeing the tendency there is to unnecessary, extravagant, and useless expenditures. They get the fashion set by those high above them; they are quick to learn and imitate those that are above them. Any way, the word is, spend, spend, spend; and in their little way it is put into practice and it turns out into just such extravagance and indefensible expenditures as that of the secretary of the Public Works Department. He goes down to Montreal and he comes back—has he a pass; are his fares included in that? What in the world does he pay that amount of money for in a trip down to Montreal and back. What cab hire can he possibly use around Montreal, and what street car fares to make up the amounts that he charges.

Mr. MORIN. He is on strike.

Mr. FOSTER. It seems to me he is striking the government mighty hard. I do not think this requires any comment at all; there may be some good reason for it, but upon my word I cannot see it.

Mr. HYMAN. There is no doubt the secretary of the department is called upon very often to go to Montreal and to Quebec. I have not had time to go through the Auditor General's Report, but I have had my attention called to this matter and I have asked Mr. Gelinas to make a full and complete detailed statement. I can only see that he should conform to what ought to be the usages in these matters, which is, that there should be a careful expenditure of public money when he is on public business.

Mr. OSLER. If I were in order I would move that this gentleman's salary should be doubled, because if imitation is the sincerest flattery, then he has flattered his chiefs of the present government to an extent that I am sure these gentlemen appreciate.

Mr. BENNETT. Hear, hear ; get him a private car.

Post Office Department, $280,385.44.

Mr. TAYLOR. Will the Postmaster General explain this increase of $5,000.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Postmaster General). They are simply the statutory increases with the addition of one first-class clerk and one second-class clerk.

Mr. TAYLOR. Last year the minister asked for $321,779 for the year, and he is asking in the coming nine months for $246,000. If he figures that out he will find there is an increase of $5,327.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. There is an increase on the total vote of $7,100, and that arises in this way :—

Mr. TAYLOR. Excuse me, the $7,000 is for the year, and I am referring to this vote for the nine months.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. That is what misled me ; I did not think of that explanation. The increase of $7,100 arises in this way : there are two additional clerks asked for. Whereas, last year there were 17 first-class clerks provided for, 18 are now asked ; whereas last year there were 41 second-class clerks, 42 are now asked. The two additional clerks amount to $2,700. The statutory increase of $50 a year to 184 clerks amounts to $9,200; one increase of $30 statutory ; 19 of $20, $380; 3 of $10 each, $30; and one at 25 cents a day or $78.25 a year. These items of increase aggregate $12,418.25. Against that is set a deduction of $5,310 which arises from the difference between the salaries of certain clerkships which became vacant and the salaries of persons appointed or promoted at lower salaries. So that the total result is an increase of $7,108.25, or, for three fourths of the period, the figure which the hon. gentleman has given. That is the explanation of the increase, and the only item, apart from the statutory increases, is the two clerkships I have referred to.

Mr. FOSTER. Who have been appointed?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. No appointment has been made.

Mr. FOSTER. Why are they necessary ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Simply from the increased work due to the expansion of the business of the department. The first-class clerk is desired to take special charge of the business of newspaper postage which has grown to very large dimensions and which calls for the attention of one clerk to be devoted practically entirely to it. The work of the second-class clerk will probably be devoted to the postal stores branch, which shows a great increase of work due largely to the establishment of new post offices and new postal routes, particularly in the Northwest.

Mr. BARKER. Has the deputy minister reported that these additional offices are necessary ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Yes, the deputy minister is responsible for this very estimate.

Mr. BARKER. I asked if he had reported it ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. He has reported it to me.

Mr. FOSTER. Sir William Mulock, I understand, was a pretty hard worker. I imagine that he got along pretty well last year without these two officers, because he attended to the department. Is one or the other necessary because of the change of policy in that respect.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I was not aware that there was any change of policy in that respect. I propose to amend the resolution by adding the following after contingencies :

Including $25 per month to be paid to G. C. Anderson for extra work signing cheques after office hours, and $50 a year to pay W. Cooch for technical work of inspecting letter carriers' boots, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act.

M. R. L. BORDEN. Are these extra clerkships to be filled by promotion from one class to another ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The intention is to fill them by promotion.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Who is now performing the work which is to be imposed upon the first-class clerk to be appointed ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. There are several, I am not sure as to the exact number, who are working at this newspaper postage work which it is designed to put into the hands of one man.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. minister has referred to the increase of work in his department necessitating an increased staff. Would not the same cause of increase apply to some of the offices outside of Ottawa ? Is it not a fact that some of these offices are shorthanded by reason of this increase of work, and what is being done to provide for them ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I can only say that whenever any need for extra assistance in any of the outside offices has been pointed out, that extra assistance has been provided.

Mr. OSLER. I ask for information. What are the office hours of the civil service ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. In the Post Office Department from 9.30 to 4.30, with an hour of absence for luncheon.

Mr. OSLER. In ordinary business it would be a fatal mistake to pay clerks extra money for doing work after office hours, and I think it is a wrong principle to introduce into the civil service.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I thoroughly agree with my hon. friend as to the impropriety of awarding in terms anything for extra work after office hours, and, with the permission of the House, I will ask leave to withdraw this proposition in its present shape, with the view of asking in the supplementary estimates for this amount for this man, who well earns it. He has been a clerk in the service for twenty-four or twenty-five years, and he has of necessity to do this work after office hours. He signs fifty or sixty thousand cheques in the course of a year, and it seems to me to be objectionable to provide for his payment by stating in the Supply Bill that it is for extra work after office hours.

Mr. OSLER. If a man who is a trustworthy man has to do this extra work, he should get more pay. I do not think it should be provided for as extra work. A trades union man is tabooed by his fellow-workers and looked on as a 'scab' if he does extra work.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. That does not apply to the $50 a year for W. Cooch for technical work which I understand has been provided for in the Supply Bill for years.

Mr. J. D. REID. What is the amount these two extra clerks are to get?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The first class, $1,500, and the second class, $1,200—$2,700 together.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the reason this work must necessarily be done outside of office hours.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Otherwise it would be necessary to engage another clerk to do the work. During office hours he is very fully employed. He is the head of one of the branches. He is willing to do this work of signing the cheques after hours for $300 per annum. If he were required to do that during business hours, we would have to employ another clerk who would cost much more than $300.

Department of Trade and Commerce—
Salaries.. .. ..$16,668 75
Contingencies.. .. .. 5,700 00

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There are but few changes. One third-class clerk promoted to a junior second class, increase $150. Statutory increases $650.

Office of the High Commissioner—
Salaries.. .. ..$ 6,450 00
Contingencies.. .. .. 13,500 00

Mr. OSLER.

Mr. FOSTER. Has there been any change made lately in the scope of this office as regards immigration work?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If my memory serves me right the High Commissioner has been made a channel of communication between the Interior Department and the Immigration branch in London. That is the only change.

Mr. FOSTER. Was there not some trouble between the High Commissioner's office and Mr. Preston?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Preston and Mr. Griffith had some serious differences and there was a good deal of correspondence on the subject. About twelve months ago the High Commissioner came to Ottawa and this matter was thoroughly gone into with him. I asked him to investigate it and adjust it in the best way possible and have not heard from him since on the subject.

Department of the Interior—
Salaries.. .. ..$128,224 94
Contingencies.. .. .. 21,500 00

Mr. OLIVER. With regard to the alleged discrepancy between the estimate and the Auditor General's Report, I have to say that the report which was quoted was the report for the year previous to the one mentioned in the estimates. Therefore the comparison did not apply. There was an error in the figures as they appeared in the printed estimates. The number of first-class clerks should have been stated as 18 and the number of second class as 24. Compared with the current year there is an increase of one in the first class and a decrease of one in the second class. This is caused by the promotion of F. Nelson from the second to the first class.

Mr. FOSTER. Was he at the top of his class?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. How many others were at the top of the class?

Mr. OLIVER. The particulars with regard to Mr. Nelson are these: He has been employed in the Interior Department since Nov. 4, 1882. He was appointed to the permanent staff on June 1, 1885. He reached the maximum of the second class on Jan. 1, 1905. He is attached to the registration branch of the department. It is proposed to promote him to the first class with the minimum salary of $1,500 per annum. No increase is therefore caused by his promotion. He passed the necessary promotion examination in 1887.

Mr. TAYLOR. How about the thirty- one?

Mr. OLIVER. That is the same number as in the current year.

Mr. TAYLOR. There are only 25 provided for in the estimates.

Mr. OLIVER. That is another misprint.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is more than a misprint unless we have more at one salary than is stated. You have six at $700, one at $670, two at $662.50, ten at $650, three at $637.50, one at $600 two at $500. You have to put down six more or the Auditor General cannot pay.

Mr. OLIVER. The error is in the first line. It should read 'third-class clerks, seven at $700, six at $650.'

Mr. TAYLOR. Surely after these estimates are printed the minister has some officer in his department who checks them with the manuscript sent to the printer. They should not be laid before the House in a misleading manner.

Mr. OLIVER. The officers have called attention to the error so there will be no longer danger of it being carried through the vote. I can only say that there was an error and that we apologize.

Mr. OSLER. I think it was the members on this side who called attention to the error.

Mr. OLIVER. The resolution is correct, and if passed without any reference, it would have gone through correctly.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the minister able to say whether he drafted any of these clerks for his work in the Northwest during the late provincial elections ?

Mr. OLIVER. No, these were employees in the inside service, and remain in Ottawa.

Geological Survey—salaries, $49,931.25.

Mr. BARR. Perhaps the minister will tell us whether there are any errors in this item.

Mr. OLIVER. I had not expected this item to come up. The director is not present. But I can assure the House that these figures are correct.

Mr. FOSTER. Are there any extraordinary increases ?

Mr. OLIVER. None. There is an addition of a third-class clerk.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This includes a vote at the rate of $3,000 a year for the director of the survey. I think a vote at the same rate was asked for last year and given. There is still no regularly appointed head of the survey. The position of deputy head and director is filled by Dr. Bell as acting director. I brought this matter to the attention of the minister last year, and I may repeat now very briefly what I said then at great length. Dr. Bell, I believe, has been a good director for the last three or four years, and during that time he has received a salary, I think of $2,400, instead of the regular salary of $3,000 which has always been paid the deputy head of the department, at least for some years. The minister said, last year, I think, that he would deal with this matter soon. We have had the same information from the head of the department for several years. There has been about the same diligence in regard to it as there has been with regard to the tariff—the government were always going to deal with it the next year. Will the minister be good enough to tell us what is the cause of the delay. Though he is technically responsible for the delay, still we recognize that it took place before he assumed his present position. I am discussing the department not the minister, when I ask why this delay occurs. Why is it that the minister comes down this year without a statement conveying any information as to when the position will be filled?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Perhaps I can answer my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden). The present minister is not responsible for the long delay which has occurred in filling this position.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. He accepts responsibility when he takes the office.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Of course. But, perhaps, he is not as familiar with the reasons as myself, because I was in the government before he was. The office has been vacant for three years, if I remember well. The subject was more than once brought to my attention by the former Minister, Mr. Sifton. I am sorry I have to give the explanation at present why the office has not been filled. Everybody acknowledges the very superior merits of Dr. Bell as a scientist—his qualifications in that respect will not be questioned by anybody. But the relations of Dr. Bell with the different members of his staff are not as cordial as they might be. Though Dr. Bell is eminent in his profession, a very superior man as a scientist, perhaps he has not the faculty of managing men which is essential to such a position. Dr. Dawson was eminently successful in that respect. As I have said, from time to time, the question has arisen about filling the office. There were good reasons why Dr. Bell should be called to the position made vacant by the death of Dr. Dawson, but there were reasons on the other hand why that should not be done. The minister has come to a conclusion, I think, after conference with me—but which, before it is made official, I think, should not be given to the House. But in a few days the appointment should be made.

Mr. OSLER. What work, speaking generally is accomplished by the geological survey ?

Mr. OLIVER. The work is largely exploratory. As a result of that work, information as to portions of the country which have not been traversed by the representatives of any other branch of the public service can be given. We have also results from the scientific investigations with regard to all parts of the country, in regard to matters of economic importance, in regions which are not so distant and which are covered by other branches of the public service. It has been alleged against the usefulness of the geological survey that the practical results have not been as important as the expenditure might justify. But it is of the nature of the case that the work of the geological survey must be largely speculative—it is a work for the collection of information. Geology to-day is not an exact science, but it is one toward which information is being continually collected, and in that work the geological survey of Canada has taken some valuable part.

Mr. OSLER. What is the total amount expended?

Mr. OLIVER. The vote this year will be about $100,000.

Mr. OSLER. I think this question ought not to be passed over at the present time in the ordinary way. Canada is in this position to-day that enormous interest is being taken in the development of our minerals and new discoveries are being made. I think the government of Canada for the last 25 years has been absolutely remiss, has been criminally negligent in the conduct of this department. The eyes of the industrial world are now turned towards Canada, not only with regard to our mineral resources, but in regard to many other things. But it must be said that at the present time we know practically nothing about our own country, we have no reports concerning a great part of it. The Geological Department is perhaps just now the most important in the whole government, and we have a man at the head of that department who the government does not think is fit to be at the head of it—not because of his want of knowledge, but because of an incapacity in some respects, perhaps because he is not a good organizer. I say that the government ought to have the very best man to be found in the world at the head of the Geological Department of Canada, I do not care what price they have to pay him. Most of this expenditure we are considering is for clerks in the office at Ottawa, it is not for doing outside work, a very small part of it is for real original work. Now we are just groping along. We have a vast territory, and the people of this country ought to know with some reasonable degree of certainty what it contains. We have no knowledge of it at all; we are drifting along with a man at the head of that department that we pay $2,400 a year. I say that instead of passing this item of $50,000 or $60,000, the government should let it stand over in order that they may reconsider this vote, that they may realize the importance that attaches to this department, and that they may be more liberal in the money they vote for the purpose of acquiring an actual knowledge of the resources of this country so far as scientific men can acquire it. Any other country in the world, with the prospects that Canada has to-day, would have the ablest experts procurable at the head of the Geological Department. We ought to have full and accurate information of the resources in all our enormous territory to the north and to the west. We are doing absolutely nothing to find out the value of the country so far as its geology is concerned, and so far as its mineral wealth is concerned.

Mr. OLIVER. For my part I agree thoroughly with a great deal of what the hon. member (Mr. Osler) has said as to the importance of the Geological Department making a thorough examination into the natural resources of Canada. But I think perhaps he hardly appreciates the amount and value of the work that has already been done, not only in recent years, but for many years past. I think he scarcely appreciates the extent and accuracy of the information that was collected by the Geological Survey Department under the preceding government as well as under the present government. There are in the records of the Geological Department to-day, to quote an expression we have all heard, 'mountains of information' with regard to the geology, the geography and the climate of Canada in all its parts, records which are moulding away in the vaults of the Geological Department. These are all available to the public; anybody who wants them can have them, but apparently the people do not want them, or do not know that they can get them. Every reasonable means has been taken to inform the public that these records are available to them. At any rate, the government takes this opportunity of again making it known to the public that the records are available in the department, that they have been collected for the benefit of the public, and if the public do not choose to avail themselves of that information, neither the Geological Department or the government can be blamed. It is, however, a fact that these records are not distributed free; they are sold at a moderate price. The reason, I take it, that they are sold instead of being distributed gratuitously, is because it was supposed that only those interested in them would care to get them. The charge is a small one, and those really interested in the reports it is supposed would be gald to pay for them. The idea, I presume, was that it was needless to expend large sums in printing reports for free distribution which were of no special value to any one but those who were

interested in them. I assume that is the reason the preceding government decided to sell the publications of the Geological Department rather than give them away. At the same time I would be glad to receive a mandate from the House to scatter these reports gratuitously, or to accept any other reasonable suggestion that would secure a more thorough distribution of the literature now lying in the records of the Geological Survey Department. Speaking for myself, I repeat what I said in the beginning, that the government fully appreciates the importance of the work the geological survey has been and is now doing. It was not with any idea of slighting the work that the present estimates were not made larger. These are the main estimates based upon the work of last year, and I hoped that before we brought down the supplementary estimates we would be able to place a statement before the House showing that we had been doing some aggressive work and that we would also have been able to give more explicit information as to the directorship of the survey.

Mr. OSLER. I do not want for a moment to belittle the work that has been done. I know that the late Dr. Dawson did everything that it was possible for one man to do under the conditions then existing. In regard to the statement the hon. minister makes that there are mountains of information in the department which are not made use of, that is one of the things I would complain about because no man has time to look into these enormous reports. I should say that to make use of these reports at all a man should go over them, pick out those things which are interesting and embody them in a short blue-book which would be read by everybody. But, as the hon. minister says, there are enormous volumes, enormous folios of information. It is like looking for a needle in a hay stack for one to go through these volumes and find it. There has been no attempt to distribute shortly and tersely this information so that people can understand what has been the result of all the expenditures of this department. What have we obtained ? I say we have obtained exceedingly little knowledge of our own country and that we have enough before us to make it worth while for this government to spend a very liberal sum of money to get the very best men that can be got to give to the people a knowledge as far as possible of what we have in this country. It has not been done in the past and I know that unless a change in the policy of the department in connection with this matter takes place, it will not be done in the future.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am very glad to have the privilege of saying a few words in reference to the books in the geological department in which are stored the mountains of information which the hon. minister has referred to. If the hon. gentleman will turn to the Auditor General's Report, page 15—H, he will find that the amount received for the publications of the geological survey last year was only $675.16, and if he will investigate further he will find that he is paying a man more to collect this $675 than the amount received. When we take into consideration that in the neighbourhood of $130,000 is spent in gathering information from one end of this Dominion to another so as to educate our people in reference to the valuable mines and minerals we have throughout our country I feel confident that the hon. minister, if he considers the best interests of the people, will do away with the charge for these reports which are being sent out. For instance, I have been called upon many times myself to send reports to different parts of the country, and I have in my hand now a bill from the department for reports that I have sent to men in my own riding. My people are specially interested in this geological department and in its work and I think it is unreasonable and unfair that these reports should be lying, as they are and as I know they are, in the cellars of the geological institution rotting practically simply because the people are being taxed if they wish to secure copies of them. I believe there should be a distribution made of these valuable reports. They are most valuable. As my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler) has already said in reference to the value of the geological department to the people of Canada, I may say that it is one of the most important departments that there is in the Dominion at the present time, and I am satisfied that sufficient attention has not been paid to that department in the past. I sincerely hope that the government will pay particular attention to that department and see that the mines and minerals of this Dominion are developed to the extent that they are capable of being developed.

I do not wish to prolong the discussion of this item, but I wish to call the attention of the committee to another matter in connection with this department. Possibly it has been referred to here to-night, but I want to ask the hon. Minister of the Interior whether he has appointed Dr Bell to be director of the survey and if not, why he has not appointed Dr Bell ? I sincerely believe there is not a man in the Dominion who is more deserving of the position of director of the geological survey, or as head of any department than is Dr Bell. I want to say to you that I have followed his books for years and I can vouch for the valuable work that he has been doing for the department. I find that in the year 1903-04, $3,200 was voted for the deputy head and director, that in the year 1904-05 $3,500 was voted for the deputy head and director and this year I notice that $3,000 is being asked for

the deputy head and director. If the hon. minister will consult the Auditor General's Report as I have, he will find that the deputy head and director has only received $2,400 per annum. I would like to ask the hon. minister what has been done with the extra amount and why the director has not even received the regular statutory increases that are due to him from year to year.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong) was not in the House a moment ago when this matter was discussed. I stated to the committee, and I am very glad to repeat it to my hon. friend who is a friend of Dr. Bell, as I am myself, that the reason why we have not appointed Dr. Bell to the vacancy is not because Dr. Bell is not quite competent in his profession. Everybody recognizes his great ability as a scientist, but while everybody recognizes the great superiority of Dr. Bell as a geologist, it at the same time has unfortunately been too true that he has not been as successful in the management of the staff as his predecessor was, and for this reason the government have long hesitated whether they should appoint Dr. Bell to that position or call him to another duty. That is the reason and the only reason. According to my reading of the Civil Service Act for an officer of that kind there is no statutory increase.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. May I ask the Prime Minister if this $3,000 that has been voted year after year is to be given to Dr. Bell or whether the $3,000 which is asked to be voted at the present time is to go to Dr. Bell ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The government has decided to make an appointment and it will be made inside of a week.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I have been very much interested in the discussion that has taken place on this item. I desire to concur in the remarks of my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler). I look upon this department as a very important one. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of the Interior whether the geographic department comes under the geological survey. Do they not perform geographical work as well as geological work in this department ?

Mr. OLIVER. The geographical department is not now a part of the geological survey.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Usually they are connected ; I think they used to be.

Mr. OLIVER. They were at one time.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I do not know whether there is any department now of that kind ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, there is a department in connection with the geographical surveys branch rather than with the geological survey.

Mr. ARMSTRONG.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The geographic survey and the geological survey are of the utmost importance to a new country like Canada. They constitute the best means of disseminating knowledge amongst the citizens of our natural resources and I quite agree with what has been said that we do not know what we have in this country yet. We have not been apprised of the value of our territory with all its resources, minerals and other valuable deposits that there are in the Dominion of Canada. It seems we are not aware of these until strangers come in from foreign lands and take possession of some of the most valuable of our assets. Then we find that we have something in a particular district. This applies to the recent discoveries in the Cobalt district as well as to other mineral districts discovered in the past. The most valuable mines generally fall into the hands of strangers rather than into the hands of Canadians. This department might very well be enlarged ; it is one of the branches of the service that the House would unite in saying is not up to the standard it should be. There should be a more liberal allowance to the head of the department and a more liberal distribution of the knowledge that is obtained. What is the use of collecting this information if it is not disseminated among our people. It is most desirable that this information should be placed before our citizens in order that they may see where the treasure of our country lies, and that they may develop these rich natural resources if they so desire. I have had some correspondence with Dr. Bell asking for information, I do not know him personally, but so far as I know of him he fills the position admirably. I believe he is a good man, and I would be sorry to see him dispossessed of the position he holds. I do not know whether that is the intention of the government or not. I would like to see his hands, or the hands of some superior man if he can be found strengthened. I would suggest that these valuable reports should be distributed to Canadians free of charge. Free distribution of public documents is the rule in other departments of government, and I do not see why an exception should be made in this case. If necessary a resolution should be moved asking the minister to make a free distribution of these geological reports in the future.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I wish to emphasize what has been said in regard to Dr. Bell. It would be a most serious draw back to the Geological Department were he removed from its head and I would be very sorry indeed to see it occur. I am quite sure the Prime Minister will see that the words of only a few of the men in the department will not be accepted, for I believe if he investigates he will find that a very large majority of the officials who are engaged

under Dr. Bell are sympathetic with him, and are his tried friends.

Mr. OSLER. What has been done of late years in experimenting for oil north of Edmonton ? The late Dr. Dawson was strongly impressed with the probability of valuable oil fields being discovered there. In the early days of this government a boring machine was sent out there but it was so bad that it fell to pieces before it got to the ground, and there was practically no boring done. One or two small borings were attempted, but I think all that machinery is still on the desert in the prairie. I believe that the government should spend a reasonable sum in experimenting for oil in the far north. They have the late Dr. Dawson's reports very strongly pointing to the probability of oil being found in that district.

Mr. OLIVER. The late government is entitled to the credit of having begun the boring for oil north of Edmonton, and their efforts were continued by this government. The boring rig did not fall to pieces. There was one well sunk at Athabaska Landing about 100 miles north of Edmonton, to about 1,700 feet, and another boring was made at Victoria about 80 miles north-east of Edmonton, and a boring made 700 feet No oil was struck in either of these places and then the rig was removed to a point down the Athabacka river 200 miles north of Edmonton, and a boring made 700 feet deep. There, such a heavy flow of gas was struck that it was impossible to continue the boring operations and as the rig was then 200 miles away from Edmonton and down the river, it would not pay to bring it up. That is why the rig was left there and why it is not in use. At present a private company is boring for gas in the city of Edmonton and they are now down over 1,000 feet.

Mr. HENDERSON. They ought not to have to bore as deep as that in Edmonton.

Mr. OLIVER. Perhaps they would not in Halton. It is possible this private company might go to a greater depth if the House would agree to give them some assistance in the matter.

Mr. OSLER. The government did not attempt to bore where Dr. Dawson advised them.

Mr. OLIVER. I beg pardon ; all the boring done by the government was under the direction and advice of Dr. Dawson.

Mr. OSLER. That is years ago.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes. There was boring done at Athabaska Landing, Victoria and Pelican Rapids.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is it the intention to continue boring with the government rig that is there now ?

Mr. OLIVER. The government rig is at Athabaska and had not been in use for years. Private parties have boring rigs at Edmonton and points on the Athabasca river.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In reply to what the Prime Minister has suggested in reference to Dr. Bell, while we cannot profess to know anything about the discipline of the department and while we must accept what the Prime Minister has suggested in that regard, nevertheless I think it should be taken into consideration that the government have placed Dr. Bell in a very anomalous position for three or four years by leaving him at the head of the department without the authority which would appertain to his office if he were placed there permanently. I know nothing more likely to cause dissatisfaction and want of discipline than to leave that department as this government has left it for four years. A great deal of consideration should be given by the government to that fact. Dr. Bell could not possibly have the same control over his staff or exercise the same discipline in his department that he could have done if he had been appointed to be permanent head of the department within a reasonable time after the death of the late Dr. Dawson. However, we shall hear further of that.

There is just one thing I would like to say to the Minister of the Interior with regard to the information which is gathered by the staff. I should be sorry to believe that the mountains of information so gathered are to be compared to the mountains of information which on a certain celebrated occasion were laid on the table of this House. If I thought they were not more substantial in their nature, I should favour the abolition of that department. I am speaking, not of that which I know but of that which I am informed when I say that the compilation and arrangement of the information so gathered is not properly carried out. I am not saying this by way of criticism of the officers of the department, but in criticism of the system that has been pursued in the past, and I am not reflecting upon this government more than on previous governments. I understand that there is a great deal of material in the department which is not readily available to the public, or, if it is, there is a good deal of difficulty in getting at it. There are two important features to be considered in connection with this or any similar department. One is the gathering of the information, the ascertaining of certain facts about the physical character of this country. That work must necessarily be done by experts, and it should be done by the very best experts who can be obtained for the purpose. After that point is reached, the work is almost absolutely useless unless the results of it are put into systematic shape and rendered readily available for all the people to whom it may be of use. It is in these two latter respects

that the work of the department does not seem to be up to the standard, if the information that comes to me from members of the House who have made themselves familiar with the subject, is reliable.

Mr. FOSTER. I think that one of the best things that could be done to popularize the work of the department would be to get a clever scientific editor and put him to work on these mountains of information. I sympathize with the idea of distribution, but if these geological compilations were put into the channels of free and inconsiderate distribution, I believe that in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred they would be wasted because of their technical nature. But if you will get the right kind of man who understands the practical needs of this country and who will edit this information and put it before the public in the form of popular pamphlets, I would favour the distribution of these pretty widely even if it involved considerable expense. Part of this information is extremely technical, and the great majority of people will not be interested in it, but it is of great use nevertheless. That might go to scientific people, while the other part might be put in the popular form, with illustrations and maps, for distribution to the public. I reiterate what my hon. friend has said, that the government has not done it duty in the last three or four years by the Geological Department. It was the business of the government not to hesitate in appointing a permanent head. Every year they hesitated, they made the department less useful than it would otherwise have been. It was very unfair to Dr. Bell himself. I would not like to be made the principal of a school under conditions which made every teacher under me think he had as good a chance of getting the place as I, and without any authority. It was unfair to keep Dr. Bell in that position for three years. The government should have had the firmness to appoint him at once or else to appoint some one else. The whole department has been rendered less efficient than it would otherwise have been by that delay.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. I suggested to the First Minister a few days ago the advisability of systematizing the work of the different departments in regard to map making. At present there are four or five departments issuing maps. To my mind this whole work could be systematized and better done, to the advantage of all the departments if it were concentrated in one department and under one head. I am not finding fault. This is a suggestion which I made years ago, and which I am encouraged to repeat by the statement made by the Prime Minister a few days ago. I am satisfied that if this were done, it would result in a great saving of labour to the departments and in advantage to the public.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

Departments generally—Care and cleaning of departmental buildings, including amount of $100 required to pay for firing noon gun, which amount may be paid to a member of the Civil Service, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $30,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The increase of $5,000 is necessitated by the increase in the number of departmental buildings.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is there any increase in the number of departmental buildings ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, we have buildings scattered all over the city.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You include those leased ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, they must be looked after.

General consulting engineer to Dominion government—
Salaries.. .. ..$ 5,175 00
Contingencies.. .. .. 750 00

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Schreiber was promoted from the position of deputy minister and chief engineer of railways to the position of consulting engineer.

Board of Civil Service Examiners, salaries and other expenses under the Civil Service Act, including $400 for the secretary and $150 for a clerk, which sum may be paid notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $2,250.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. What is the system followed in these examinations and who are the men who compose the board ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. They are Mr. DeCelles, Mr. Waters, and another gentleman. The papers are collected by a secretary appointed in each city and sent to the examiners.

Governor General's secretary's office—
Salaries.. .. ..$ 8,662 50
Contingencies.. .. .. 14,525 00

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I was asked for information as to the increase and I have the following information from Col. Hanbury Williams. As regards the estimates for contingencies, they include statutory increases, also the four temporary employees of the office, and increased expenditure for stationery and sundries. The amount provided in the main estimates was insufficient during the past two years, and supplementary votes were found necessary. It is not thought possible to reduce the expenditures under these heads during the coming year.

Some resolutions reported.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will any government business be taken up to-morrow ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, March 21, 1906.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Hon. WILLIAM TEMPLEMAN, member-elect for the electoral district of Victoria, B.C., introduced by Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. Ralph Smith.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved :

That the name of Mr. Maclean (Lunenburg) be placed on the Public Accounts Committee instead of Mr. Carney.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS.

DREDGING IN ONTARIO.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

1. What amounts, if any, have been paid for dredging in the province of Ontario, from the 1st day of July, 1905, up to the present time, the place where such work was performed, the names of the parties doing such work, and the amount paid therefor.

2. Are there any unpaid amounts due or alleged to be due for dredging ? If so, to whom, what are the amounts, and where was the work performed ?

Hon. CHARLES HYMAN (Minister of Public Works). The information asked is quite voluminous; I will have to ask the hon. gentleman to move for a return.

NATURALIZATION LAWS.

Mr. TAYLOR asked :

1. Has the attention of the government been directed to the following passage in the recent report of Mr. C. V. C. Van Duesen, special examiner of the Department of Justice of the United States, relative to naturalization : 'A new phase in fraud in citizenship involving naturalization has developed since the establishment of the Republic of Cuba and the wonderful development of the farming interests in the Northwest provinces of Canada. It is the dual citizenship maintained by naturalized citizens of the United States, who have taken the oath of allegiance to the Republic of Cuba, but still retain their certificate of United States citizenship, which they are at liberty to use, and undoubtedly have done so whenever their convenience or necessity demands such use. It is conservatively estimated that 50,000 native and naturalized citizens of the United States, chiefly from the border states, have taken up the prolific wheat lands in Manitoba in the last five years, some buying railway lands, but many entering upon government homestead lands as British subjects, while still retaining their certificates of United States citizenship, and exercising such rights when in this country' ?

2. Has the government any, and what, information, upon the subject referred to ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I thought I had already answered that question. The government has no information on this subject.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Mr. CROCKET asked :

1. What portion of the route of the proposed National Transcontinental Railway has been surveyed and located between Winnipeg and Quebec ?

2. What portion of the route, if any, of the proposed National Transcontinental Railway has been surveyed and located between Quebec and Moncton ?

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

1. Quebec to Winnipeg, approximate total distance 1,366 miles, all surveyed, of which 395 miles have been located and advertised for tenders, and 149 miles have been submitted to the Commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway as first location and the revision of said location is proceeding.

	Miles.	Dist.
From Quebec Bridge westerly..	150	'B'
Vicinity of Hurricinaw River. .	44.5	'C'
Eastward from boundary between Quebec and Ontario..	8	'D'
Westward from boundary between Quebec and Ontario..	59.8	'D'
Vicinity of Red Paint River, northwest of Lake Nipigon..	37.7	'E'
Pelican Lake to a point about 10 miles east of Winnipeg..	244	'F'
	544	

2. Moncton to Quebec via Back or Centre route approximate total distance 514 miles, all surveyed, of which 428.7 miles have been submitted to the Commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway as first location and the revision of said location is proceeding.

	Miles.	Dist.
Quebec Bridge to boundary between New Brunswick and Quebec..	220	'B'
Quebec boundary eastward to Grand Falls..	62	'A'
Plaster Rock, eastward	68	'A'
West of Chipman..	20	'A'
Chipman to Moncton..	58.7	'A'
	428.7	

Via St. John or River Route, approximate total distance 531 miles, all surveyed, of which 407 miles have been submitted to the Commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway as first location and the revision of said location is proceeding.

	Miles.	Dist.
Quebec to boundary between New Brunswick and Quebec.	220	'B'
Along St. John River between Grand Falls and Fredericton.	66.3	'A'
Quebec boundary eastward to Grand Falls..	62	'A'
Chipman to Moncton..	58.7	'A'
	407.0	

HOPE ISLAND TIMBER.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

1. What amount of timber of different kinds was removed from the lighthouse reserve on Hope Island by Mr. Manley Chew under permission given to cut thereon ?

2. What amount has been paid by the said Manley Chew therefor ?

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

1. The total amount of hemlock, elm, birch and hemlock booms reported to the department cut was 30,724 feet. The bass wood and cedar is paid for in a lump sum and not by measurement.

2. Mr. Chew has paid $161.75.

WHARF AT DORSET.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES asked :

Is it the intention of the government to construct a wharf at Dorset, on the border of Muskoka and Victoria and Haliburton, on Lake of Bays, during this year ?

Hon. CHAS. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works). Representations have been made to the department as to the necessity for the construction of a wharf at Dorset. There is no vote available. The matter will be given consideration when the estimates are brought down.

COLLINGWOOD DRY DOCK.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

What amount, if any, has been paid to the Collingwood Dry Dock Company for bounty, under the Act for the assistance of dry docks ?

Hon. CHAS. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works). $30,000.

MUTUAL RESERVE LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY.

Mr. T. MARTIN asked :

1. Has the attention of the government been directed to the statement in the public press, that the officials of the Mutual Reserve Life Insurance Company, of New York, have been charged with grand larceny in the first degree, and with forgery in the third degree ?

2. If the government has not already done so, what action do they propose taking in the matter, in the interests of policy-holders in Canada ?

3. Has the government taken any steps to ascertain whether such statements are correct?

4. What opinion has the government on the subject ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The government have no information on the subject except that which they obtain through the public press. They assume that the charges will be properly investigated and dealt with in the New York courts. They are not aware of any action which can be taken in Canada in such a matter for the benefit of Canadian policy-holders.

SASKATCHEWAN LAND COMPANY.

Mr. LAKE asked :

1. Has the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company earned the right to purchase the whole, or what proportion, of the 250,000 acres of homestead lands, under their agreement with the government, at $1 per acre ?

2. Have they selected all the lands they are entitled to purchase, and have patents been issued for these lands ?

3. Do these lands become liable to the payment of such taxes as may be legally imposed on surrounding lands owned by private individuals, directly the company has earned the right to purchase them ?

4. Have inspections in regard to the fulfilment of their conditions by the company been regularly carried out ? If so, at what intervals, and what is the date of the last inspection?

5. Has the company completed the selection of the odd numbered sections, the right to which they may have acquired from any railway companies earning land grants ?

6. If not, how many acres have they selected up to the 1st January, 1906, and what portion of these were patented on that date ?

7. How many acres still remain unselected and unpatented by the company ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of Interior) :

1. They have earned the right to purchase 150,000 acres.

2. They have not selected all the lands they are entitled to purchase; patents have been issued for 142,808.75 acres

3. These lands become liable to taxation on transfer to the company.

4. Reports of inspection are dated 22nd December, 1903; 30th September, 1904, and 11th January, 1905.

5. Yes.

6. All selected. 173,573·94 acres patented.

7. None unselected. 27,229·11 acres unpatented.

RECOGNITION OF VOYAGEURS.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES asked:

1. Were the boatmen or voyageurs from Canada to the Nile, under Sir Garnet Wolseley, in the early eighties, given medals or scrip for those services ?

2. Did the Canadian government recognize them in any official way ?

3. Were the boatmen or voyageurs in 1870, under Sir Garnet Wolseley, recognized in any official way by either the British or Canadian governments ?

4. If so, what was the nature of such recognition ?

5. Is it the intention of the government to grant those boatmen or voyageurs, who served on Red River expedition of 1870, scrip or medals for their services ?

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

1. They were given the Soudan medal by His Majesty's government. They also received the Khedive's bronze star. They did not receive any scrip.

2. No, except as stated in answer to No. 1.

The balance of the questions I would ask to stand.

DISEASES AMONG ANIMALS.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES asked:

1. Has the Department of Agriculture any record of an outbreak of disease among cattle, sheep, horses, or hogs, in the county of Victoria during the last year ?
2. What was the nature of the said outbreak, if any ?
3. What was the result ?
4. Were any of the farmers paid for the loss of their animals ?
5. If not, why not, if any were lost or destroyed by disease or by order of the government officials ?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK W. BORDEN (for the Minister of Agriculture):

1. Yes.
2. Anthrax was suspected and a veterinary inspector was sent to investigate.
3. No evidence was found pointing to the existence of any of the diseases dealt with under the 'Animal Contagious Diseases Act.'
4. No.
5. No animals were destroyed by order of the veterinary inspector.

POSTMASTER AT CANNINGTON.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES asked:

1. In what business was the late postmaster at Cannington engaged prior to his dismisal ?
2. Was the late postmaster granted an inquiry before being dismissed ?
3. What reports or complaints against him were received by the department ?
4. Who furnished those reports ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Postmaster General):

The business which the former postmaster at Cannington was said to have been carrying on was that of a grocer. Different residents of the village complained of the fact that the postmaster should be, as they put it, subsidized by the government against them, and expressed suspicion that their mailable matter did not receive fair treatment in the Cannington post office when supposed to relate to their business affairs. Investigation was made by an inspector who made personal inquiries from the postmaster himself and from other persons, and reported to the department the result of such investigation.

MAIL SERVICE IN PARRY SOUND DISTRICT.

Mr. BENNETT asked:

1. What amount is paid to the courier for carrying mail from North Sequin post office to Missionary Road post office, in the district of Parry Sound ?
2. Who is the contractor, and were tenders called for the service ?
3. What were the receipts of Missionary Road post office last year, or for the past six months?
4. When was Missionary Road post office opened, and at whose request ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Postmaster General). Missionary Road is not known to the department as the name of any post office in Canada.

LAKE CECEBE LIGHTHOUSE.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

1. Was a lighthouse constructed by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, or the Public Works Department, near Magnetawan, on the Magnetawan river, district of Parry Sound, last year ?
2. How many tenders were received therefor, if any were asked ?
3. What was the contract price ?
4. Was there a local inspector of the work ? If so, what was his name, and what remuneration was paid to him ?

Rt. Hon. SIR WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries).

1. Yes; by the Department of Marine and Fisheries in Lake Cecebe near its debouchement into Magnetawan river.

2. Tenders were not asked. The work was small and it was desirable to push it to completion during the low water of summer. A wooden lighthouse on a cribwork pier was consequently built by day's labour by direction of the minister.

3. There was no contract price, but the total cost of the work was $760.64. Including the cost of the cribwork, foundation, lighthouse tower and supervision of work.

4. Yes, Captain Joseph Mortimer, $3 per day.

PAYMENTS TO WOODS LIMITED.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. What is the total amount paid by the government from the 1st March, 1905, to the 1st March, 1906, to Woods Limited, or to J. W. Woods, on account of rent of buildings in the city of Ottawa ?
2. What is the total amount paid by the same to the same from the 1st July, 1904, to the 1st March, 1906, for flags and awnings ?
3. Is Woods Limited an incorporated company, and who is its president ?

Hon. CHARLES S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works) :

1. $16,340.
2. $3,873.90.
3. The department has no definite information, but presumes that it is. J. W. Woods signs as president.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. What is the total amount paid to date by the government of Canada to Woods Limited, or to J. W. Woods, for goods supplied for the Georgian Bay Canal Survey, since the beginning of said survey, up to 1st March, 1906 ?

2. Were tenders called through the newspapers for said supplies before they were ordered ?

Hon. CHARLES S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works) :

1. $8,279.26.

2. These goods were purchased at different times and in various quantities, in the usual way of purchasing supplies.

RENTAL OF POST OFFICE BOXES.

Mr. BOYCE asked :

1. What are the regulations of the Post Office Department governing the installation of, and rentals received from, post office boxes in cities and towns ?

2. What proportion, if any, of the revenue derived from box rents is received by the postmasters for their own use, where the boxes are installed (a) at the expense of the government ; (b) at the expense of the postmaster ?

3. Have the box fittings in all post office buildings, erected since 1896, been furnished at the expense of the government ? If not, what exceptions are there, and what are the reasons for such exceptions, if any ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Postmaster General) :

1 and 2. At post offices where the postmaster and staff are paid fixed salaries, the Post Office Department receives as a part of its revenue the whole amount collected for box rents. At other offices postmasters are allowed fifty per cent of the box rents collected. When boxes are installed at the expense of the postmaster, he is allowed the full amount of rents collected for all such boxes.

3. Yes.

INSPECTION OF CANADIAN RIFLES.

Mr. WORTHINGTON asked :

1. Did Major Pym, or any other imperial officer, come from England at the request of the government, for the purpose of inspecting or reporting on the Ross rifle, or any other arm, or part thereof, of the Canadian service ?

2. If so, was such an inspection held and a report made ?

3. If so, what was the nature of the report ?

4. If no inspection was held, why was it not so held ?

5. Was this officer paid by the Dominion government ? If so, how much, and for what service ?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK W. BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). 1, 2, 3, 4. An officer was applied for on April 28, 1905, by the Department of Militia to assist in the work of inspecting the Ross rifles before delivery. No reply was received from the War Office until some months afterwards when notification was sent to the department that Major Pym had been selected. In the meantime, the work of inspection has been carried on by an inspecting staff under direction of Lieut-Colonel R. Cartwright, A.A.G., for musketry. Major Pym arrived in Canada about March 4, and reported to the Master General of Ordnance at Ottawa. It is expected that he will assume his duties on the inspecting staff at Quebec immediately.

5. This officer will be paid by the Dominion government at the rate of $2,800 per annum.

EMPLOYMENT OF A. G. DUNCAN.

Mr. BOYCE asked :

1. Is A. G. Duncan, of Marksville, St. Joseph's Island, in the employ of the government ?

2. If so, in what capacity, when was he appointed, and at what salary ?

3. Is he entitled to receive for his own use any fees or emoluments in addition to his salary ? If so, what, and is he required to make a return of such ?

4. What are his duties ?

5. Is he required to devote his whole time to the performance of his duties ?

6. What amounts have been paid to him annually (a) for salary ; (b) for expenses ; (c) for fees and emoluments, in addition to his salary, since his appointment ?

7. Is he required to make an annual or other periodical reports ? If so, when was his last report received ?

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

1. Yes.

2. April 17, 1899, at a salary of $1,200 per annum.

3. No.

4. As inspector of fisheries, to carry out a general supervision of the enforcement of the Dominion Fishery laws within his district.

5. His services are required to be at all times at the disposal of the department.

6. (a) For salary,—1898-1899, $200 ; 1899-1900, $1,200 ; 1900-1901, $1,200 ; 1901-1902, $1,200 ; 1902-1903, $1,200 ; 1903-1904, $1,200 ; 1904-1905, $1,200. (b) For expenses,—1898-1899, $233.13 ; 1899-1900, $776.62 ; 1900-1901, $292,73 ; 1901-1902, $406 ; 1902-1903, $496.08 ; 1903-1904, $377.10; 1904-1905, $319.86. (c) Nothing.

7. He is required to make an annual report, periodical reports, and reports at all times on matters referred to him or which may arise in his inspectorate. The last report received from him is dated February 9, 1906.

GOVERNMENT DOCK AT SAULT STE. MARIE.

Mr. BOYCE asked :

1. What amount was expended during the year 1905, and up to the 28th February, 1906, upon (a) construction and repairs, and erection of buildings, upon the government dock at Sault Ste. Marie ?

2. Under whose superintendence were such expenditures made, and what was his remuneration ?

3. What buildings, if any, have been erected on the dock, warehouses, coal sheds, and the like ?

4. By whom was the work done ?

5. Were tenders called for the work ? If not, why not ?

6. If the buildings are not completed, what is the estimated cost of completing them ?

7. If the work on the buildings is not being done by contract, upon what terms and what rate of remuneration is the work being done, and what persons or firms, respectively, supply the material required ?

Hon. CHARLES S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works).

1. Repairs, &c., $590; erection of building, $3,727.50.

2. James Penman, inspector. Remuneration, $2.50 per day.

3. A combined waiting room, office and warehouse building.

4. Messrs. Dunlop and Boyd.

5. Yes.

6. Cost of completing building estimated at $4,177.50.

7. Work under contract.

SASKATCHEWAN VALLEY LAND COMPANY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN asked :

1. Did the government make or cause to be made in or previously to 1902, any valuation of the lands, if any, sold or granted by the Crown that year to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, or its assigns ?

2. If so, when, and by whom, was such valuation made ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). No valuation was made.

QU'APPELLE, LONG LAKE AND SASKATCHEWAN RAILWAY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN asked :

1. Was the order in council, dated 1st August, 1902, relating to the land grant of the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway and Steamboat Company, communicated to that company by the government ?

2. If so, what date was it first communicated to that company ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Yes.

2. August 15, 1902.

HON. A. B. AYLESWORTH.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

Since the appointment of the Honourable A. B. Aylesworth to the position of Postmaster General, in how many actions, causes, matters, or proceedings, has he been engaged as a counsel before a judge or judges appointed by the government of Canada ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). There is no department of the government which is in possession of any information under which an answer could be given to that question.

PORT OF CANSO MEDICAL STAFF.

Mr. DANIEL asked :

1. Has any one been appointed to succeed the late Dr. Brine in the office of supplying medical attendance and medicine to sick fishermen at the Port of Canso, Nova Scotia ?

2. If so, who is the person appointed and at what salary ?

3. Does Dr. McGarry still hold the office of quarantine officer at the Port of Canso, Nova Scotia ?

4. If so, at what salary ?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). The answers to the first two questions are furnished by the Department of Marine and Fisheries. They are :

1. No.

2. Dr. P. A. McGarry was recommended but declined to accept the position at the salary named, which was the same as Dr. Brine received, viz. $280 per annum including all medicine supplied.

The third and fourth questions are answered by the Department of Agriculture and the answer is, No.

STEAM SERVICE BETWEEN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND AND GREAT BRITAIN.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN asked :

1. How many trips were made during the year 1905 by steamers under contract with the government, between Prince Edward Island and Great Britain ?

2. What are the names of the ships, the dates of the trips, port of call in Great Britain, and the amount of subsidy paid for such trips ?

3. Is it proposed to subsidize steamships on said route next season ? If so, what number of trips, dates and port of call.

Hon. WM. PATERSON (for the Minister of Trade and Commerce) :

1 and 2. No trips were made in 1905.

3. An item has been placed in the Main Estimates to provide for such service —Vide Vote No. 161—but it is yet too early to determine whether it will be expedient to run such trips or whether steamers can reasonably be secured for the purpose.

DREDGING ST. MARY'S RIVER.

Mr. BOYCE asked :

1. What amount was paid by the government during the year 1905 for dredging in St. Mary's River, (a) at the canal and approaches; (b) at the government dock ; (c) in the channel ?

2. To what persons, firms or corporations, respectively, were such amounts paid ?

3. Was the work in each case performed by contract under tender ? If not, under what arrangement ?

4. What prices are paid per yard at the different places, respectively, what dredges were employed and who owned them ?

5. To what depths has the river been dredged, (a) at the canal, both approaches ; (b) at the government dock ; (c) in the channel ?

6. Have any complaints been received from navigators, of the difficulty of access to the government dock by reason of submerged rocks and boulders in the approaches ? If so, from whom were such complaints received, when, and how were they dealt with ?

Hon. CHARLES S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works) :

1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. No expenditure made by this department for dredging in the St. Mary's river, in 1905.

6. Representations have been made by the wharfinger and the Board of Trade of Sault Ste. Marie, and the matter is now under consideration.

DRILL HALL, ST. JOHN, N. B.

Mr. DANIEL asked :

1. Is it the intention of the government to proceed with the erection of a new drill hall in St. John, N.B., this year.

2. If so, on what site ?

3. If it is not the intention of the government to proceed with the erection of such drill hall this summer, at what date does the government propose to proceed with such erection ?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). The matter is under consideration.

TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

When will the report of the transportation commission be printed and distributed ?

Hon. CHARLES S. HYMAN Minister of Public Works). I am hurrying up the printers as much as possible and doing all I can to have it completed.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For copies of all letters and documents relating to the establishment of an imperial intelligence service.—Mr. Belcourt.

For copies of all thermograph records of temperatures on ocean steamers in the possession of the government, taken during the season of 1905, stating : (1) where the thermograph was placed in each case, whether in cold storage chambers, cool air chambers, ventilated chambers, unventilated chambers, or on deck or other part of the vessel, exposed only to the natural ocean temperature, and in this latter instance, if liable to be exposed to the sun's rays ; (2) the kind of produce that was stored in the chamber, if any ; (3) date of sailing of steamer, the port from which sailing, name of vessel.—Mr. E. D. Smith.

1. For a return showing the description of all lands in Manitoba and the Northwest, formerly reserved for timber or hay purposes, to which homestead entries have been granted since 1st January, 1905.

2. The date of decisions to open such reservations for settlement.

Mr. BOYCE.

3. The names of applicants, in order of application, on the books of the various agencies and sub-agencies, for each quarter section, at the date when the entry was granted.—Mr. Lake.

For a return showing the number of applications for inspection received at the several land agencies in Manitoba and the Northwest for each month of the years 1904 and 1905, from homesteaders desiring to secure their patents.

2. The number of inspections made monthly from each agency.

3. The number of applications for inspection on file 1st January, 1906, at each agency.—Mr. Lake.

For a return of all valuations made in or previously to the year 1902, of the lands sold or granted in that year to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company.—Mr. R. L. Borden.

For copies of the contract, together with plans and specifications, between the government and the Dominion Coal Company, for the improvement of Glace Bay Harbour, for public purposes. Also copies of all correspondence, telegrams, memoranda, and representations made by delegates, members of parliament, or any other persons, having reference thereto. Also copies of all accounts furnished to the government for expenditures on Glace Bay Harbour, by the Dominion Coal Company.—Mr. Martin.

For a return showing : How many horses were tested for glanders with mallein in the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, respectively, by the officials of this government ; names of owners of horses ; name of official, and date of application in each case ; date when the horses were destroyed, in each case ; date the owners received compensation in each case ; amount received by the respective owners, and the valuation in each case ; the variations of temperature in each case, with the highest and lowest readings ; number of cases quarantined; names of owners, and period of quarantine ; number of cases where re-tested, and the result ; number of cases slaughtered after being re-tested ; compensation paid, names of the owners, and the amount paid to each ; cases where horses were slaughtered after being tested, and the number of post-mortem investigations held, with the result in each case and the names of owners.—Mr. Staples.

For a return showing : How many wrecks there were on the Pacific coast in Canadian waters in 1900, 1901, 1902, 1903, 1904, 1905, and in 1906, up to date, British and foreign ; number of lives lost in each wreck ; the total financial loss in ships and cargoes ; the inquiries made by the government into the causes of such wrecks ; the causes given for such wrecks ; the results of reports made of such investigations, as to hulls or machinery, by the British Columbia inspectors ; the port of registry of each vessel wrecked ; the age of each ship.—Mr. R. Smith.

QUEBEC BRIDGE AND RAILWAY COMPANY.

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

For a copy of the last financial statement and balance sheet of the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company.

2. A list of the directors of the company and of its chief officers.

3. A statement of the bonds of the company which have been guaranteed by the government, and which have been negotiated or are pledged.

4. A statement of all moneys paid by the government on account of capital or interest on the said bonds.

He said: This motion calls for information which ought to be in the possession of the House. Under section three of the Act by which we undertook to guarantee over $6,000,000 of bonds for the construction of the Quebec bridge, it was provided that the government would have power to cause at any time an investigation to be made of the books of the company by any officer it might judge fit to depute for that investigation. The government therefore has power at any time to obtain the information asked for by this motion. I think it is urgent at present, in view of the construction of the Transcontinental Railway, in view also of the unfinished condition of the Quebec bridge and on account of the large amount involved by the government guarantee, that we should get that information. Before the motion is put, I would ask permission of the House to amend it by adding after the words 'chief officers,' the words 'and of the shareholders of the company and the amount of shares possessed by each shareholder.'

Amendment agreed to.

Motion as amended agreed to.

SOUTH AFRICAN VOLUNTEERS.

Mr. ANDREW BRODER (Dundas) moved:

That this House would be pleased to learn that the volunteers of the several South African contingents from Canada, suffering total disability, incurred in such service, will receive recognition from their country, as part of that empire on behalf of which they willingly made such sacrifices.

He said: I have brought this matter to the attention of the House three times during the last three sessions. I bring it forward again feeling that it is a matter which ought to have had the attention of the government before this time. When it was first mentioned here the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden), if I remember rightly, as well as the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) left the impression that the subject would at least receive the consideration of the government. The following session it was again brought to the attention of the House and, if it were possible, to make deeper the impression upon the minds of the hon. members to which I have referred, the right hon. Prime Minister and the Minister of Militia did so, giving expression to their intention of looking thoroughly into the matter and dealing with it—as I understood them—on its merits. I need not say that the whole country would naturally look for some recognition, not only by this House, but by the government, of the claims upon us of these men whose acts did more, perhaps, to bring this country to the attention of the world than any other thing that has been done for a long time. This great Dominion has so largely benefited by the efforts of the South African contingents and by the recognition by the people of the empire, not only of the country as a whole, but as individual Canadians, to lay down their lives, if necessary on behalf of the empire. Sir, these men made a personal sacrifice by which this country was largely benefited, and up to this time the country has not recognized in any sense the claims even of those who suffered total disability in the empire's defence. It is scarcely necessary for me to appeal to the appreciation either of the House or the Canadian people on behalf of the men whose claims are set forth in this resolution. I have in my own riding one young man—whose case comes to my mind probably because I am so familiar with it—Trooper Mulloy, a man of more than ordinary ability, an ambitious and intelligent young man, who started out with high aims and a strong purpose of being a man in the world, who saw fit, as a matter of duty, to enrol himself as a South African volunteer, and who, while in the service, lost both eyes. That young man is receiving from the British government 60 cents a day. (I think that in discussing this matter last year I stated this sum at 65 cents a day, but I have learned since that I was in error). There are some who think—some who have even stated—that recognition of the services of these men who might be considered empire volunteers should be left to the imperial authorities. If we look into the matter we shall find that the Canadian government have already committed themselves to the principle that they have a duty in relation to these volunteers, because where it was pointed out that the pay of these men under the rules of the Imperial service would not equal the pay of Canadian volunteers, the government increased that pay to our standard here in Canada. So the principle being admitted, I cannot see why we, as a part of the great empire, should hesitate a moment to act upon that principle in a matter in which our duty is so clear.

It is rather a strange thing that no country in the world, perhaps, has been so slow as Canada has been to recognize the claims of individuals who have not merely risked life and limb in defence of the country, but have suffered disability as a result. I do not wish to appeal to this House in the sense of asking charity on behalf of this man. Not at all, Sir, the appeal is a higher one than that; it is an appeal to our sense of duty to recognize the claim which these men clearly have upon the people of this

Dominion. Though I have referred personally to Trooper Mulloy, because I know him personally—for he grew up within a few miles of my own door—and though his is certainly a case which should be recognized, I do not wish to single him out above others. There are men in every province whose claims deserve equal recognition with his; for I do not think there is a province in the Dominion but had the honour of participating by sending some of her sons to fight the battles of the empire in South Africa. That being the case, there should be no hesitation whatever on the part of the government to recognize the claims of these deserving men. I have suggested a comparison with other countries. I do not wish that this country should copy the pension list of the United States. But the action of the United States has a lesson for us. In that country no man who has turned out in defence of his country is neglected by the state. Even those who have the misfortune to become mained or injured in the employ of the government after having been in the army from 1861 to 1865 have been recognized under the pension laws of the United States. The list of pensions in the United States to-day is quite as large as it was two years after the war closed. I do not say that we should go so far as that, but I do say, and I do urge upon the government, that this country should recognize in a tangible and fitting way the claims of those men who have added glory to the name of Canada in the battle fields of the empire.

Now it is all very well for us to sit in our quiet homes and enjoy the benefits which the personal sacrifice of these men has procured us, while we let them live or die as best they can, without receiving any recognition at the country's hands. I think it is high time that something should be done in this matter. I am sure I appeal to a sympathetic House in this regard, and I hope the government will see fit to act, and act promptly on behalf of these men whose claims should have been recognized before this day. I think it is time that we should have at least the opinion of this House in reference to this matter, and I take pleasure in moving this resolution, seconded by my hon friend from Dorchester (Mr. Morin).

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). I am sure the House will agree with all that my hon. friend (Mr. Broder) has said about the good results to Canada and to the empire at large from the services rendered by our volunteers in the war in South Africa to which he has so eloquently and pertinently referred. With the sentimental side of the question I think we can all agree, but, Mr. Speaker, there is a business aspect to this question which must not be overlooked. Last year when my hon. friend brought the matter to the attention of the House. I told him that the volunteers who went to South Africa had gone there as British soldiers, that they had made a distinct contract with the British government as to what their treatment should be, namely, that they should be treated as well in every respect as volunteers from Great Britain herself. The government of Canada on behalf of these volunteers accepted those terms; and that being the case, surely we have a right to insist that they should abide by those terms. I stated further, Mr. Speaker, that we had had troubles of our own in Canada, notably the Fenian Raid, the Northwest Rebellion, and other troubles as a result of which Canadians on Canadian soil had been wounded, and some of them had met with total disability. I stated that these men had been pensioned, that their pensions were being paid by the Canadian government. I told him that I had examined carefully the pension list, the amounts of pensions paid for certain disabilities by the Imperial War Office, and the pensions paid for similar disabilities by this government, and that I found them to be practically the same. But I went the length of saying that if, in the case of any of those who were wounded in South Africa, even though a contract had been made, it appeared that there was any very serious discrepancy between the amount they were paid by the British government for those services as pensions, and the amount paid to our volunteers for services in Canada, I would consider whether we might not increase the amount to equal the Canadian amount, just as we did in the case of the pay, as the hon. gentleman has correctly stated. I have looked carefully over the list, and I am unable to see that there is any practical difference between the two rates of pay.

Mr. BRODER. There were some cases that received special recognition, such as Capt. Peters, who received $1,000 per annum.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I looked into that question, and I found a satisfactory answer, although not having the memorandum here at this moment I am not quite prepared to say what it is. But it was an officer, at any rate, of high rank to whom that particular treatment applied, and not a soldier in the ranks. Now it seems to me that the question for this House to consider is whether we should depart from a rule of action laid down for our own volunteers serving in defence of Canadian soil, for the upholding of Canadian authority within Canada, whether, I say, we should treat those who served in South Africa differently from the way we have treated those who have served in Canada. I am not aware that any exception has been taken to the treatment which has been accorded to those volunteers who served in

Canada, I am not aware that my hon. friend makes any complaint with regard to that. Surely we are not going to ask this parliament to treat the volunteers who served in South Africa better than we treat those who have served in defence of this country itself. Such being the case, I think I must ask my hon. friend to withdraw his motion, having had an opportunity of placing his views again before the House, as he has done on several occasions. He made one remark with which I agree absolutely. He says that no country in the world has been so slow as Canada to recognize the services of our volunteers who had served, I presume he meant, on the occasion of the Fenian Raids and the North-west Rebellion. So far as the Fenian Raids are concerned, I agree with him entirely, and it remained for the present government to take action shortly after they came into power. It was my great pleasure to be able to take the earliest opportunity of bringing the matter to the attention of the Imperial authorities, as a result of which the Fenian Raid medal was granted. We had in this country men who had served their country for many years as volunteers. We knew that in England a long service medal was granted to her volunteers, but in Canada no recognition of that kind had ever been made. I had the honour to bring that matter to the attention of the Imperial War Office, and we have now the satisfaction of knowing that a long service medal for men who have served in the ranks, and a long service decoration for officers, have been granted, and that hundreds, if not thousands, of our Canadian volunteers are now wearing those medals and decorations. So we have, at any rate, come at last to a sense of our duty in that respect. I have nothing to add, Mr. Speaker, to what I have said. I do not think we are prepared at this moment to admit that it is our duty to treat those who have served the empire in South Africa differently from the way we have treated Canadians who have served the empire on Canadian soil.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). Before the motion is disposed of I would like to say that the terms of the resolution do not seem to be such as would not commend themselves to every member of this House; their application may be another thing. The resolution reads :

> That this House would be pleased to learn that the volunteers of the several South African contingents from Canada, suffering total disability, incurred in such service, will receive recognition from their country, as part of that empire on behalf of which they willingly made such sacrifices.

I would not suppose that the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) would have found anything in that resolution which would not commend itself to him. As far as the business aspect of the case is concerned—and to this he has devoted most of his remarks—I think it might fairly be taken into consideration that the men who went from Canada to South Africa were in many cases of a different class from the ordinary rank and file of the British army. They were young men attending colleges, young men attending law schools, studying for the professions, men of a high class, for the most part, who gave up their prospects in life for the purpose of fighting for the empire in South Africa, and it hardly seems to be right to dismiss the subject as the Minister of Militia does, in a word, because these men receive the same pensions that the ordinary rank and file of the British army receive for total disability. I would have thought it possible that the government might have considered this question in a broader and more generous way. The case which has been alluded to by the mover of the resolution is certainly one which will appeal to every one of us. A young man of very great ability, who probably would have distinguished himself in either the professional or public life of this country, went to South Africa, lost the use of both his eyes, is permanently disabled in that way and on his behalf the hon. member (Mr. Broder) has made an appeal by the resolution he has moved to-day. The Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) has certainly not laid undue stress upon the sentimental side of the case in the remarks he has made, and I repeat that it would seem to me that the consideration to which I have alluded might very well have been taken into account by the government in dealing with the matter that has been brought to the attention of the House.

House divided on motion Mr. Broder.

YEAS :

Messieurs.

Alcorn,	Lancaster,
Ames,	Lefurgey,
Armstrong,	Lewis,
Barker,	Macdonell,
Barr,	Maclean (York, S.),
Bennett,	McCarthy (Calgary),
Bergeron,	McLean (Queen's P.E.I.),
Blain,	Martin (Queen's, P.E.I.),
Borden (Carleton),	Monk,
Boyce,	Morin,
Brabazon,	Northrup,
Broder,	Osler,
Chisholm (Huron),	Paquet,
Christie,	Pringle,
Clements,	Reid (Grenville),
Cochrane,	Roche (Marquette),
Cockshutt,	Schaffner,
Crocket,	Smith (Wentworth),
Daniel,	Sproule,
Elson,	Staples,
Foster,	Stockton,
Ganong,	Taylor,
Gunn,	Walsh,
Haggart,	Ward,
Henderson,	Wilmot,
Herron,	
Ingram,	

Jackson (Elgin), Kemp, Lake, Lalor, Wilson (Lennox & Addington), Worthington, Wright (Muskoka)—59.

NAYS :

Messieurs.

Adamson, Archambault, Aylesworth, Beauparlant, Béland, Belcourt, Borden (Sir Frederick), Bourassa, Brown, Bureau, Calvert, Campbell, Carney, Carrier, Carvell, Copp, Costigan, Crawford, Cyr, Delisle, Demers, Derbyshire, Desjardins, Devlin, Dubeau, Dugas, Dyment, Finlay, Finlayson, Fitzpatrick, Fortier, Galliher, Gauvreau, German, Girard, Gladu, Grant, Greenway, Harty, Hunt, Hyman, Jackson (Selkirk), Johnston, Kennedy, Knowles, Lachance, Lanctot, Lapointe, Laurence, Laurier (Sir Wilfrid), Laurier (L'Assomption), Lavergne (Drum. & Arth.), Law, LeBlanc, Logan, Loggie, Lovell, Macdonald, Macpherson, McCarthy (Simcoe), McColl, McCool, McCraney, McIntyre, McLennan, Marcile (Bagot), Marcil (Bonaventure), Martin (Wellington), Mayrand, Meigs, Oliver, Pardee, Parmelee, Paterson, Parent, Piché, Pickup, Proulx, Ratz, Reid (Restigouche), Rivet, Ross (Rimouski), Rousseau, Savoie, Schell (Glengarry), Sinclair, Sloan, Smith (Nanaimo), Smith (Oxford), Stewart, Telford, Templeman, Tobin, Turgeon, Turiff, Watson, Zimmerman.—97.

PAIRS :

Messieurs.

Ministerial :	Opposition :
Brodeur,	Lennox,
Caldwell,	Clare,
Emmerson,	Avery,
Ethier,	Leonard,
Fielding,	McLaren,
Geoffrion,	Perley,
Guthrie,	Fowler,
Hall,	Hughes (Victoria),
McKenzie,	Porter,
Miller,	Bland,
Sifton,	Bristol,
Talbot,	Seagram,
Lemieux,	Tisdale,
Fisher,	White, Hon.

Motion negatived.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

Mr. CALVERT. The hon. member for Two Mountains (Mr. Ethier) has not voted.

Mr. ETHIER. I am paired with the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Leonard). Had I voted I would have voted against the motion.

MONTREAL TURNPIKE TRUST.

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

1. For a return showing the present indebtedness to the Dominion government of the Montreal Turnpike Trust, (a) on capital account ; (b) for arears of interest.

2. The amounts collected at each toll gate belonging to the said Turnpike Trust, during the year ending 31st December, 1905.

3. The amount expended on each section or road division under the control of said Trust, during the said year, ending 31st December, 1905, and the contracts given out during the year, with the name of the contractor, the date and amount involved in each case, the cost of stone supplied, and in each case an indication as to whether tenders for such contracts were called for in the public press.

4. The amount paid out during the said year at each toll gate for salaries to day and night keeper, and all other expenditure at each of the toll gates maintained.

5. The actual indebtedness in detail of the said Trust, outside of its bonds due to the government of Canada.

6. A detailed statement of sums paid out during the year outside of salaries, road maintenance and rent.

He said : The object of this motion is to obtain accurate information as to the financial affairs of the Montreal Turnpike Trust. I have moved a similar motion almost every session since 1896, and I have on many occasions urged upon the government the necessity of appointing a commissioner to investigate the affairs of the trust and to suggest some remedy by which the nuisance of having these toll gates all around the city of Montreal shall be abated. Our late lamented friend, Mr. Prefontaine, who was conversant with the matter, just before his death had admitted the necessity of looking into the affairs of the Montreal Turnpike Trust, and he was desirous of covering by that commission the toll gates in the vicinity of the city of Quebec. As my right hon. friend is aware, I suggested the name of Mr. Kent, who is at present serving on the insurance commission, as a man conversant with the situation around Montreal and quite competent to investigate it. I had also suggested the name of Mr. Alexandre Desmarteau who seemed to be acceptable to Mr. Prefontaine, and I had also suggested the name of Mr. Thomas Trenholme, who is one of the members of the trust. As the Prime Minister is aware, the bonded indebtedness of the Montreal Turnpike Trust to the government, together with accumulated interest, now reaches the sum of over $250,000, and there is no possible prospect of the government

ever recovering either the principal or the interest. I repeat that it behooves the government to look into this question and to have the matter investigated in order that that nuisance of long standing; that obsolete toll gate system around Montreal should be abolished. I beg to move this motion seconded by Mr. Blain.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). I express my sympathy with this motion. Until a few years ago the city of Toronto was surrounded by these toll gates; they were a great obstruction to the development of the city, but the city in some way was able to have them removed. I trust that the city of Montreal will succeed in having these toll gates abolished and I hope that city will set a good example to all the cities of Canada by not creating any permanent franchises within its limits.

Motion agreed to.

DOMINION ELECTIONS ACT, 1900—AMENDMENT.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 2) further to amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900. He said: On the first reading of this Bill I made a brief explanation of it. Should the second reading now carry I propose to move that the Bill be referred to the Select Standing Committee appointed on the motion of the Minister of Justice.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read a second time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN moved:

That the said Bill be referred to the special committee of seven members appointed on the 16th instant to inquire into the operation of the Acts relating to the election of members to this House, and that the said committee be authorized to consider and report upon the said Bill.

Motion agreed to.

ACT RESPECTING THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN moved the second reading of Bill (No. 3) to further amend the Act respecting the House of Commons. He said: The observations I have just made with regard to Bill (No. 2) are applicable to this Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read a second time.

On motion of Mr. Borden the said Bill was referred to the special committee with the same instructions as with regard to Bill (No. 2).

CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN moved second reading of Bill (No. 4) further to amend the Criminal Code, 1892. He said: Mr. Speaker, as I said very little about this Bill at the time of its introduction, I would like to make a few remarks at this stage. In the first place, it proposes to enact that:

The members of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada are persons holding a judicial office within the meaning of the next preceding section.

The next preceding section of the Criminal Code is one that relates to judges of courts and to members of parliament, and it might be well that I should place that section before the House in order that hon. members may understand what is proposed to be done. Section 131 of the Criminal Code, is as follows:—

Every one is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to fourteen years' imprisonment who,—

(a) holding any judicial office, or being a member of parliament or of a legislature, corruptly accepts or obtains, or agrees to accept, or attempts to obtain for himself or any other person, any money or valuable consideration, office, place, or employment on account of anything already done or omitted, or to be afterwards done or omitted, by him in his judicial capacity, or in his capacity as such member; or

(b) corruptly gives or offers to any such person or to any other person, any such bribe as aforesaid on account of any such act or omission.

It is desirable, I think, that the members of the board of railway commissioners, who are persons holding a judicial as well as administrative office, should be brought within the purview of that section. It may be that in the amendment to the statutes which we are to have before us, that provision has already been adopted.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think it is a very proper provision.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The next section of the Bill which I am introducing is an amendment to the Criminal Code, section 131-B. It is a very long section, and I will not read it to the House. I believe hon. gentlemen have examined it, and we shall have a discussion of it later. The difficulty with section 131 of the Criminal Code, which concerns the same matter to some extent, is that it simply makes the giving or accepting of a bribe an indictable offence. The evil, if it be an evil, with which I propose to deal is something different from that. My Bill differs from that of the Minister of Justice in this respect. We have approached the subject from different standpoints. I agree that some of the provisions which the Minister of Justice proposes are very proper provisions, and possibly the Bill he has introduced and the Bill I introduce might be regarded as supplementary of each other, and both of them may perhaps be reported upon in that way by the committee. I desire to make it a criminal offence that any member of this House, whether he be a member of the legal profes-

sion or not, shall accept a sum of money or a reward of any character for any service he performs with regard to legislation before a committee of the House or before the House itself. The provisions of the Bill are designed to have that effect. Let me point out to the House the source from which I draw the idea of the Bill, and what has been done in England and the United States in the same direction. We have in the rules of this House only one provision, so far as I am aware, which touches this particular matter. It is this :

Resolved, that the offer of any money or other advantage to any member of this House, for the promoting of any matter whatsoever depending or to be transacted in parliament, is a high crime and misdemeanour, and tends to the subversion of the Constitution.

I do not think that provision, the source of which I will speak of in a moment, covers the object I have in view. It was not so considered in the British House of Commons, in which a very interesting debate on this question took place in the year 1858. The resolution which I have just read from our own rules is a resolution which was adopted by the British House of Commons as far back as the year 1695. It was not regarded there as sufficient, and in the year 1858 Viscount Hotham moved in the British House of Commons a resolution on the same subject. The debate which ensued I have under my hand ; it is reported in the English 'Hansard', third series, volume 151, commencing at page 176. Viscount Hotham was asked to withdraw the resolution. There were a great many reasons urged against it. He declined to do so, and in the end his motion was adopted by a vote of 210 to 27. The resolution of Viscount Hotham, which is to be found at page 184 of the volume of 'Hansard' to which I have just referred, is this :

That it is contrary to the usage and derogatory to the dignity of this House that any of its members should bring forward, promote or advocate in this House any proceeding or measure in which he may have acted, or been concerned for or in consideration of any pecuniary fee or reward.

The resolution was undoubtedly aimed at a practice which seems to have prevailed previously to that date in the British House —the practice of members of the bar receiving rewards, accepting retainers, in respect of legislation which was introduced into the British House or before committees of that House. The debate which took place on the motion is, as I have said, very interesting. I will not weary the House with it. Any hon. gentleman who takes an interest in the subject, and especially the members of the committee who will have this matter under consideration, may if they see fit consult that debate, and I think they may possibly receive some useful suggestions from it. Similar discussions, on which I will not weary the House, came up at various times in the British House between 1858 and 1899. In 1899 Sir Robert Finlay, then Solicitor General, in answer to a question propounded by a member of the House, said that if a solicitor after his election as a member should continue to engage in parliamentary practice, a question of parliamentary usage might arise for the decision of the House. The question and answer are reported in the English 'Hansard', fourth series, volume 76, page 264. I have taken the trouble to make pretty careful and pretty extensive inquiries as to the practice of counsel and solicitors in the British House with regard to this subject, and I have received only one answer from every source to which I made application, and that is, that no barrister or solicitor in the British House of Commons would for one moment think of carrying on his professional business after his election as member of parliament, in respect of any matter coming before that House. Not only is that the case, but they carry it a little further there. Counsel who are members of the British House of Commons, and who have been concerned in the debate of questions arising in the House, take very good care not to accept a professional retainer in the courts afterwards in respect of any matter which has been so debated by them in the House ; thus they make the rule operate conversely. Of course, so far as the House is concerned, the first branch of the rule is the all-important one for parliament to consider. Mr. Mundella, whose resignation as President of the Board of Trade is very thoroughly discussed in the Edinburgh 'Review' for April, 1901, resigned his position as President of the Board of Trade because a judge's order had passed that he, being a director of a New Zealand loan company, should be publicly examined by one of his own officials. In announcing his resignation, he said :

I think that the public have the right to be sure that there is not the slightest suspicion of conflict between personal and public considerations.

In the United States they have dealt with this subject very thoroughly. I shall not read all their enactments, but shall refer my hon. friend the Minister of Justice and the members of the committee to the Constitutional Manual and Digest of Cases published in 1890. In this volume the committee will find collected at pages 436, 437 and 438 the various sections of the revised statutes of the United States which deal with the subject I am now bringing to the attention of the House. It is not necessary that I should read these provisions, but let me say that everything I have expressed in this Bill is included in the statute law of the United States at present and has been so included for many years. If the members of the committee will be good enough

to examine the statutes which are collected on these pages, they will there find ample justification, if the legislation of the United States can be regarded as a justification, for placing a similar law on our statute book. In the United States they have had prosecutions against senators and members of congress who have infringed the statute to which I have referred. There have been, I think, no less than three of these prosecutions within the past eighteen months. I shall not refer to only one, namely, the prosecution brought against the United States Senator, John L. Mitchell, senior senator for Oregon. The prosecution of this gentleman attracted some attention not only in the United States but elsewhere. I am quoting from the 'London Times' of July 5th, 1905.

New York, July 4th.—After a trial lasting two weeks United States Senator John L. Mitchell, senior senator for Oregon, was found guilty at Portland, Oregon, to-day of accepting pay for practicing before departments of the federal government. The penalty is imprisonment for not more than two years and a fine of not more than ten thousand dollars. Mr. Mitchell was under an indictment on graver charges including that of feloniously conspiring to defraud the government of public lands by means of false and forged affidavits and fictitious persons. So popular is Mr. Mitchell in Oregon that a verdict of acquittal or the jury's failure to agree was regarded as certain. The evidence, however, was too direct and it is difficult to see how any other verdict than that given could have been reached. One of the witnesses was Mr. Mitchell's law partner who swore that the senator and himself had altered their partnership agreement when the danger of a prosecution became imminent making the articles read that Mr. Mitchell was not to receive money for business in federal courts. Mr. Mitchell is the second senator to be convicted of a criminal offence within a few months. The fact that not a single evening paper here regards the news of the conviction of a member of the senate as 'live' enough to be put on its front page is, perhaps, as good an indication as could be found of the condition of public conscience regarding malfeasance in office. It should be added that to-day being Independence Day the 'Evening Post' does not appear.

I have referred already to the Bill of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice, and I have said that it might be regarded as supplementary or complementary to the Bill I am introducing. Both, I understand, are to go before a committee. If I might be permitted to say a word with regard to the custom of members of the bar carrying on practice in this House, while they are members of it, I would say that I am entirely in accord with the provisions of this Bill of the Minister of Justice in that regard. I do not think it is proper for members of the bar to practice before committees of this House for reward. I do not think it is proper for members of the bar to take retainers in respect of Bills which they carry on through the various stages in this House and before the Senate. Let me illustrate what I mean, and I think the evil of the practice will be very evident. I have had one or two matters come under my own personal observation, and when this committee gets at work I shall be perfectly willing to go before it and testify as to one or two matters that have come under my personal observation and to one or two, as to which I have not personel knowledge but the strongest kind of information. A member of the bar is retained either in support of or in opposition to a Bill. He goes before a parliamentary committee and makes it known to that committee that he has a retainer from certain parties interested in that Bill. He represents his clients before that committee. If the practice could be stopped there, something might be said in its defence, although I myself would be prepared to say, even if the practice went no further, that that should not be allowed. But the difficulty is that the practice does not stop there. The next step is that a member of the bar, who has been retained before a committee of the House or before a committee of the Senate—he being a member of either House—deals with that Bill and in respect of it before a committee of which he is a member. And there is just one step beyond this which is this—that he does not disclose to that committee, before which he appears, the fact that he is a retained solicitor or counsel acting for those who are interested in that measure. A member of the bar who does that, puts himself in an absolutely false position. Members of the bar are retained to do work which other members of the House, not belonging to the legal profession, think themselves fully capable of performing just as efficiently. A member of the bar is retained in respect of a Bill. Part of his work may be conversations with other members and discussion of the subject with them. A member of the House who is not a member of the bar thinks himself just as capable of doing that as any practising advocate and undertakes similar work; and when you have a member of parliament accepting that position and not disclosing to his fellow members the fact that he is a retained and paid advocate for the Bill, you have a situation which might be described in language that I hesitate to use in this House. That is the danger of permitting members of the bar to carry on their practice in this House or the Senate or before any committee of the Senate or any department of the government. I venture to say for that reason that the Bill which has been introduced by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice and the Bill which I have introduced—both having a common end, both intended to effect a common purpose—are Bills which should receive, not only the very careful attention of the committee but also the very careful attention and consideration of this House

when that committee reports. I therefore beg to move the second reading of this Bill, and after moving its second reading I shall make a similar motion in regard to it as in the other cases.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I beg to move that this Bill be also referred to the special committee of seven appointed on the motion of the Minister of Justice on Friday last, and that the said committee be authorized to consider it and report upon the same.

Motion agreed to.

DOMINION CONTROVERTED ELECTIONS ACT.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN moved second reading of Bill (No. 5) further to amend the Dominion Controverted Elections Act. He said: I gave a brief, but I think, sufficient explanation of this Bill when I moved the first reading. I now beg to move the second reading and ask that this Bill be disposed of in the same manner as the other.

Bill read the second time, and referred to the same committee with the same instructions.

RAILWAY ACT, 1903, AMENDMENT.

On the order—

Second reading of Bill (No. 9) an Act to further amend the Railway Act, 1903.—Mr. Maclean.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). I am ready to go on with this Bill, Mr. Speaker. I have waited two or three days for the Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Emmerson) to be in his place.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister.) If convenient for my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) the Bill will be called to-morrow. The Minister of Railways is not here to-day, but is expected to be in his place to-morrow. Whether he is here or not the Bill can be taken up.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 5 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, March 22, 1906.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 35) to incorporate the Western Loan and Trust Company.—Mr. Adamson.

Bill (No. 36) respecting the Canadian Niagara Power Company.—Mr. German by Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 37) respecting the Montreal Park and Island Railway Company.—Mr. Geoffrion.

Bill (No. 38) to incorporate the Temple Mutual Life Association.—Mr. Bole by Mr. Turriff.

Bill (No. 39) respecting the Canada Atlantic Railway Company.—Mr. Macdonald by Mr. Galliher.

LOAN COMPANIES.

Mr. A. ZIMMERMAN moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 40) respecting certain loan companies.

Mr. TISDALE. The hon. gentleman should give us some explanation of what the Bill is.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. This Act as now introduced is a verbatim copy of an Act passed by both Houses in 1903, Bill (No. 24). Through some official oversight it was never presented for the royal assent, and so, through no fault of its promoters, failed to become law. This is for the purpose of giving loan companies greater powers in regard to investments, but is asking for nothing more nor less than the Bill of 1903.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

RAILWAY FACILITIES IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked :

1. Has the government received petitions or copies of resolutions passed at public meetings in New London and Rustico, in Prince Edward Island, in reference to the extension of railway facilities to these sections?

2. Has the survey of the proposed New London line been completed and final as to location, or is it the intention of the government to order a survey for a loop line to serve both New London and Rustico ?

3. If not the latter, does the government intend to proceed with the survey of a short spur line to serve the large section of Rustico, as asked for by petition and resolutions passed at various public meetings, and sent to the Department of Railways and Canals ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. Yes, petitions have been received from the inhabitants of New London and vicinity.

2. Yes, a survey has been made from Emerald Junction via. Granville, P.E.I., and another via. Clinton to Stanley Bridge, and a reconnaissance survey has been made

from Kensington via. New London to the same point.

3. Answered by No. 2.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND STEAMSHIP SERVICE.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked :

1. Has the government considered the commercial necessity of establishing steamship communication between the north side of Prince Edward Island and Miramichi, the Magdalen Islands and Sydney ?

2. Is it intended to call for tenders for a suitable steamer to make weekly trips on this route during the coming season ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Trade and Commerce) :

1. Yes.

2. No.

QUEBEC BRIDGE.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Have the subsidies granted by the provincial government of Quebec and the city of Quebec, towards the construction of the Quebec bridge, amounting to $250,000 and $300,000, respectively, been paid in cash to the Quebec Bridge Company ?

2. With whom were the bonds of the Quebec Bridge Company, amounting to $472,000, and referred to in the Dominion statute, 3 Edward VII., chapter 54, negotiated, and have the said bonds been withdrawn or redeemed ?

3. Were the said bonds redeemed by government guaranteed bonds ?

4. Were said bonds redeemed at their par value of $472,000, or at the value they had realized, of $283,279 ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. Yes, except the subsidy granted by the provincial government, which is payable at the rate of $30,000 per annum, of which $180,000 is already paid and a sum of $70,000 is still payable by the province.

2. The bonds amounting to $472,000 and referred to in the Dominion statute 3 Edward VII, chap. 54, were interim bonds and were negotiated with M. P. Davis and Thomas McDougall as trustee, by a deed of mortgage dated May 15, 1902, and they were redeemed by a deed of release dated March 2, 1904.

3. Yes.

4. They were redeemed at par value according to contract passed between the Quebec Bridge Company and its contractor.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Has the government caused to be made at any time, under section 5 of chapter 54 of 3 Edward VII., any inspection of the books of the Quebec Bridge and Railway Company ?

2. If such inspection has taken place, by whom was it made, and has any report been received?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Railways and Canals). No inspection of the books of the Quebec Bridge Company has yet been made.

TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Have the commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway expropriated or taken possession of any lands required for the purposes of the eastern division of the said railway within the province of Quebec ?

2. Has any payment or agreement to pay been made for any said lands required for such purposes ? If so, what is the cost to date of such expropriations ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Railways and Canals). The Commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway have not expropriated or taken possession of any lands for the purposes of the eastern division of said railway within the province of Quebec.

RAILWAY ACCIDENTS IN CANADA.

Mr. KEMP asked :

1. How many passengers travelling on railways in Canada met with fatal accidents during the years 1904 and 1905 ?

2. How many employees and others met with fatal accidents during the same period ?

3. How many passengers, employees, and others met with serious injury ?

4. Have investigations been held on behalf of the government in respect to such accidents ?

5. If so, will the government lay reports of such investigations upon the table of the House?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1, 2 and 3 :

—	—	Year ended June 30, 1904.	Year ended June 30, 1905.
Steam Railways...	No. of Pass. killed.	25	35
Electric " ...	" " "	10	30
Steam Railways...	" Empl. "	192	206
Electric " ...	" " "	3	3
Steam " ...	" Others "	178	227
Electric " ...	" " "	40	23
Steam Railways...	" Pass. injured	234	244
" " ...	" Empl. "	912	919
" " ...	" Others "	259	194
Electric " ...	" Pass. "	508	884
" " ...	" Empl. "	64	65
" " ...	" Others. "	272	347

4. I have no information on this question.

5. No.

SWAMP LANDS.

Mr. STAPLES asked :

1. What system or method is used by the government in classifying swamp lands ?

2. What is the nature of the swamp lands known as class 'a' and class 'b,' respectively?

3. How many acres of swamp lands of 'a' and 'b' were transferred by the Dominion gov-

ernment to the Manitoba government in each year since 1896, giving class 'a' and 'b' separately in each instance ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Swamp lands inspectors appointed by the government inspect the lands as the surveys progress, and report to the Minister of the Interior.

2. There is no classification of swamp lands in the manner mentioned.

In Orders of the Governor General in Council vesting the title to swamp lands in His Majesty the King for the purposes of the province of Manitoba, lands being transferred are in certain cases described as being in a schedule marked 'A', and lands not surveyed at the date of the Order but reserved under the order for transfer to the province when surveyed are described in certain cases as being in a schedule marked 'B'.

3. Swamp lands were transferred by Order of His Excellency in Council to His Majesty the King for the purposes of the province of Manitoba in each of the years from 1896 to the present year as follows.

	Acres.
1897	151,985·39
1898	3,120·00
1899	197,281·39
1900	160·00
1902	20,744·01
1903	112,424·33
1904	77,721·01
1905	16,445·00

Lands were set apart by Order of His Excellency in Council for transfer to His Majesty the King for the purposes of the province of Manitoba when surveyed as follows :

	Acres.
1903	90,840
1904	87,840

PORT COLBORNE BREAKWATER.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

1. How much money has been expended to date on (a) dredging ; (b) on dock or breakwater work at Port Colborne ?

2. How much has been expended to date on the government elevator at Port Colborne ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) (for the Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. The cost of dredging is	$142,843 50
Cost of submarine rock excavation is	438,752 25
Total under-water excavation to date	$581,595 75
(b) Cost to date on breakwaters	752,142 52

2. Amount expended to date on elevator at Port Colborne is $98,199.99.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY ILLUMINATING OIL.

Mr. FOWLER asked :

1. What quantities of illuminating oil have been bought by the Intercolonial Railway department during the last three fiscal years, respectively, and from whom ?

2. Was said oil bought by tender ?

3. If so, who were the tenderers, and at what price did they tender, respectively ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. The following are the quantities of illuminating oil bought by the Intercolonial Railway for the last three fiscal years, viz :

	Gallons.
1903—Imperial Oil Company	58,854
Gall Schneider Oil Company.	89,436
1904—Imperial Oil Company	78,383
Gall Schneider Oil Company..	75,785
1905—Imperial Oil Company	169,229

2. All the above mentioned oil was bought by tender, except 58,854 gallons supplied by the Imperial Oil Company in the year 1903.

3.

Imperial Oil Co. For Specification		'A' 22 c
Imperial Oil Co.	"	'B' 24 c
Gall Schneider Oil Co.	"	'A' 19½c
Gall Schneider Oil Co.	"	'B' 21½c
Imperial Oil Co.	"	'A' 19½c
Imperial Oil Co.	"	'B' 20½c
Gall Schneider Oil Co.	"	'A' 21½c
Gall Schneider Oil Co.	"	'B' 22½c
Canadian Oil Co.	"	'A' 19 c
Canadian Oil Co.	"	'B' 18¼c
A. D. Gall Petroleum and Chemical Co. for Specification		'A' 20⅛c
A. D. Gall Petroleum and Chemical Co., for specification		'B' 20⅝c
Eastern Railway and Supply Co.		'A' 17 c
Eastern Railway and Supply Co. (better quality)		'A' 18 c
Eastern Railway and Supply Co.		'B' 17½c
Eastern Railway and Supply Co. (better quality)		'B' 18 c

RECOGNITION OF VOYAGEURS.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES asked:

1. Were the boatmen or voyageurs in 1870, under Sir Garnet Wolseley, recognized in any official way by either the British or Canadian governments ?

2. If so, what was the nature of such recognition ?

3. Is it the intention of the government to grant boatmen or voyageurs, who served on the Red River expedition of 1870, scrip or medals for their services ?

Hon. CHARLES S. HYMAN (for the Minter of Militia and Defence):

1 and 2. No.

3. It was decided by the government of the day that they were employed as civilians and not eligible for medals or scrip. They were, in fact, treated precisely as were the teamsters employed at the same time. It is not intended to depart from the decision then reached.

PAYMENTS TO WOODS LIMITED.

Mr. MONK asked:

1. What is the total amount paid to the Woods Limited, or to J. W. Woods, by the government during the year ending 30th June, 1905, for goods furnished to the Transcontinental Railway Construction Commission ?
2. What is the total amount paid by the government from the 30th June, 1905, to the 1st March, 1906, to the Woods Limited, or to J. W. Woods, for goods furnished to the Transcontinental Railway Construction Commission ?
3. Did the said construction commission call for tenders through the newspapers before placing orders for goods with the Woods Limited ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WLFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Railways and Canals:

1. $16,125.29.
2. $11,402.50.
3. Goods furnished by Woods, Limited, were purchased by the Commissioners' purchasing agent at wholesale prices. Tenders are not publicly called for in such cases, as the goods are generally wanted for immediate requirements, but quotations are usually obtained.

FREIGHT CHARGES ON THE INTERCOLONIAL.

Mr. SINCLAIR asked:

1. What is the rate on steel products per ton per mile by the Intercolonial Railway from Sydney to Montreal ?
2. What is the rate on fish per ton per mile by the Intercolonial Railway from Mulgrave to Montreal ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. The rate on steel products by the Intercolonial Railway from Sydney to Montreal is ¼ cent per ton per mile.
2. The rate on fish by the Intercolonial Railway from Mulgrave to Montreal is 57-100 cents per ton per mile.

TRENT VALLEY CANAL.

Mr. WARD asked:

1. What surveys have been made of the outlet of the Trent Valley canal, from Rice lake to Lake Ontario, during the past two years ?
2. By what route have these surveys been made ?
3. By whom have the surveys been made ?
4. Has the government come to any decision as to the proper route to be adopted ?
5. Have the reports of surveys been submitted to the Department of Railways and Canals by the engineers in charge ?
6. What is the probable amount of damage caused by the break in the Trent Valley canal at Peterboro' and Kirkfield ?
7. Have the officers, in whose charge these works were, been retained, or have such officers been dismissed ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. Instrumental surveys have been made over three proposed routes for the Trent canal from Rice lake to Lake Ontario.
2. The respective routes surveyed were from Rice lake to Port Hope; Rice lake to Cobourg; Rice lake to Trenton.
3. By E. J. Walsh, C.E., and staff.
4. No.
5. No.
6. When the leaks occurred in the embankment approach to the lift lock at Peterborough, the commissioner stated in his report that $2,000 should cover the expenditure in connection with the repairs to be made.

It is impossible at the present time to say what the cost of the repairs will be for the damage at Kirkfield.

7. Five of the officers connected with the works have resigned.

DREDGING ST. MARY'S RIVER.

Mr. BOYCE asked :

1. What amount was paid by the government during the year 1905 for dredging in St. Mary's river, (a) at the canal and approaches; (b) at the government dock; (c) in the channel ?
2. To what persons, firms or corporations, respectively, were such amounts paid ?
3. Was the work in each case performed by contract under tender ? If not, under what arrangement ?
4. What prices are paid per yard at the different places, respectively, what dredges were employed and who owned them ?
5. To what depths has the river been dredged, (a) at the canal, both approaches ; (b) at the government dock ; (c) in the channel ?
6. Have any complaints been received from navigators, of the difficulty of access to the government dock by reason of submerged rocks and boulders in the approaches ? If so, from whom were such complaints received, when, and how were they dealt with ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Railways and Canals).

1. Amount paid by the Department of Railways and Canals during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1905, for deepening and widening channel way at upper entrance Sault Ste. Marie canal was $46,633.74.
2. Messrs. Hickler Bros., $21,060.74 ; and C. S. Boone, $25,573.
3. Yes, the work was performed by contract under tender.
4. Eighty cents ; and one dollar and seventy-four cents per cubic yard. Dredges No. 5 and 8 owned by Hickler Bros., and Dredges No. 10 and 15, owned by C. S. Boone.
5. Lower approach 21 feet to 21 feet 5 inches. Upper approach 21 feet 5 inches below extreme low water.
6. None by the Department of Railways and Canals.

FLOUR SUPPLY TO PENITENTIARIES.

Mr. TAYLOR asked :

1. In what newspapers were tenders invited for the supply of flour for the penitentiaries at Kingston, St. Vincent de Paul and Dorchester?
2. Were tenders invited in any other manner than by advertisement in newspapers ?

3. Over what dates did such advertisements in newspapers, if any, extend ?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (for the Minister of Justice) :

1. Ontario : Acton 'Free Press,' Alexandria 'News,' Belleville 'Ontario,' Brantford 'Expositor,' Brockville 'Recorder,' Chatham 'News' Collingwood 'Bulletin,' Cornwall 'Freeholder,' Cobourg 'World,' Embro 'Courier,' Essex 'Free Press,' Eganville 'Leader,' Galt 'Reformer,' Hamilton 'Times,' Hamilton 'Herald.' Ingersoll 'Chronicle,' Kingston 'British Whig,' Kingston 'Canadian Freeman,' Listowel 'Banner,' London 'Advertiser,' Milton 'Reformer,' Ottawa 'Danebrog,' Ottawa 'Free Press,' Ottawa 'Le Temps,' Peterborough 'Examiner,' Port Hope 'Guide,' Ridgetown 'Plaindealer,' Stratford 'Beacon,' Toronto 'Globe,' Toronto 'Star,' Toronto 'Register,' Toronto 'Grocer.'

Quebec : Arthabaskaville 'L'Union des Cantons d'Est,' Montreal 'Le Bulletin,' Montreal 'Le Canada,' Montreal 'La Presse,' Montreal 'La Patrie,' Montreal 'The Herald,' Montreal 'Witness,' Montreal 'Shareholder,' Quebec 'Le Soleil,' Quebec 'Telegraph,' Quebec 'L'Echo de Québec,' St. Hyacinthe 'L'Union,' Sorel 'Le Courrier,' Sherbrooke 'Le Progrès de l'Est,' St. Johns 'Le Canada-Français.'

Nova Scotia : Amherst 'Daily News,' Halifax 'Acadian Recorder,' Halifax 'Morning Chronicle,' North Sydney 'Enterprise,' North Sydney 'Herald,' Sydney 'Daily Record,' Sydney Mines 'Enterprise.'

New Brunswick : Fredericton 'Herald,' Moncton 'Transcript,' St. John 'Globe.'

Prince Edward Island : Charlottetown 'Patriot.'

Manitoba : Brandon 'Sun,' Selkirk 'Expositor,' Stonewall 'Argus,' Winnipeg 'Free Press,' Winnipeg 'Commercial Weekly.'

Northwest Territories: Prince Albert 'Advocate,' Regina 'Leader.'

British Columbia : Vancouver 'World,' Vancouver 'Province,' Vancouver 'Ledger,' Victoria 'Times.'

2. In response to the invitation for tenders in May, 1905, ten were received for Kingston penitentiary, eight for St. Vincent de Paul, and eight for Dorchester, at prices ranging from $4.19 to $5.70 per barrel. These prices were thought to be too high and it was decided to defer purchase until after harvest. In September a letter inviting tenders was sent to all who had tendered in May and to such others as it was thought might tender. Thirteen responded, some tendering for the supply of one, others for more than one penitentiary. The following tenders were received : Nine for the Kingston penitentiary, nine for St. Vincent de Paul and eight for Dorchester, at prices ranging from $3.84 to $4.80 a barrel. In every case the lowest was accepted.

3. Three insertions in daily newspapers, on three Saturdays in May. Twice in May in the weekly newspapers.

Mr. TAYLOR.

OTTAWA POST OFFICE RECONSTRUCTION.

Mr. BLAIN asked :

1. What is the total expenditure on the Ottawa post office since the fire ?

2. When will it be completed, and what is the estimated total cost ?

Hon. CHARLES S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works) :

1. $175,113.65, including clearing away rubbish and fitting up temporary quarters for post office service, and moving and renewing furniture by fire.

2. The post office officials are in possession of the building, which is completed with the exception of internal fittings. The total estimated cost of reconstruction is $183,113.65.

NORTH ATLANTIC TRADING COMPANY.

Mr. OSLER—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. Has the Department of the Interior made any investigations into the operation of the contract of the 28th November, 1904, with the North Atlantic Trading Company, as intimated by the First Minister to be its duty (see 'Hansard' of 1905, page 9,447), and with what result?

2. Has the government made any investigation as to whether the said contract has been abused, and with what result ? (See 'Hansard' of 1905, page 9,448).

3. Has the government considered the question of terminating the said contract, and what, if any, action has the government taken or decided to take ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The operation of the contract of the 28th November, 1904, with the North Atlantic Trading Company is a question which the government has under consideration.

JOSEPH NIXON.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. Has any further report been made by Mr. Leach, or by any other commissioner, in respect of Joseph Nixon, land agent at Macleod, subsequent to that of 3rd April, 1905 ?

2. If so, will the minister lay it on the table of the House ?

3. What settlement has been made with the bona fide lot purchasers at Macleod, who paid in their fees to Nixon, and what loss, if any, has been sustained by the government therein?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Yes, two reports by Mr. Leech dated 18th August, 1905, and 19th December, 1905; and reports of the 17th January, 20th January, and 9th March, 1906, by the agent of the Department of Justice at Macleod.

2. Yes, on an Order of the House being obtained.

3. Lots sold by Joseph Nixon to certain purchasers and afterwards patented to town of Macleod, have been re-transferred to the Crown in order that sale to original purchasers may be carried out. The government has sustained no loss.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps the minister would lay that on the table without the formality of a motion.

JOHN F. NELSON ; CHARLES SUTHERLAND.

Mr. LAKE asked:

1. Is John F. Nelson in the employ of the government as fishery inspector, or in any other capacity ?

2. Is Charles Sutherland in the employ of the government as Indian farm instructor, or in any, and what, other capacity ?

3. If either of these gentlemen is not now in the employ of the government, when and under what circumstances did he or they leave such employ ?

He said : This question is identical with one asked by me on the 14th of March. It was answered by the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Fisher) and by the Minister of the Interior (Hon. Mr. Oliver). But I find that the answer of the Minister of the Interior, which I did not catch, does not appear in 'Hansard,' so I have asked the same question in order to have it placed on 'Hansard.'

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I noted that 'Hansard' had incorrectly taken the answer that was given on that day. The answer to the part of the question which relates to the Department of the Interior is as follows :—

2. No.

3. Mr. Sutherland's services were dispensed with on or about the 18th of February, 1906.

POSTMASTER AT CANNINGTON.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

What was the salary or income, gross and net, of the postmaster at Cannington, for each year since 1903 ?

Hon. CHARLES S. HYMAN (for the Postmaster General) :

1902-03	$782 53
1903-04	934 51
1904-05	959 46

WHARF ON RIVIERE JESUS.

Mr. LEONARD—by Mr. Monk—asked :

1. Is it the intention of the government to complete the work commenced for the construction of a wharf and its approaches, on the Rivière Jésus, at St. François de Sales, county of Laval ?

2. What amount has been expended up to the present on such construction ?

3. What is the amount required to complete the said works at St. François de Sales ?

Hon. CHARLES S. HYMAN Minister of Public Works) :

1. Yes.

2. $12,254.71.

3. Balance of appropriation, $1,693.19, will be sufficient to complete the work.

SALARIES OF GUARDIANS, ST. VINCENT DE PAUL PENITENTIARY.

Mr. LEONARD—by Mr. Monk—asked :

1. Has the government or the Department of Justice, received a petition from one or several of the employees at the St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary ?

2. If so, what are the names of those who made that petition ?

3. Is it the intention of the government to increase in a general manner the salaries of the guardians at St. Vincent de Paul penitentiary ?

4. Is it the opinion of the government that those employees are sufficiently paid ?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (for the Minister of Justice) :

1. Yes.

2. Joseph Desjardins, J. Percy Forster, Edmond Bélanger, Paul Blondin, P. J. G. Lynch, A. McDonough and Agra Bourgeois.

3. The matter is under consideration.

4. The matter is under consideration.

WHARF AT TERREBONNE.

Mr. LEONARD—by Mr. Monk—asked :

1. What amount has the government expended up to the present, for the construction of the wharf and approaches thereto, at Terrebonne, on the Rivière Jésus ?

2. Have such works been completed ?

3. Does the government propose completing such works this year ?

4. What amount is required for the completion of such works ?

5. Is all the money that has been voted for such works expended ?

6. If not, what balance remains for expenditure ?

7. Why did not the government ask, in the estimates for the financial year from the 1st July, 1906, to the 31st March, 1907, for the amount necessary to complete such works ?

Hon. CHARLES S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works) :

1. $12,320.49.

2. No.

3. Work is expected to be completed by the end of present fiscal year.

4. The present appropriation will, it is hoped, be sufficient.

5. No.

6. $1,625.95.

7. Nothing required.

CARRIAGE OF COAL FOR THE INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY.

Mr. GAUVREAU asked :

1. Is it the intention of the Minister of Railways to have all the coal intended for the use of the Intercolonial Railway brought to the port of Rivière du Loup, or else to have it carried, as heretofore, by rail ?

2. If so, has he ordered, or is he soon going to order, hydrographic surveys at the Point, so as to ascertain the depth of the water at high and low tide, in order to have the dredging done that might be needed in case of a lack of water sufficient for the steamers carrying the coal ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. It is not the intention of the Railway Department to bring coal via the port of Rivière du Loup. The supply for that point will be hauled by rail from Lévis, where it is intended to install coal handling appliance adequate for the requirements of Rivière du Loup, Chaudière and Drummond divisions.

2. No.

SALARIES OF LIGHTHOUSE KEEPERS.

Mr. GAUVREAU asked :

Is it the intention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to grant the increase in salary, this session, which has been so urgently requested for several years back by the lighthouse keepers and the captains of floating lighthouses ?

Hon. CHARLES S. HYMAN (for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries). The Minister of Marine and Fisheries has handed me the following answer : The question of increasing the salaries of these officials, based upon the importance of each light, the difficulties attending its management and isolation and other like conditions, is now, under consideration.

CIVIL SERVANTS AND OUTSIDE EMPLOYMENT.

Mr. WALSH asked :

1. Are civil servants in the employ of the government at Ottawa permitted to engage in any occupation, business or work outside the performance of their duty ?

2. In how many departments, and what departments, is this permitted ?

3. How many civil servants carry on any business or work outside of their official duties?

4. What is the policy of the government with respect to this question ?

5. What rule does the government enforce with respect to customs officers and other officials in the outside service in this manner ?

6. Have any persons been dismissed, or threatened with dismissal, since the 1st of January, 1900, for this reason ?

7. Who are such persons, and in what position were they employed, what annual salary did each of them receive, and what is the date of their dismissal ?

8. The foregoing questions apply to all the departments except the Department of Customs.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Civil servants generally in the employ of the government at Ottawa are not permitted to engage in any occupation, business or work outside the performance of their duty. This is the rule in most of the departments. The government does not know how many civil servants carry on business outside of their civil service duties. The policy of the government on this subject was recently expressed in this House. The rule in force was explained by my colleague the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) a few days ago. I am not aware that any person has been dismissed or threatened with dismissal on this account.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman) if he is making any headway with that return of mine.

Mr. HYMAN. So far as the Department of Public Works is concerned, it has already been laid upon the table. I spoke to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries about it, and I understand that his return has been almost completed.

RAILWAY ACT, 1903, AMENDMENT.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER Lincoln and Niagara) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 6) in amendment of the Railway Act, 1903. He said : This Bill is one which, I think, as soon as the facts are stated to the House, will be at once concurred in by everybody. It relates to proceedings that are taken in arbitration against the land-owner where the company is compulsorarily taking a man's land. Until 1903 we had two sections upon the subject. In 1903, the Hon. Mr. Blair, in consolidating the Act, thought it wise to make one section out of two sections, namely, sections 150 and 151 of the Consolidated Railway Act of 1888. The first of those two sections related to a case where the land-owner did not pay any attention to the proceedings, did not give a notice refusing the offer made by the company, nor did he appoint an arbitrator. By that section, the law as it was until 1903, the company were permitted to make an application, and it will occur to you at once that there was no one but the company who had any standing to make an application. The next section, 151, dealt with the case where the land-owner did take notice of the proceedings and gave notice refusing to accept the sum offered by the company, and apointed his arbitrator ; and in that case either party could invoke the court for an appointment of the third arbitrator so that the proceedings could go on. Now I am satisfied that there was a mistake in the wording of the section that I am seeking to amend, the mistake occurred in consolidating the two sections and turning them into one. The law as it has been on the statute-book since 1903 says, that nobody but the company in any case can invoke the court for the appointment of an arbitrator so that proceedings can go on. I am satisfied that never was the intention of this parliament, it never was intended in 1903 that the land-owner who is resisting as to the amount offered him, can have his proceedings tied up at the will of the company for ever, and can be prevented from having his hearing—because he cannot get his board of arbitrators constituted—and can be compelled to

stand mute and either take what the company offer him or never have his proceedings gone on with unless the company sees fit to invoke the court. I, therefore, propose to amend that section by adding the words, 'or of the opposite party,' after the word 'company;' and by adding the words, 'or the company,' after the word 'party' in the sixth line, so that it will read when amended as follows :

If, within ten days after the service of such notice, or within one month after the publication thereof, the opposite party does not give notice to the company that he accepts the sum offered by it, the judge shall, on the application of the company or of the opposite party, six days' notice of which shall be given to the opposite party or to the company, appoint arbitrators——

And so on. Unless that amendment is made, when a man is resisting the company as to the amount, and when he says, I have material evidence to prove that I am entitled to more damages than the company offers me, and I want the matter determined, and cannot get it determined unless the company at its own will will invoke the court—in that case what happens ? Now, I am bound to mention a case which came under my notice. I happened to be asked to act as arbitrator in several cases last summer, and the land-owners could not get the arbitration proceeded with because the company would not ask the court to appoint arbitrators. The money is paid into court, what the court sees fit to order, and they may order a little more than the amount offered by the company, sometimes twice as much, or less, according to the magnitude of the property in question. The company gets an order under the other section of the Act that the proceedings can go on as far as they are concerned, so that they can take possession of the man's land. Certain sums of money are paid into court, and that money has to lie there until there is a determination as to how much the man is entitled to. But they can prevent the man getting a determination unless they choose to make an application to the court that proceedings shall go on. Because under the old law of 1888 there were two classes of cases provided for : One was where the man stood mute and did nothing, paid no attention to it, and in that case the company made an application. I am not quarreling with that, if it remained that way. But in the other case the man takes action, takes an interest, notifies the company that he will not accept the amount, and asks the court to appoint arbitrators. But he cannot go to the court and get an appointment made unless the company is willing to make the application for him. Now it is not fair that the land-owner who wants his case determined, who wants to find out what he is entitled to, who wants it determined by these arbitrators when he cannot agree with the company, that he should be compelled to take the company's offer, which may be totally inadequate, simply because the company won't allow proceedings to go on by making an application. I can see how the accident occurred when the two sections were run into one. The Hon. Mr. Blair acted on the theory that if the man pays no attention, the case is to be in the same position as if he had notified the company that he would not accept their offer. I am not quarreling with that feature of it, because it does away with the necessity of a notice. But since 1903 the law is open to the objection that if he does not notify the company at all he is to be taken as refusing their offer. If he accepts their offer, of course, there is an end of it, but if he does not wish to accept their offer, he simply does nothing. Therefore, in consolidating the Act Mr. Blair provided that the court should appoint three arbitrators, but, as I think, entirely by mistake, he left the previous part of the section standing, namely, that the application should be made by the company ; and as it stands now the courts are bound to decide that they cannot appoint arbitrators unless the company itself asks for their appointment. Now, I think either party to the proceedings ought to have the right to accelerate them and get the matter determined ; and I trust with this statement, the government and the House will see fit to adopt this amendment.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). In the course of the revision of the statutes the commissioners discovered this omission, and it was brought to my notice. It was my intention to introduce this amendment in connection with some other amendments to the Act, but as my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) has preceded me by moving his amendment, I can see no objection to its going through.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, considered in committee, and reported.

CERTIFICATES TO MASTERS AND MATES OF SHIPS.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara) moved the second reading of Bill No. 7 to amend the Act respecting the certificates to masters and mates of ships. He said : Mr. Speaker, this Bill is one which I introduced in the session of 1904 and which was debated then but which was defeated by a vote of the House principally, as I take it—and as I think 'Hansard' shows on a fair construction of the language—that legislation of this kind would be introduced in the next succeeding session—that is the session of 1905. As several hon. gentlemen now in this House were not in the House in 1904, I will have to ask those who were in the House in 1904 to bear with me while I repeat for the benefit of those who were not then in the House the reason why I think this Bill ought to be passed. The Bill is brought forward

at the instance of the Masters and Mates Association of the Dominion of Canada. It is supported by those of us who feel that the principle is a sound one, other than those interested in the Masters and Mates Association, as ordinary residents and citizens of the Dominion of Canada. The principal object of the Bill is to compel those who take out masters and mates certificates for the inland waters of the Dominion of Canada to be British subjects. That of itself, standing alone, it seems to me, would commend it to everybody in this House and it is all the more necessary because by the laws of the United States a man who is a master or mate and a Canadian citizen or a British subject cannot take a situation as master or mate on a boat owned in the United States unless he foreswears his allegiance to the King of Great Britain and becomes an American citizen. So that, practically, the business part of it, outside of the sentimental consideration, is one that ought to appeal to everybody in this House. A master or mate who is a Canadian citizen and who remains a Canadian citizen and a British subject is limited by the laws of the United States to employment upon vessels owned in Canada. But the master or mate who is an American citizen can take his situations, can get his positions on American boats, and if they do not suit him he can come over without anything to stop him and take a situation in the Canadian marine against the Canadian citizen. You may call it protection or reciprocity according to the way you look at it. I do not care which you call it. It is both. I want Canadian masters and mates to be protected and I want reciprocity with the United States; that is if they say to us that British subjects, otherwise well qualified to man their boats as masters and mates, are not good enough for these boats because they will not foreswear King Edward and his successors, then we ought in self defence to say to the United States: You must employ your own American citizens at home and not send them into Canada to take the places of our British subjects. The late, lamented Mr. Prefontaine, in a statement which he made in the House in 1904, said that I ought to be patient, that he would introduce legislation during the next session—that is the session of 1905—upon this subject. The correspondence is upon 'Hansard.' I do not want to weary the House by reading it in detail but perhaps some hon. gentlemen who were not then members of the House would like to know where to find it. It is in the 'Hansard' of 1904, vol. III. I have not the exact page. The late Mr. Prefontaine took the position that he had been delayed that session in bringing down a government measure to accomplish this object and he said that if I would be patient and allow the matter to drop for that session he would introduce a Bill in the next session. We know it was not introduced and I feel obliged therefore to propose this legislation now.

In order that the House may quite understand that this is a matter which is serious I propose to read extracts from the proceedings of the Canadian Association of Masters and Mates at their annual meeting held in February of the year 1904 which, as I said a while ago, was the initiation of this Bill. I have here the proceedings of the annual meeting of the Grand Council of the Canadian Association of Masters and Mates, held at Toronto, on February 8th, 1904. The printed record of these proceedings having been handed to me by the association.

Capt. Milligan moved, seconded by Capt. Jordan, that the Dominion government be memorialized to amend the law so as to make the examination of masters and mates more rigid and to require that all recommendations of a master to a candidate for examination must be made on oath, or the candidate must produce a recommendation from the executive of a branch of this association.

That was carried. Then:

No one but British subjects to hold certificates, and in case a master or mate removing to take service in a foreign country and it was necessary for him to swear allegiance to that country, his Canadian certificate to become absolutely void, and should he wish to return to Canada he must become again a British subject in the proper and regular manner and take out a new certificate after he has been domiciled in Canada the time prescribed by law.

Then again:

Capt. Gidley moved, seconded by Capt. Dix, that a committee, composed of Capts. Milligan, McCoppen and Boyle, St. Catharines, be appointed, with Mr. Lancaster, M.P., for Lincoln to revise the Acts relating to masters and mates, prepare amendments to said Acts in the shape of a Bill on the line of the resolutions passed and suggestions made at this meeting, and that it be presented at the coming session of parliament.

Then it was:

Moved by Capt. Milligan, seconded by Capt. Jordan, that this association memorialize the Dominion government to cancel all certificates of masters and mates held by persons who have gone, or may go, to the United States and obtain certificates to sail vessels, where such persons are required to swear allegiance to the United States in order to qualify them to obtain such American certificate.

These resolutions were adopted in order to assist legislation of this kind to be passed by this House. Now, we have to ask ourselves whether the resolutions are reasonable and whether the legislation sought by this Bill is fair and such as ought to be passed. As I say the first clause of the Bill which I am moving here deals with the question of requiring masters and mates on our inland waters to be British subjects, and it proposes to strike

out the words 'or for persons' so that they must be British subjects and not other persons. The Act as it now stands, chapter 42, 57-58 Victoria, amending the original Act reads :

Examinations may be instituted in Canada, for British subjects or for persons domiciled in Canada,——

The amendment is to strike out the words 'or for persons,' the effect being that they must be British subjects domiciled in Canada in order to obtain these certificates. The association supplemented these proceedings by sending memorials to this government, memorials which were acknowledged by the late Minister of Marine and Fisheries and which are among the documents of the department, asking that this legislation be passed. Then, in order that there may be no doubt as to what the American law is, I propose to read to the House a statement of the officers of the United States Department of Commerce and Labour at Buffalo, New York, on the subject. Mr. W. D. Graham, secretary of the Canadian Association of Masters and Mates, wrote so that there would be a distinct statement as to what their law is and the letter which he got in answer to his inquiry from Mr. Frederick L. R. Pope and Mr. Joseph D. Schumacher, United States local inspectors, omitting the first portion, is as follows :

In reply to your second question, an Act of congress, approved May 28, 1896, provides that, after the first day of January, 1897, no person shall be qualified to hold a license as a commander or watch-officer of a merchant vessel of the United States who is not a native-born citizen, or whose naturalization as a citizen shall not have been fully completed.

The United States law can also be found in section 2174 of the revised statutes, which says :

Every seaman being a foreigner who declares his intention of becoming a citizen of the United States in any competent court and shall have served three years on board a merchant vessel of the United States subsequent to the date of such declaration may, on his application to any competent court and the production of his certificate of discharge and good conduct during that time together with the certificate of his declaration of intention to become a citizen, be admitted a citizen of the United States ; and every seaman being a foreigner, shall, after his declaration of intention to become a citizen of the United States for the purpose of manning and serving on board any merchant vessel——

And it goes on to say that he may obtain his license. So he has to become a citizen of the United States before he can get a license to run one of their boats. Therefore, we cannot get employment for our Canadian masters and mates on boats, say, for instance, sailing out of Buffalo, that are owned by American citizens. American owned bottoms cannot employ these Canadians unless they will foreswear their country and become American citizens. On the other hand, United States citizens can come in here under the law and get employment on our boats. I am not sure that this government allow it if they find it out. They may not allow it except they become British subjects, but this government are doing nothing wrong under the statute if they allow them to get licenses to run boats and still remain citizens of the United States.

There are other sections of this Act which I propose to amend in order to carry out that idea. I move to amend the section of the Act that deals with the effect of the certificates they get and this is supplementary to the main object of my legislation in regard to their being obliged to be British subjects. I propose that they shall cease to be entitled to use these certificates if they cease to be British subjects. I move that these certificates shall become void on their ceasing to remain British subjects even if they are British subjects when they get their certificates. As long as they remain British subjects the certificates shall be good but they shall not be good in Canada if they cease to be British subjects. I propose that if they change their allegiance to the country they thereby forfeit their right to run a boat on our inland waters.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) has read a letter written by some one. I did not catch the name. Is that letter written by some official of the United States or by some other person ?

Mr. LANCASTER. It is from the government officials, the local inspectors of the Department of Commerce and Labour, Steamboat Inspection Service, of the United States, in Buffalo, New York. These are the people who apply the law and who will not allow our Canadian people to take out licenses unless they foreswear their allegiance to the British Crown, and declare their intention of going over to the United States. I am quite willing to send this letter over to the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur).

Then, the other principal enactment that I am asking this House to pass in my amendment is that relating to the qualification of the Examiners of Masters and Mates. It would hardly be believed, if it were not stated here on the statute-book that a man can be an examiner under our law and not know anything about navigation. A dry goods merchant, a lawyer, a doctor, a farmer, a carpenter, or anybody else under our law can be an examiner of masters and mates on our inland waters. I do not believe this government would employ people who were not competent lake navigators, but if they chose they could do so and if they did so they would do it legally. I think the statute ought to be such that

no government could employ anybody to examine me as to my qualifications to serve as master or mate on a boat on inland waters unless that person is a competent lake navigator. The second object of my Bill is to amend the section in regard to the qualification of examiners and to insist that these examiners must be competent lake navigators. It is the same thing as if those of us who go up for the law examination at Osgoode Hall were not examined by lawyers or those who go up for examination in a medical case were not examined by doctors. I think it has only to be stated in order to be remedied. I dare say—and I do not wish to be misunderstood here—that this government would, if they knew it, never appoint a man an examiner unless he were a competent lake navigator, but the government might be asked to do it and in the interest of the proper conduct of these affairs I should think that the government would prefer to have a statute behind their backs which would prevent the appointment of anybody who was not a competent lake navigator because then they would not be oppressed with applications by people for positions of that kind which they, by law, could not appoint them to. I am not likely to be ever a member of a cabinet in this country, but if I were a member of the government and I were asked to do that sort of thing I would be very glad indeed if I had behind me a statute which compelled me to do what I thought I ought to do and prevent me from being solicited to do things that I should not in the interests of our inland navigation do. But, as the law stands to-day, the government may, if they see fit, appoint anybody to be an examiner of masters and mates, to say whether they are qualified to man boats and I think no harm can be done and that a great deal of good can be done if the statute is amended so that legally the government could not appoint anybody to be an examiner of masters and mates unless that person applying for the position is himself a competent lake navigator. There is another aspect of the matter that also appeals to me whether it does to others or not. There is a great deal of life at stake upon these boats. Besides all the mercantile value there is a great deal of life at stake upon these vessels on our upper lakes and we cannot be to careful that the masters and mates are the very best that can be obtained. They can deceive a man who is not himself a competent lake navigator but they cannot deceive a man who is a competent lake navigator in examining them. I will not weary the House at any further length, I move the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. JOHN H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough). Mr. Speaker, I desire to draw the attention of the House to one of the clauses referred to by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) in his speech. The Bill says that:

> But no person shall be appointed an examiner in respect to masters and mates of ships trading on the inland waters or on coasting voyages unless he himself is a competent lake navigator and has a certificate to that effect.

I would ask the question: Why a lake navigator? The hon. gentleman who prepared this Bill evidently forgot that there was an Atlantic ocean on one side of this country and a Pacific ocean on the other. It would be a very curious thing if we should adopt a provision that a man examining a sailor at Sydney, N.S., to be captain of a vessel should be a competent lake navigator. I am referring to the fact that this Bill applies not only to inland waters but to the coasting trade. I think the fact must have escaped my hon. friend that we have a very large coast where people know nothing at all about lake navigation, and if a clause like that is necessary it should apply only to the province of Ontario or to the inland waters.

I do not see why it would not be sufficient to say, if he were a competent navigator or a man who had himself passed the usual examination as a captain or master of a ship. It seems to me that would be a better provision than to provide that he should be only a lake navigator.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There is no such thing as a certificate for a lake navigator.

Mr. LANCASTER. If he were qualified as a competent lake navigator would he not be competent to examine masters of coasting vessels? Would not one cover the other?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I do not think so. I think the navigation of the Atlantic and Pacific coasts is the greater by all means. The people engaged in the coasting trade have no knowledge at all of the lakes, and it would be absurd to provide that the men to examine masters for the coasting trade should be competent lake navigators.

Mr. J. D. REID. I am fully in accord with this Bill. Living as I do on the St. Lawrence I know as a fact that there are a number of American citizens living in the United States who hold Canadian certificates as masters, and who come to Canada and take charge of some of our Canadian vessels to the injury of our own citizens. I also know as a fact that a great many Canadians, a number from my own constituency, who have gone to the United States and worked their way up to become masters of American vessels, have had to become American citizens and move their families to the United States before being allowed to take charge of those vessels. When Americans come over here to do dredging, they generally bring with them a lot of American citizens to take charge of their plant. I

think this Bill should have gone a little further and included engineers as well as masters and mates, and I hope they may be included in it. The number of people employed on vessels in this country is limited, and, therefore, none but Canadian citizens should be employed so long as our neighbours to the south are so strict in their rules against Canadians. I hope the House will pass the Bill and thus far protect our Canadian mariners.

Mr. PARDEE. It appears to me, in listening to the remarks of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this Bill, that in a great many ways it is along proper lines. Nevertheless, the House cannot be too careful in looking into such a Bill as this which affects a very large class of the community; for if we go too far in the direction suggested, it may do us more harm than good. I am free to confess that I think we ought to legislate along such lines as will keep our home markets for our own people, but there are in my own constituency a large number of marine men who might be very materially affected if we passed such legislation as would have the effect of causing the United States to pass a retaliatory law. I am not prepared to consider the clauses of this Bill as it has been introduced, because I am not familiar with the nature of the amendments which it proposes to make, and therefore I would respectfully ask that it be left over for a day or two until I and other members of the House can look into it, and until I can get the advice of the Mariners Association of my own town as to what effect this Bill may have.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think it would be an advantage to have this Bill reach the committee stage. I intend myself to point out some omissions from the Bill. After we have discussed it to some extent in committee, we might let it stand for further consideration, so as to meet my hon. friend's convenience.

Mr. BRODEUR. Before the Bill is read the second time I wish to make a few remarks with regard to some of the principles involved in it. My hon. friend proposes that the examinations shall be made under oath. This is rather an extraordinary proposition. It seems to me that examinations have never yet been made under oath. It would be very extraordinary to require that all who present themselves for examination shall be sworn before they write their papers or answers. I think my hon. friend has not given to this matter all the consideration that should be given to it. I believe this is the first time in the history of Canadian legislation that such a proposal has been made. Another proposal in the Bill which it seems to me should be carefully considered by this House is that all masters and mates coming from Great Britain, who have passed their examination there and are in possession of certificates of a very superior character, are to be debarred by the Bill from passing an examination for masters and mates in this country unless they have lived here three years.

Mr. LENNOX. They are British subjects.

Mr. LANCASTER. I am not changing that. It has always been the law.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, my hon. friend is mistaken. All British subjects since the legislation of 1894 could be admitted to pass their examinations. In 1894 the law was amended and British subjects, whether they were here only a month or six months or three years, could pass their examinations. But my hon. friend suggests that those men should not be admitted to pass their examinations. That is very serious.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What clause ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is the result of clause 1. The old section reads as follows :

> Examinations may be instituted in Canada for British subjects or for persons domiciled in Canada for at least three years.

Now my hon. friend is asking that British subjects should be debarred from passing that examination unless they have been in this country three years.

Mr. LANCASTER. No.

Mr. BRODEUR. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. That is what is proposed in this Bill.

Mr. LANCASTER. No.

Mr. BRODEUR. I will read to the hon. gentleman the law as it will be amended by this Bill :

> Examinations may be instituted in Canada for British subjects domiciled in Canada for at least three years.

What can that mean, if not that a British subject who has not been domiciled in Canada for three years would be debarred from passing the examination ?

Mr. LANCASTER. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brodeur) want the other words struck out too, if he does I do not object.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is a different thing. I am speaking of the Bill as it is, and I am saying that the Bill has not been sufficiently considered. For, as he must see himself, this is a very serious objection to his Bill—that we should say to the seamen from Great Britain that though they are British subjects, they cannot come and pass their examination in this country until they have been domiciled here three years. There are other objections which could be brought against the Bill. It has been suggested that the Bill should be considered in committee, and the committee report progress. I have no objection to that step ; but I do not wish, by agreeing to the second reading of the

Bill, to be committed to any of the principles herein embodied. There are some provisions of the Bill which might be adopted. With that reserve, I have no objection to the Bill being read the second time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The proper time for the discussion of these details is in committee, I should say. I do not think we commit ourselves to any very definite principle by reading this Bill the second time. It may be, as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) has said, that a certain effect might be produced by the language of the Bill which perhaps was not contemplated. But, of course, it is almost impossible to prepare legislation—especially for a private member to prepare legislation—in such a way that it will not require correction in committee. I may point out that the government of which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brodeur) is a member introduced a railway Bill a few years ago in which, before it passed into law, no less than fifteen hundred amendments were made, and this notwithstanding the fact that the country had the satisfaction of paying a very large sum to a gentleman in New Brunswick for his services in drafting the Bill. Therefore, I do not think there is any reproach to my hon. friend from Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) in what has been said. I should have supposed that the government would welcome the hon. gentleman's assistance in bringing to the attention of the House and the government a subject which is admittedly worthy of consideration.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. SPEAKER. When shall the House go into committee on said Bill ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. At the next sitting of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I thought the minister's idea was to go over it to-day for the purpose of discussion, but allow the clauses to stand.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have no objection to discussing the clauses in committee.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It being understood, of course, that the Bill stand over.

Mr. BRODEUR. And none of the clauses be adopted.

House went into committee on the Bill.

On section 1.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara to the effect of the amendment, if he will allow me. If he will look at the statute 57-58 Victoria, chapter 42, section 3, he will see that, if the amendment suggested be adopted, that section will read as follows :—

Mr. BRODEUR.

Examinations upon oath may be instituted in Canada for British subjects domiciled in Canada for at least three years ?

The rest of the section will remain as it is. The result of that amendment, as I understand it, of course there may be some uncertainity—will be to make examinations under oath compulsory. That, if it means anything, will mean that the individual who offers himself for examination being sworn will give his answers subject to the penalty for perjury if he makes a mistake. Perhaps that is not what the hon. gentleman has in view—I am quite sure it is not. Then, by striking out the words ' or other persons,' the section will be made to provide that only those can be examnied who are British subjects and have been domiciled in Canada for at least three years. I am sure that that also is not what the hon. gentleman has in view. What he has in view, I fancy will be accomplished by saying 'British subjects who intend to become masters or mates, or persons domiciled in Canada for three years.'

Mr. LANCASTER. I agree to that.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. What about the examination on oath.

Mr. LANCASTER. As to that I would just say a word. It is not at all such a careless a piece of legislation as might be inferred from what has been said. I have had several discussions with the masters and mates on these subjects, and very able and intelligent men they showed themselves in that discussion. They pointed out that when a man offers himself for examination, a part of his qualifications, and a very large part, is in the form of the certificates he gets from men under whom he has served. Men who wish to be thought good fellows and who wish to do a good turn to another give certificates that are not true as to service, and consequently the service is becoming degraded by men who have not the qualifications they are supposed to have. It may be that what is desired in this legislation can be better accomplished by some other form of words. I do not pretend to be perfect in these matters. As to the examination on oath, of course it was not intended to make a man a perjurer by a wrong answer in examination. It was simply intended to provide that these certificates—certificates which he must produce in order to qualify—shall be the evidence of real service and not the mere results of good fellowship. So long as my hon. friend can arrange that these certificates shall be under oath, that is what I am driving at.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not suppose that my hon. friend wants that the examination itself should be under oath, but only the certificate which the applicant has to file showing how many months he has served under a mate or master.

Mr. LANCASTER. That should be under oath.

Mr. BRODEUR. But the applicant has to make a declaration that the particulars mentioned in the certificate are true and this declaration is tantamount to an affidavit.

Mr. LANCASTER. But, what I am referring to is the certificate which the applicant produces, and my contention is that that certificate should be made under oath.

Mr. BRODEUR. But I think that point is met by the existing law under which any one who makes or procures to be made any false representation for the purpose of obtaining for himself or anybody else a certificate is guilty of a misdemeanour.

Mr. LANCASTER. But the man who certifies may be living in Buffalo or Detroit or Chicago and you cannot prosecute him there without extradition. All I am aiming at is to protect the British subject.

Mr. BRODEUR. I don't see how we could reach, even under my hon. friend's clause, a party living in the States who made a false certificate.

Mr. LANCASTER. I want the certificate to be in the form of a statutory declaration so that the person giving it could be prosecuted for perjury if it were not true.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know how you could prosecute a man who is outside our jurisdiction. Our law governing statutory declarations would not operate in the case of a declaration of that character made in the United States. You might make an amendment providing that the declaration, if made in the United States, should be made in such a way as would give it the force and effect of an oath under the law of the United States.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The whole thing requires to be very carefully considered.

Mr. STOCKTON. I wish to call attention to section 3. It is required that the examiner shall in all cases be a competent lake navigator. That would interfere with the coasting trade and the examinations for that trade in the maritime provinces. You should require him to be a competent lake or coast navigator.

Mr. LANCASTER. I will agree to that.

Mr. BRODEUR. We have no law which speaks of lake navigators.

Mr. LANCASTER. Strike out the word 'lake' and say competent navigators.

Mr. BRODEUR. I think our regulations go far enough. So far we have had no serious complaints with regard to them. Here is our regulation :

No person shall act as an examiner of candidates for masters' and mates' certificates until he has been duly appointed, and has received from the chief examiner of masters and mates a certificate to the effect that he is qualified to act as examiner.

Well, suppose we appoint a man in Ontario for lake navigation, of course the chief examiner will have to see that this man is properly qualified in the knowledge of lake navigation. When he comes to give a certificate to a man who is called upon to discharge duties in the maritime provinces, of course he will have to see that this man is qualified in respect to coast navigation, or to navigation in that part of the country. So I think my hon. friend would seriously complicate the situation by leaving these words as to lake navigation. I think our regulations are broad enough at present. Moreover, there has never been any complaint that I know of with regard to the qualifications of examiners, and I think this clause ought to be struck out.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before we leave section 1, let me observe that there has not been much said about the main subject of the clause, that is, to impose restrictions upon men coming from the United States to this country and obtaining certificates to act as masters or mates on vessels on the inland or minor waters of Canada. What is the view of the government with regard to the proposal of my hon. friend from Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) with respect to that? We have not discussed that point very much, though it seems to have been the main object of the clause, as I understand the hon. gentleman who introduced the Bill.

Mr. LANCASTER. With regard to what the Minister of Marine and Fisheries said last, I wish to submit that if we struck out the word 'lake' what would be the effect of it ? Just about what we all want, that the man should be a competent navigator.

Mr. BRODEUR. With regard to the question raised by the leader of the opposition, I have not given much consideration to that point, because I simply took the Bill as it was. I thought the Bill was unfair to British masters and mates coming to this country, that as the Bill was drafted it could be considered as debarring British subjects, who have not been living in this country for three years, from passing an examination. That is the view I took of it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is satisfactory; the Minister did not look at it in this aspect, and he requires a little time for consideration before he announces the policy of the government.

Mr. BENNETT. Living on a part of the Georgian bay where there are a great many captains and mates engaged in navigation, I may say that there is a strong feeling against American captains being permitted to come in there and ply on Canadian wa-

ters and on Canadian boats, as is now the case. There has been in past years a great deal of towing of logs on the north shores of the Georgian bay and Lake Huron over to the state of Michigan and other points in the United States. However, that has been stopped, but the practice then commenced of permitting a large number of American tugs to come in and by various means to circumvent the laws of the land, has been followed up by their adopting all possible means to introduce American vessel men. There is a strong feeling in the town of Midland, Collingwood and other points against the practice that now prevails.

Mr. BRODEUR. Are not those men holding Canadian certificates, or do they come over here and act as masters without certificates ?

Mr. BENNETT. I have heard complaints in both respects, as to the fact that Americans are enjoying Canadian certificates, and the further fact that Americans come in and are allowed to ply their vocation without having even Canadian certificates. I know the feelings and the wishes of vessel men in that neighbourhood, as well as on other parts of the lake, and I have seen memorials making complaints, and I hope the government will see fit to endorse the action of my hon. friend from Lincoln and Niagara and allow this Bill to go through so that the trade may be limited to Canadians. I would even go as far as the hon. member for Leeds, and I say that the Bill should be made applicable not only to masters but also to engineers.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I would call the attention of the hon. gentleman who has charge of this Bill (Mr. Lancaster) to section 2, which provides that the applicant should make a declaration of the name of the master under whom he has served. Now, it might be difficult for him to comply with that clause. We all know that sailors do not serve under one master very long. Sometimes a sailor works for two or three months on one ship and then he goes to another, and by the time his two years are up he may have served on several. Sometimes captains are away out of the country, some of them may not be living, and it might be difficult for the applicant to comply with that provision before he can get a certificate. In England the system is different. There the sailor is employed before an officer of the Board of Trade, and when his voyage is ended he is paid off before the officer of the Board of Trade, and a record is kept of the number of days he has served, and when he applies for promotion the records are turned up to find out how many years the sailor has served. There is an official account kept of his services. We have no system of that kind in Canada with regard to our coasting and inland waters. I think it would be well to amend our law and to provide that a customs officer or some other officer should keep a record of the discharge or transfer of sailors, and of the length of time they have served, or in some other way to keep an official record of the number of years he has served.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to ask the minister to state what is the practice on the lakes at the present time. Do citizens of the United States who have not a proper certificate of competence from the proper authorities in the United States, come into this country and act as captains, engineers or mates on Canadian vessels, or what is the practice with regard to that ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, they have to be Canadians and British subjects before they can do that. If they are foreigners, they have to live in this country for three years before they are entitled to pass an examination and act as masters and mates.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. They must be domiciled here ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Domiciled for three years in this country before they can act as masters or mates. My hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) a few moments ago referred to the fact of some Americans coming up here. My information is that there are very few who come here and pass their examinations, because they have to reside in Canada for three years, and if they have not passed the three years in Canada they cannot pass the examination. There are very few who do that. I think my hon. friend was referring to a different state of affairs which cannot be controlled under this clause ; that is with regard to the navigation of American boats which are employing American mates. I think that is the situation to which my hon. friend is referring. As far as these certificates of masters and mates are concerned the law, in effect, is that if a man is a British subject he may apply for a certificate as master or mate on a Canadian vessel. If he is foreign-born he has to pass three years here and then he may have a right to go and pass the examination. These are the only two cases with which we have to deal under this Bill, and I think there are very, very few cases of this kind. I do not think, speaking on the spur of the moment, without having considered the question on the line brought forward by my hon. friend, that this resolution is necessary, because there are very few cases, if there are any, where Americans have come up here, have passed three years here and then passed their examinations.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. How is the time for which the foreign person has lived in Canada proven and before whom is it proven ?

Mr. BRODEUR. He has to make a declaration to that effect himself and if the

declaration he makes is false, then he is liable to be brought before the criminal courts for a misdemeanour.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I wish to state that I have been told by masters and mates in Vancouver, and also by engineers, that the majority of the men who are acting as pilots, mates and engineers on the Yukon river, in British bottoms, are Americans. The hon. minister does not think that to be true ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, I do not say that.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I am prepared to state that the law was simply winked at in the Yukon country. So I have been told by the shipmasters who came down to Vancouver after trying to get positions on the Yukon.

Mr. BRODEUR. That would be against the law.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Entirely against the law. I have been told also that American engineers have received permits to act on the Yukon river from our Canadian officials. I am not prepared to state positively that this is the fact, although I am told that and I have seen correspondence strongly bearing out the statement I am now making. I am of the opinion that, although this Bill may not exactly meet the occasion, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster), who has brought it in, has the right spirit at least, that is to do all we possibly can to keep the American masters and the American mates and the American engineers out of our country and keep these positions for our own people. There should be some reciprocity. The Americans apply a very, very strong law against our people, and I do not see, I cannot understand, why there should not be a strong desire on the part of our government to see that the Americans are not able to circumvent the law as they are doing to-day, as I am positively and authoritatively informed they are doing.

Mr. LANCASTER. I can assure the minister that these cases are not half as scarce as he would seem to think. If he lived near the Welland canal, as I do, and saw the number of men on the Canadian boats going through the canal, who are not British subjects who simply get around this provision by saying that they have been domiciled in Toronto, St. Catharines, or some other place in Canada, for three years, when in fact, they have only gone there occasionally or have spent only part of their time in St. Catharines, Toronto or other places, while their wives and children have been living in the United States. You cannot stop them from doing this unless you have a statute such as I propose, which says, to these men: Unless you can prove that you are a British subject, get off the boat. If we are all agreed that they should be British subjects, there is no possible harm in saying so, and I am prepared to meet all other suggestions the minister may make in order to have reasonable legislation. The principle I am fighting for is to have Canada for Canadians or for British subjects.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. As I understand the minister there is no evasion of law on the lakes, such as has been alluded to by the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson) in respect to the Yukon river.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, I have no information in regard to that. I have not been informed that certificates have been given in the way mentioned by the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson). I shall look into the question because it seems rather extraordinary that certificates would have been given in such an irregular way.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The United States law does not permit a master or mate to receive a certificate of competency unless he becomes a citizen of the United States. Am I not correct in that ? Is it true that the law of the United States does not permit any person to receive a certificate of competency as master or mate unless he becomes a citizen of the United States ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am not very sure, but my impression is, from reading the law, that they will have to take the oath of allegiance without becoming naturalized. I am not very sure in regard to that. After reading over the document just handed to me by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) it seems to me that the law simply provides that they have to take the oath of allegiance in the United States without being obliged to become American citizens.

Mr. J. D. REID. They must reside as well ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is the same with our law.

Mr. J. D. REID. I know of Americans living on the other side and yet having Canadian certificates.

Mr. LANCASTER. I have read the American statute; it says that they must first declare their intention of becoming citizens and then as soon as they do that they are to be considered citizens of the United States so they have to take the position that they are citizens of the United States. It simply provides a procedure first; it says they are then citizens and as soon as they do these things they can take positions on the boat.

Mr. BRODEUR. They have to become naturalized ?

Mr. LANCASTER. Yes, under that section.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Perhaps the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur)

is holding back information which we would like to hear. We have been told in the newspapers that at an early date, at a pilgrims' dinner in New York, a very important announcement is to be made in connection with the relations between Canada and the United States. Probably there has been an arrangement in regard to reciprocity, in this and other things, and until that dinner comes off and that announcement is made the country may have to wait for an announcement of policy in regard to this particular subject.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Was this published in the 'World'?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. No, it was in organs of the hon. gentlemen that this announcement was made.

Mr. BRODEUR. Would the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson) be kind enough to give me information in regard to these certificates in the Yukon of which he speaks.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I shall be pleased to do so, I think there is some correspondence in the department.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of course the minister observes that the member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) says that he knows of one case where a master who is an American citizen living on the American side has received a certificate of competency and is acting as master of a Canadian vessel. That would clearly be an evasion of the law.

Mr. BRODEUR. It may be that the law has been violated and that certificates have been given in a way that is not absolutely correct. Of course the law provides for that, and it may be a question as to whether it is necessary to amend the law when it seems to meet the situation.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. There is no doubt that the feeling among the men on the upper lakes, as has been stated by the member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), is that this law is not being carried out in accordance with the intention. Whether it is the fault of the administration of the officers, on whom devolves the responsibility of its enforcement I do not know, but the Canadian masters and mates are perfectly satisfied that they are not getting fair treatment as compared with the treatment of Canadian masters and mates under the United States laws and I want to place myself on record as emphatically endorsing the view of the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson) that we should make it as difficult for an American to get papers in this country, entitling him to become a master or a mate as it is for a Canadian to obtain such a certificate in the United States. If we do that I do not think any harm would come of it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Would that be going far enough? I have not looked at the Act but it seems to me the Act provides that in order to take the examination it is simply necessary to make a declaration of intention to become an American citizen. The applicant may never become an American citizen, may never do anything further, so that will not carry us very far. It seems to me we should carry the matter further and see whether we cannot restrict the certificates to British subjects domiciled in Canada and make them valuable only so long as the Canadian domicile continues. That may be the most effective way to meet the difficulty.

Mr. TAYLOR. I have seen the American law but there is a case which has come under my own observation. Messrs. Folger Brothers of Kingston have a line of steamers running through the Thousand Islands. These steamers have American register. They wished to have Mr. Carnegie of Rockport to command one of these steamers but in order to qualify he had to move his family to Cape Vincent for a certain time before he could take out papers for that boat. He had to become an American resident, to live in the United States and become a citizen of the United States before he could sail the steamer.

Mr. BRODEUR. Is not the Canadian law the same? When we are dealing with a Canadian registered vessel is she not obliged to have for master or mate a British subject?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No, one domiciled in Canada for three years.

Mr. J. D. REID. As I understand, if an American citizen comes to this side and is on a Canadian steamer for three years as wheelsman, &c., although he has always resided on the American side, after he has had a certain number of years on the Canadian steamer he is granted a certificate as master. That has occurred in a case I know of and the man has never been a resident of Canada.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is a violation of the existing law.

Mr. J. D. REID. That is what I say. He has his master's paper and can sail a boat on either side of the river. He has an American certificate and if he can do better on an American vessel he takes her but if not he takes a Canadian vessel. A case of that kind is most unfair to our citizens.

Mr. LANCASTER. The minister will notice that under the present law, all a man has to do is to prove in some way that he has been domiciled in Canada for three years, then he gets a certificate good to him for ever He is an American citizen all the time, he was when he got a certificate, but he brings his family over to Niagara Falls

from Buffalo or to Windsor from Detroit, or perhaps sends them as far in as St. Catharines, eleven miles from the border, because he can there get on the boats going through the Welland canal very handily, and lives a part of that three years there, so that he will not be accused of perjury. when he swears he has been domiciled in Canada. Then he has that certificate given to him for ever, as a Canadian master, but he never was a Canadian citizen. He can get jobs in the United States as an American citizen and as an American citizen can keep Canadians out of jobs on this side.

On section 2,

The said section 3 is further amended by adding the following subsections thereto :—

2. No person shall be entitled to present himself for examination for master until he has obtained a certificate of competency as mate, and has served as such for at least twelve months, and furnishes a statutory declaration of the master under whom he served of such service.

3. No person shall be entitled to present himself for examination as mate until he has served as wheelman for a period of twenty-four months, and furnishes to the examiner a statutory declaration of the master under whom he served of such service.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I wish to call attention to subsection 3 of section 2 which you have just read. This is to be added as a subsection to section 4 of chapter 42, of the statutes of 1894 which was substituted for section 3 of chapter 73, of the revised statutes. Now, section 4 of the statutes of 1894 provides for the examination of masters and mates for inland waters and for coasting voyages. 'Coasting voyages' are defined by a previous section to include

A voyage between Canada and Newfoundland or St. Pierre and Miquelon, or a port or place in the United States of America, or in the West Indies or South America, or in Central America or Mexico.

If this amendment should become law the result would be that any person, say in the province of Nova Scotia, applying for a certificate as master or mate, would have to satisfy the examiner that he had served for twenty-four months as a wheelman. That seems rather peculiar to me, but possibly there may be some explanation. I imagine my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) has in mind that the applicant shall serve as wheelman aboard a steamer in inland waters, so it would be unreasonable to prohibit a person from applying for a certificate as master or mate say in one of the maritime provinces, and prevent him from taking the examination because he has not served for twenty-four months as a wheelman.

Mr. LANCASTER. Why ?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. Because it is not a qualification at all. I move that subsection 3 be struck out.

Mr. DANIEL. It is absurd.

Mr. LANCASTER. I think we had better not be in too big a hurry to strike that out. The reason for that clause is that the Masters and Mates Association, after discussing that with me, convinced me that it was absolutely necessary that a man should have qualified as wheelman before acting as mate, and my hon. friend now intimates that it is absurd to require that qualification. He might perhaps tell me how if a man has had no experience as a wheelman he would be qualified as a mate to manage a vessel.

Mr. DANIEL. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman to explain what he means by a wheelman.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. gentleman surely does not want me to enter into a disertation as to what a wheelman is.

Mr. DANIEL. I do.

Mr. LANCASTER. Then I am sorry to tell my hon. friend that I cannot take up the time of the House in that way, because every one who is interested in navigation knows what a wheelman is. If we have to explain to gentlemen exactly what we mean by a wheelman, we will be told that we have left out some part of the qualifications of a wheelman and be told there are other things a wheelman does. These words have a technical meaning which every navigator understands.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Not in the coasting trade.

Mr. LANCASTER. This section is dealing with inland water navigation particularly. If it is the case that there are words in that section which are not applicable to the coasting trade, I would point out that I have not brought in the coasting vessels; the section of the statute to which I am applying this has amalgamated these two things. Some gentlemen about me ask questions in a semi-loud tone of voice and seem to expect me to answer them, but they will not stand on their feet to explain what they mean.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. Will the hon. gentleman explain ?

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. gentleman behind me (Mr. A. K. Maclean) says, as I understand, that this clause will not do to apply to coasting vessels. Has the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. A. K. Maclean) any objection to this applying to the inland waters ? These are what it is intended to apply to, and, if it will meet his views, I am willing to insert words to that effect. If this is not an important matter upon the coasts of Canada, I am told by the masters and mates who consult me that it is an important matter on the inland waters. Therefore, if it will suit my hon. friend, I am wiling to have the provision limited to

those waters, so that it will not apply to the coasting trade.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I cannot say that this will be satisfactory, because the objection I raised might also apply to the inland waters. I think it is quite possible that there are sailing ships on the great lakes of Canada. It is impossible for me to give a technical definition of a wheelman. If my hon. friend could do so, a great deal of difficulty might be removed. I think the clause should be struck out altogether.

Mr. LENNOX. I think it was understood that the Bill would not be finally disposed of to-day, but that we should have a discussion upon it and then let it stand for further consideration. A wheelman, I understand, is a person who takes a position upon a steamer under a master. We might get over the difficulty which has been suggested by adding, after the word 'wheelman,' the words 'or a person who has served on a sailing vessel.' The difficulty, I suppose, arises because on some sailing vessels there are no wheelmen. But the object of the hon. gentleman who introduces this Bill is quite evident, and if we allow it to stand over there will be no great difficulty, with the assistance of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and the Minister of Justice, in adopting language which would cover the various cases which could arise in connection not only with the coasting trade, but with the shipping trade on the inland waters of Canada. With the principle involved in this Bill I am heartily in sympathy. Though I do not live on the coast, I live near enough to those who follow the calling of mariners on the great lakes of Canada to know from conversations which I have had with many of these gentlemen that they have experienced great inconvenience from unjust competition at the hands of American citizens, and I would like to see the Bill confine this privilege not only to persons who are resident in Canada, but to persons who are actually British subjects, whether Canadians or people from the British isles.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I think this legislation, as submitted by my hon. friend from Lincoln, is of so indefinite a character that the suggestion which has been made that it should stand over for further consideration is the only wise one to consider at this stage. As the hon. member for Lunenburg has pointed out, section 2 would create serious complications with regard to coasting vessels and cause the greatest possible difficulty throughout the maritime provinces. I am sure that my hon. friend, on reflection, will realize that there is no such person as a wheelman recognized as an officer on vessels engaged in the coasting service.

Mr. LANCASTER. I have already suggested that we limit it to the inland waters.

What is the use of our quarrelling about something which is not any longer in dispute ?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. When my hon. friend proposes legislation which affects interests in which others are concerned, he should be willing to hear it discussed.

Mr. LANCASTER. When the point is conceded, what is the use of talking about it?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I would suggest another point for the consideration of my hon friend. By section 2 my hon. friend proposes to confine the proof of service to a statutory declaration of the master under whom the person has served. That master may have died or left the country, and it may be impossible to obtain that evidence. My hon. friend proposes that Americans should not be permitted to hold certificates for service on Canadian vessels. That proposition is one to which I think the House should give serious consideration. There is, however, this difference between the legislation which he proposes and the law that exists in the United States. By virtue of their Naturalization Act, a person going into that country can take out what are known in common parlance as his first papers; he can make a declaration of his intention to become an American citizen, which will qualify him to obtain papers to enable him to act as a master or mate. We have no such law in this country, and the proposal in my hon. friend's Bill would necessitate a person who comes into this country intending to remain here, to be actually domiciled here for the statutory period necessary to become a British subject before he could act as a master or mate. To that extent the legislation which he proposes is in excess of that which exists in the United States. To the extent of limiting the officers of our carrying trade in Canada to our own citizens I am disposed to agree with him, but we should deal with the legislation on that subject with the greatest possible care and only after the fullest possible consideration.

Mr. LANCASTER. If this legislation does not fit the case, perhaps the hon. gentleman will tell us what he would suggest in place of it.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. The hon. gentleman is proposing the legislation. I will deal with it when it comes up.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I agree with the hon. member from Pictou that it would be unwise to attempt to pass this legislation in its present shape. Some radical amendments are required. While I do not object to the principle of the measure, I think sufficient consideration has not been given to the Bill by my hon. friend from Lincoln, and I would propose that the committee rise report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. STOCKTON. It was definitely suggested by the Minister of Justice that no section should be passed to-day, but that the Bill should be moved into committee for the purpose of discussion.

The main object sought by the promoter of the Bill is an excellent one, namely, that only British subjects shall be capable of acting as masters or mates on ships registered in Canada. Are we prepared to adopt that principle ? That is a fair question for discussion. There is no necessity to move any resolution. The question is only up for discussion, and when it comes up again, if the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) has any valuable suggestion to make to protect the coasting trade of Nova Scotia or if we have any to make to protect the coasting trade of New Brunswick we shall be quite prepared to accept them.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is no objection to the clauses of the Bill being discussed without adopting any of them. That will facilitate discussion another day. It might be advisable even to refer the Bill to a special committee. My hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) raised some question with regard to the use of the word 'wheelman' in subsection three.

Mr. LENNOX. I suggested the using of the word 'sailor' which would make the language more general. I am not conversant with the terms used in navigation, but my object is to make the clause applicable not only to wheelmen but to persons occupying a similar position on sailing vessels.

Mr. STOCKTON. From a cursory reading of this section, it would seem to apply only to steamers. 'Wheelmen' on a sailing vessel has no very pronounced meaning. Every able-bodied seaman must take his turn at the wheel.

Mr. SINCLAIR. An able-bodied seaman is a man who knows how to steer. An ordinary seaman is one who works around the deck. These are the two distinctions on a sailing vessel.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am informed by the department that in several instances we have had complaints about the difficulty of securing masters and mates. People have been reported for not having Canadian masters or mates and they have replied that they could not find any. I am afraid that the twenty-four months required as the period in which a man must serve as wheelman is too long.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is a wheelman on a steamer ? Is he an officer ?

Mr. J. D. REID. On the St. Lawrence river, a man cannot take the position of wheelman until he has served a year or two on the steamer as deck hand. He is then given the position of wheelman and learns the compass from the mate.

Mr. DANIEL. I understand that wheelman on a steamer is a grade of itself. Steamers have their captains and their mates and they have also their wheelmen and deck hands. The wheelman does not serve as an ordinary man before the mast. But on sailing vessels, every able-bodied seaman is expected to take his turn at the wheel. I think that if this subsection were to read :

No person shall be entitled to present himself for examination as mate for the inland waters of Canada until he has served as wheelman for a period of twenty-four months.

It would be all right. But as the clause stands, it is extremely objectionable.

Mr. BRODEUR. It seems to me that if in the case of inland waters, we required that the certificate of the master under whom a man has served should be made in the form of a statutory declaration and then do not require such declaration in the case of certificates given by masters of sea-going vessels, there is lack of uniformity.

Mr. DANIEL. As inland navigation is confined principally, if not altogether, to steamers, and as sea navigation includes sailing vessels as well as steamers, what you would require as evidence of competency in the one case need not be required in the other.

Mr. BRODEUR. But what I am pointing out is that there can be no reason why you should insist on a statutory declaration in the case of inland navigation and not in the case of sea-going vessels.

Mr. DANIEL. That is an entirely different thing.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I would draw the attention of my hon. friend to the fact that the period of probation here proposed—twenty-four months—is somewhat long. You will remember that inland navigation is limited to six months each year, so that twenty-four months would be practically four years. Possibly what he has in mind is two seasons. So, when we deal with the Bill again, he might bear that in mind.

Mr. LANCASTER. The master and mates who saw me thought that three years was a proper period of probation. On inland waters they have about eight months' navigation, and what they counted on was three seasons of about eight months. Still, eighteen months might be a reasonable period.

On section 3,

Section 4 of the Act respecting certificates to masters and mates of ships is amended by adding after the word 'effect' in the last line the words 'but no person shall be appointed an examiner in respect to masters and mates of ships trading on the inland waters or on coasting voyages unless he himself is a competent lake navigator and has a certificate to that effect.'

Mr. LANCASTER. The idea of my hon. friends around me here seems to be that the word 'lake' should be struck out, making the provision merely that the person should be a competent navigator.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is not only that point, but the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) is providing for a certificate where the law does not now provide for a certificate.

Mr. LANCASTER. Speaking off-hand and in view of the fact that it is not intended to pass these clauses now, I do not see any objection to having the word 'lake' struck out. At the same time, I am glad of the opportunity to think it over.

On section 4.

The section substituted for section 7 of the said Act by section 2 of chapter 41 of the statutes of 1891 is amended by adding after the words 'boats' in the fourteenth line the words 'such certificates to be conditioned to become void upon the holder thereof renouncing his allegiance to the British Crown.'

Mr. BRODEUR. This and the next clause, I understand, are to bring the law into conformity with the amendment made in the first clause ?

Mr. LANCASTER. Yes, to carry into full effect the protection of British subjects.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Has not the Minister of Marine and Fisheries heard enough in this discussion to justify him in taking charge of this measure and produce a Bill that will meet the case ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I will consider that point. But the Bill of my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) perhaps may be made into a good measure.

Mr. LANCASTER. Thank you.

Progress reported.

RAILWAY ACT, 1903, AMENDMENT.

On the order,

Second reading of Bill (No. 8) in further amendment of the Railway Act, 1903.—Mr. Lancaster.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara). This Bill is a very important one and I shall take some time in discussing it. It is now ten minutes to six, and, if the government has no objection, we will call it six o'clock and go on with the Bill to-night.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. LANCASTER. Of course, I can talk until six o'clock. But I am ready to go on, and I want to get the Bill dealt with to-day. I may not get another chance this session.

Mr. LANCASTER.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will ask my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) to allow this Bill to stand. If agreeable to him, we would like to adjourn at six o'clock.

Mr. LANCASTER. Of course, I do not want to be mean about it and prevent the adjournment if that is generally desired. But my position is that when a Bill standing in my name is called I ought to be ready to go on. And I am ready to go on. But, if the adjournment takes place now, and there should be trouble in reaching this Bill on account of other Bills coming up, I want it understood that I shall be allowed an opportunity to discuss this matter.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. By all means.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Minister of Justice as to the penitentiaries of Canada for the year ending June 30, 1905.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like the attention of the Minister of the Interior—who is not in his place—to be called to the absence of the report of his department. I would ask when we may expect that report, and would urge the importance of having it placed upon the table at the earliest possible moment. I would also ask the Prime Minister what business the House is to take up to-morrow.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We shall move for Committee of Supply and, in Committee of Supply, shall deal with the estimates of the Minister of Justice, probably the Mounted Police, some of the Customs Department and the Post Office Department.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And the report of the Minister of the Interior ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will have an answer about that to-morrow.

Mr. FOSTER. And volume No. 2 of the Auditor General's Report. That is very urgently needed.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I knew my hon. friend's (Mr. Foster's) desire and so communicated with the Auditor General. He tells me that the volume is in print and is now being bound, and we shall have it early next week.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 5.50 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, March 23, 1906.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 41) respecting the Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Railway Company.—Mr. Macpherson.

Bill (No. 42) to incorporate the Buffalo, Niagara and Toronto Railway Company.—Mr. German by Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 43) to incorporate the Brandon Transfer Railway Company.—Mr. Sifton by Mr. Johnson.

Bill (No. 44) respecting the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company.—Mr. Hall.

Bill (No. 45) respecting Patent of The Anderson Puffed Rice Company.—Mr. Hall.

REPORTS PRESENTED.

Civil Service List of Canada.—Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Annual report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries for the year ending June 30, 1905.—Hon. Sydney Fisher (for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.)

NORFOLK ELECTION TRIAL.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Hon. Chancellor Boyd and the Hon. Mr. Justice Teetzel, two of the judges selected for the trial of election petitions pursuant to the Dominion Controverted Elections Act a certificate and report relating to the election petition for the electoral district of Norfolk, by which the sitting member is declared to be duly elected.

REPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would ask the Minister of the Interior, if he were here, when we may expect the report of the Department of the Interior. I asked the Prime Minister as to that yesterday.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I asked my colleague to-day about it, and he informs me that the report is all in the hands of the printer, and ought to be down at an early day.

RECOGNITION OF VOYAGEURS.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. I wish to draw the attention of the Minister of Militia to the answer which was given to the question asked yesterday about the voyageurs in the Red River expedition. The question was :

Is it the intention of the government to grant boatmen or voyageurs, who served on the Red River expedition of 1870, scrip or medals for their services ?

The answer was :

It was decided by the government of the day that they were employed as civilians and not eligible for medals or scrip. They were, in fact, treated precisely as were the teamsters employed at the same time. It is not intended to depart from the decision then reached.

I desire to ask, did not the teamsters in the 1885 rebellion receive medals and scrip ?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia). I am informed that they did not. They were paid exceptionally high rates, and after careful consideration it was decided not to grant medals, and they were not granted.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. This is for 1870, not 1885.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, I will inquire about that, but I do not think they were.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Administration of justice, $8,925.

Mr. FOSTER. I would call the attention of the First Minister to the fact that the volume of the Auditor General's Report which includes the expenses of the Minister of Justice is not yet down.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If my hon. friend was not prepared to go on with this to-day, he should have taken exception yesterday, when I announced our intention of taking it up. Nothing else is at present provided for we might agree to leave one or two items for discussion until the remainder of the Auditor General's Report is down. I understand that it is expected to be down on Monday or Tuesday.

Mr. FOSTER. It is very inconvenient to take up estimates the context of which is not shown. It seems on the face of it a fair proposal to say, we will reserve an item, but that never works out, and I think we are not asking too much in asking for the Auditor General's Report relating to the estimates which are to be taken up. The Customs and Post Office expenses are in the volumes which we have, and we are prepared to go on with these, but we are not prepared to go on with the Justice estimates.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will do anything to accommodate my hon. friend. If exception had been taken last evening to our going on with the Justice estimates, I would have made preparations accordingly. I do not see the Minister of Customs or the Postmaster General here, but I expect them before long. I would suggest that we go on with a few of the items of Justice in the meantime.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The reason I did not take objection last evening is a very

plain one. I met the Auditor General at six o'clock in the hall, and he told me that a limited number of copies of the second volume would be ready to-day. I asked him to have a copy sent to my hon. friend from North-Toronto (Mr. Foster), and I understood that that would be done. But for that I would have mentioned to the Prime Minister last night that it would not be convenient for us to go on with the Justice estimates. I would have been willing to go on even if we had had a limited number of copies. It may be that there are some in the post office now.

Administration of justce—miscellaneous expenditure, $7,500.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). Hon. members will notice a very large reduction in this item. This is a result of the creation of the two new provinces. They will be charged with the administration of justice within their boundaries, and consequently we shall be able to get along with a relatively small amount this year.

Mr. FOSTER. Broadly speaking, what is included in this item?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The cost of administering justice in the Northwest Territories as now constituted, that is, in the remaining portions which are not included in the two new provinces; also the expenses incurred in connection with extradition cases and in connection with fugitive offenders from or to other parts of the empire; also copies of testimony in application for clemency; also sundry matters not otherwise provided for. It is believed that this will be ample to cover the actual expenses, but it is impossible to make a very close estimate. The expenditure under the different headings of this item last year were $85,066.67.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What territory is covered by the item before us, and what is the population of that territory?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It will be that portion of Mackenzie district north of Alberta and Saskatchewan, the Keewatin district and Ungava. In addition we shall be obliged to provide for the other items I have mentioned in connection with extradition and the Act relating to fugitive offenders.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the judicial system of the Territories at the present time? Is justice administered by stipendiary magistrates or by judges?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In the Northwest Territories justice will be administered by judges of the new provinces. My hon. friend will remember that we allowed the judicial system to continue until such time as new arrangements were made for the new provinces. There has not been a meeting of the legislatures and no new arrangements have been made. When they have organized their judicial systems we will make arrangements for the appointment of magistrates. The portion of Mackenzie north of Alberta and Saskatchewan will be administered judicially from there, and Keewatin from Manitoba.

Administration of justice—living allowance for judge of Atlin district, $900.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. This is a continuation of the vote of last session of living allowance for Judge Young to make up for the cost of living in the Atlin district, which is supposed to be far in excess of that in other parts of British Columbia. The judge's salary is $3,000.

Supreme Court of Canada, $18,887.50.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The only change here is with respect to one new appointment of a junior second-class clerk, Miss Geary. The appointment is made on the recommendation of the registrar who says that in view of the increased work of the court another stenographer and typewriter is necessary.

Mr. FOSTER. Up to this time, in this item the words 'Nothwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act' have not appeared.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They apply exclusively to Miss Geary and are necessary because, as I understand, Miss Geary is beyond what may be called the canonical age.

Mr. FOSTER. What a splendid thing it would be if we could have one minister and one department in whose estimates these words did not appear.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is only a little sin.

Exchequer Court of Canada, $10,037.50.

Mr. FOSTER. That seems to be exactly the same for the next nine months as for the whole of the current year.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The reason for this is given by the registrar in a report in which he says that he is asking for the $4,000 as it was his intention to ask for $5,000 had the vote been for the whole fiscal year instead of nine months. He says that for the past five or six years it has been impossible for him to make both ends meet with an appropriation of $4,000, the result being that at the end of each fiscal year he has had to carry over a large amount to be paid out of the new appropriation, thus crippling at once his contingencies account for the year. He was obliged to ask for a supplementary vote last year and will have to ask for $1,000 this year, his contingencies having been exhausted except about $700 or $800. The business of the court is increasing. It is always impossible for one to make an exact estimate of the expenditure of the court, because it depends on the volume of business during the year. The

greater the volume of business outside of Ottawa, the greater the charge for travelling expenses. One of the largest items of contingencies for the fiscal year is that of stenographers' fees, including the sum due for the last fiscal year, and on account of the business coming before the court a larger sum will be required. Last year the expenditure in connection with the fees of stenographers was $2,850. Of course, that was only an apparent outlay, becuase it all comes back by way of stamps. The reason for the last item, postage and stationery for Admiralty Court judges and registrars, $112.50, is that it has been decided to allow postage and stationery to the local admiralty judges, that is to say, that the judges who are appointed to act in admiralty cases as members of the Exchequer Court. The intention is to allow each of them $5 per annum for postage and $20 for stationery, making $25 each. As there are six judges, the total amount will be $150 per annum, and for nine months $112.50.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Where do you provide for these salaries to local judges in admiralty ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think the judges are provided for in the item covering the Exchequer Court. My hon. friend will find the item under the heading of Exchequer Court of Canada.

Yukon Territory—
Travelling allowances of judges..$ 1,125
Living allowances of judges.. .. 11,250

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How many judges are there ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Three.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the minister any information as to this particular matter ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend will remember that last year when this matter was up for consideration, it was decided that I should examine into the question and ascertain whether, with respect to the living allowances of our officials and judges in the Yukon Territory, it might not be found possible to make some reduction. I had the matter looked into, and as a result the information I obtained was that the conditions in the Yukon were still almost the same as they were when these living allowances were granted. If the hon. gentleman wishes to have that matter discussed more fully, I would wait till the member for the Yukon (Mr. Thompson) was present, as he might have some information to give which I do not possess with respect to that question.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I suppose there is a written report upon it ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Who reported ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. One of the judges in the Territories, Judge Craig.

Mr. FOSTER. Then there was no further examination made, because a great many officials are involved in this matter in the different departments. What we found out last year was that a different scale, if it were a scale, was adopted and carried out in different departments, that there was not uniformity. Now, is that the only report that the minister has, or is there a general report on living expenses taking all the grades through ? It is not in one respect the most unprejudiced report when it comes from a party directly interested; though I am not casting suspicion upon the report as being untrue or anything of the kind. But if some person could have looked into the whole thing and given a report upon the whole matter, some person not personally interested in the question, we might have got at the facts in a little different way, and may be with a different result.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think that is perfectly fair, and if my hon. friend wishes, we will allow this item to stand. My recollection is that an official of the Auditor General's office was sent up to the Yukon for the purpose of auditing the accounts, and I think some report was given by him, but I am not quite certain. Perhaps it would be fairer to wait in order to ascertain if he made any report, and if he did, I will bring it down.

Mr. FOSTER. I think some get larger allowances than their salaries.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The salaries of the judges are equal to the living allowances they get.

Mr. FOSTER. Some get considerably more. I suppose a man on a small salary eats as much as a man on a large salary.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I note what my hon. friend says. An officer of the police court gets $600 more in the way of living allowances than his salary. However, we will let this item stand.

Dominion police, including one second-class clerk at $1,200, $27,750.

Mr. FOSTER. How many police ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. One commissioner, one inspector, one inspector of secret service, three sergeants of police, fifteen grade 'A' first-class constables, nine first-class constables, four second-class constables, two third-class constables, four supernumerary constables, one mail boy and one second-class clerk. The four supernumeraries are employed here during the session of parliament. They get $1.50 a day.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Will the minister explain the system of promotions in force in the Dominion police ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think the Dominion police probably come the nearest to the military police of any force I know of in the Dominion. There are no promotions or appointments made except on the recommendation of the commissioner. He is absolutely in control and I think it is necessary, if we wish to preserve the efficiency of the force, that these matters should be left in the control of the commissioner. I need not say anything about his competence or qualifications.

Mr. FOSTER. There is absolutely no political patronage ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. None whatever. Of course, I may say if I were asked to make a recommendation to the commissioner I would do so.

Customs—salaries and contingent expenses of the several courts in the various provinces and in the Northwest Territories, including pay for overtime of officers, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, $971,150.

Mr. DANIEL. What is the cause of the increase in the amount ?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). This is for the various ports covering the Dominion and we ask this amount for salaries and for overtime. There is an increase of $50,000 per annum, or for the nine months $37,500. The estimate for the nine months ending March 31 is $1,214,525, and for the twelve months it would be $1,619,366.67. The amount of the vote in 1905-6 was $1,554,865. Therefore the increase is $64,501.67. That is putting it on the basis of the full year. We are asking altogether for next year $64,000. Of this $50,000 is for increases to officers and for the new ports that may be opened during the year 1906-7.

Mr. DANIEL. Has the hon. minister any idea of what new ports will be opened ?

Mr. PATERSON. There are a great many applications, but we are opening no more than we can possibly help. We try to give all the consideration to the mercantile interest, but the pressure for new ports to be opened is so great and it will entail so much additional expenditure that we have to be convinced that there is a great necessity for them before we are able to meet the wishes of the people. We can only estimate for the coming year by our experience of last year. We took $50,000 extra last year and there is an unexpended balance of $300 or $400. It was estimated very closely. We had to take two estimates ; we had to take the original estimate and a supplementary estimate. This year we do not expect to do that. Of that amount there was about one-half expended in increases in the salaries of officers. The other half was consumed in the opening of new ports and for additional officers at the ports already opened.

Mr. SAM HUGHES.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the hon. minister give us a list of those opened last year ?

Mr. PATERSON. Out of the increased appropriation of $50,000 for 1905-6—that is for the current year—there was an aggregate increase of $23,250 to 304 officers in the various provinces excepting the Yukon. The list is made up as follows :

Province.	No. of officers.	Total increase.
Ontario..	100	$7,600
Quebec..	73	5,390
New Brunswick..	25	1,850
Nova Scotia..	42	2,340
Prince Edward Island..	5	250
Manitoba..	35	2,910
British Columbia..	19	2,210
Alberta..	2	200
Saskatchewan	3	200

So that, last year, out of the fund of $50,000 that parliament was kind enough to grant we used $23,250 of the $50,000 to give added remuneration to these 304 officers. We expect, during this year, if parliament is willing to vote what we have asked, to spend a like amount for the same purpose and then we are taking a balance of $25,000 or so for the additions that we will have to make to the staff and for any new ports that we may feel impelled to open, though, as I said before, we are going very carefully in that matter.

Mr. DANIEL. Are these increases statutory increases or does the government pick out certain employees or officials and give them certain increases ?

Mr. PATERSON. No, they are not statutory in the outside service. They have to be granted on merit as each case commends itself to the department. Statutory increases are confined to the inside service.

Mr. BLAIN. The hon. minister did not give us a list of the new ports opened last year ?

Mr. PATERSON. New ports were opened at Alexandria, Ont., Bannerman and Yorkton, Man., and Crofton and Venanda, B.C. Glace Bay was made a chief port.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Did the hon. minister take into consideration the application made last year for a new port in the Muskoka district where a very large number of American tourists come during the summer season. I think the nearest port is Orillia where they were able to make their entries at the present time. It was thought that if there were an office at Gravenhurst, Bracebridge, or Huntsville, it would be a very great convenience and would enable travellers to get their luggage through on the same train with themselves. Has that been taken into consideration ?

Mr. PATERSON. A special officer is sent there during the tourist season but a permanent port has not been established.

Mr. W. WRIGHT. I would urge upon the minister the necessity there is for establishing a customs port either at Bracebridge or Huntsville, which would be a great convenience to the business people in that locality. I might tell the minister that there is one firm alone there which imports over $1,000,000 worth of goods per annum and it is very inconvenient to them to be compelled to make their entries either at Orillia or at Toronto. It would certainly be a matter of very great convenience indeed if the minister could give a port further up in the Muskoka district, either at Bracebridge or Huntsville.

Mr. PATERSON. The question of constituting a port at Bracebridge has been pressed upon the department very strongly, and as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wright) says the proposal possesses a good deal of merit. But we have so many applications that we are necessarily forced to go slowly, or, I am afraid parliament would hardly like to give us the amount we would have to ask for. I recognize that Bracebridge has as strong a claim as many places where in times gone by ports have been established. I cannot say more than that Bracebridge is on the waiting list and is not forgotten entirely.

Mr. DANIEL. On whose recommendation does the Minister of Customs increase the salaries of officers in the outside service ?

Mr. PATERSON. We like to get the reports of the collectors and of our inspectors as to the circumstances which justify an increase. We have 1,600 officers altogether under the department. In Toronto and Montreal we had numbers of men who were getting only $500 a year, and while that might be considered a fair salary many years ago I think the House will agree that in view of the increased expense of living in the cities, that pay was not sufficient. Wherever we found officers with $500 a year in the cities, without exception we gave them $550 one year, and last year we increased it to $600. We think they will have to remain at that for some length of time. A great portion of the increased vote went in that way. In the case of increasing the collectors' salaries we exercised our judgment. Probably the collector would draw our attention to the fact that the business of the port had increased, and we could judge of that not only from the revenue of the port but also by the number of entries which is perhaps a better indication of the increase of the work. In these cases we have been able to give the collectors a little more salary. That, in a general way, is how the increases have been given.

Mr. DANIEL. I would like to know how it is done in a 'particular' way. Are increases given on the recommendation of the member for the constituency, or have salaries been increased because of the fact that they were low ?

Mr. PATERSON. The guiding principle was to increase salaries that were low. We have to have the reports of our inspectors, and in the case of collectors we determine by looking at the work of the office. I would not say that members do not make representations, but we do not feel impelled to act upon the representations of the members. I can assure my hon. friend (Mr. Daniel) that should he or any other member of the House make representations which in the view of the department were reasonable—I would not say that they would be carried out, but they would be fully considered and if not granted one year perhaps they would in another year. I suppose my hon. friend wants to get at whether the thing is administered in a fair and honourable and businesslike maner ?

Mr. DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON. I can tell my hon. friend in a general way, that that is what the department desires to do.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. I am sure that any hon. gentleman in this House who has looked into the question will not accuse the minister of either over-manning the department or being extravagant about the salaries paid to the officers. I will give the House a fair statement of the situation as it is in Hamilton to-day, and as it was in 1897. I have been making every effort for the last year or two to get additional help in the customs house at Hamilton, and as I have not been successful I can speak somewhat feelingly on the subject. In 1897 there were 34 men on the staff in the Hamilton customs house, and in the year 1905 there are only 33, or one less than eight years ago. The increase in the salaries paid to the officials in the Hamilton customs house this year over 1897, amounts to the paltry sum of $196. Now, in 1895-96 the revenue of the Hamilton customs house amounted to $614,433.55 while in 1904-5 the receipts were $1,270,312.06. During that period the receipts have doubled in Hamilton, and yet there is one customs house officer less, and the increase with the salary list amounts to the insignificant sum of $196. The House will see that the Customs Department has been run most economically as far as Hamilton is concerned ; indeed, I think too much so. I trust the minister will see his way clear in the near future to give us more assistance in that office.

Mr. PATERSON. We have not been able to meet the wish of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Zimmerman) in Hamilton, but we have very expert officers there and while I ad-

mit the revenue has increased and the work has greatly increased also, yet we are forced to be as economical as we can and so far the officers in Hamilton have managed to get along. As I have said about $25,000 went for increases to officers already in the service. During the past fiscal year we were forced to add 33 new officers whose salaries amount to $21,730. These are additions we had to make to the staffs at ports already constituted. Of these 33 officers, 12 are in Ontario, one in Quebec, 1 in New Brunswick, 3 in Nova Scotia, 11 in Manitoba, and 5 in British Columbia. Of the Ontario officers, two were appointed in Port Arthur, one at Alexandria where a new office was opened, one at St. Thomas, one at Toronto, one at Toronto Junction, and four at Windsor where the work has increased very largely. As hon. gentlemen know. Windsor is a large manifesting point, the work there has increased very largely and it was absolutely necessary to appoint four men there.

Shawenegan Falls and Grand Mère has been made an outport and an officer has been appointed there. This, as hon. gentlemen know, has become a very important commercial point and we made Shawenegan Falls and Grand Mère an outport of Three Rivers. One additional officer was appointed for New Brunswick, at St. John. For Nova Scotia one was appointed at Glace Bay, one at Clifton and one at Yarmouth.

Of the 11 new officers in Manitoba one was appointed at the new outport of Bannerman. This is down on the border. There is a new railway coming in there, part of the Great Northern system, and as hon. gentlemen will understand wherever a new railway crosses the border, you must place customs officers. One is at the new outport of Yorkton in Manitoba. Yorkton is many miles from the nearest former outport, it is virtually the terminus of a road and seemed to the department to have merits that we could not overlook. Then there was one at Portage la Prairie, where the work has increased very much, and eight have been appointed at Winnipeg. You will see the necessity for the Winnipeg appointment when I give you a few figures on the Winnipeg revenue for the last five years. The revenue was as follows :

1900-01	$ 920,000
1901-02	1,400,000
1902-03	1,803,000
1903-04	2,498,000
1904-05	2,629,000

And for the eight months of the current year the receipts have been $2,141,000, or at the rate of $3,212,000. Hon. gentlemen will see at once that, where the business is increasing at such a rate, if we can get along with even eight additional men out there, we are certainly requiring the officers to do their full duty ; and I have no doubt that will be one point at which, during the year 1906-7, we will have to place additional officers.

I might say in order to give you a general idea of how the business is increasing that customs revenue in the Dominion for the eight months ending February 28, 1906, amounted to $29,623,363, or at the rate of $44,435,044, for the full year. The customs revenue for the fiscal year 1904-5, is $42,024,339, so that if the present ratio of increase is maintained we may expect an increase of over $2,000,000 in the customs revenue.

Mr. COCHRANE. You must be bleeding the farmers white now.

Mr. PATERSON. Oh, by no means, by no means. The burden that the farmer has to bear, for which parliament is responsible, is the amount of money that he must pay to the merchant, that parliament says the merchant must pay before he gets his goods in. That is all parliament does.

Mr. COCHRANE. But you used to say that it was the farmers who paid it.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, so they do, but parliament does not make my friend or any one else buy goods ; that is their own work.

Mr. FOSTER. It never did.

Mr. PATERSON. It never did. The only place where parliament comes in is——

Mr. COCHRANE. Might I ask the minister why he has changed his platform so much ?

Mr. PATERSON. I have not changed it, I have not changed that.

Mr. FOSTER. Be easy on him.

Mr. COCHRANE. But you did not always say so.

Mr. PATERSON. As the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) says, it always used to be that way.

Mr. COCHRANE. But you did not use to say so.

Mr. PATERSON. Oh, yes, the hon. gentleman is forgetting.

Mr. COCHRANE. If I had time to go to 'Hansard' I could show you I am not.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman has not heard me explain. There is a largely increased revenue——

Mr. COCHRANE. I know that, but you always used to say it was out of the farmers pockets it came.

Mr. PATERSON. Precisely, and other classes.

Mr. COCHRANE. But you never put in the other classes.

Mr. PATERSON. And the farmers are now coming in, owing to the good times, in a measure due to the new government.

Mr. COCHRANE. How silly.

Mr. PATERSON. And they are buying more goods and the more goods they buy, the more revenue. But parliament or this government does not make a man come in and buy goods ; he does it of his own free will. Parliament says : Before you get the goods from the merchant you must pay so many dollars on the hundred into the treasury. That is the rate of taxation that the government levies for which we are responsible. Now under the old government——

Mr. COCHRANE. Take care now.

Mr. PATERSON. That government said they must pay $18.28 on the average on every $100 worth that came in. This government said : This is too much. And for $16.04, you can have your $100 worth of goods. That is where the burden has been reduced, it has been reduced by 12½ per cent on what the farmer has to pay as far as the action of the government is concerned, and the revenue has more than doubled.

Mr. COCHRANE. Who pays the balance ?

Mr. PATERSON. Pays the balance of what ?

Mr. COCHRANE. Of revenue.

Mr. PATERSON. The balance of revenue ?

Mr. COCHRANE. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON. The free-will offering of the people coming in and buying more goods.

Mr. COCHRANE. Oh, how silly.

Mr. LALOR. Then, do I understand the minister to say this government has saved the farmers nearly $2 a year ?

Mr. PATERSON. I say—and the hon. gentleman need not take my word, he can work it out himself and it is in the returns —there was under the old government an average rate of $18.28 duty, levied on every $100 worth of imports, taking the free and dutiable together. Parliament imposed that rate. Parliament was responsible for that average rate and for that alone parliament is responsible ; for parliament does not send any man or woman into a store to buy goods—they do that of their own free will. But we are responsible for what we say the merchant must pay into the Dominion treasury before he can get these goods. I say that on the average, taking dutiable goods and free goods together, the old government said they must pay $18.28, but this government says : We will do with $16.04, and if the farmers, owing to their better conditions, and all other classes of the community are paying more, because there is more money going into the revenue, that is their own free-will offering. As far as the government is concerned, they have lessened the burden of taxation.

Mr. HENDERSON. We have heard this story every year for the last six or seven years.

An hon. MEMBER. Ten years.

Mr. HENDERSON. And the more I hear of it, the less I think there is in it. The Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) has told us that under the former regime the average rate of duty on goods, dutiable and free, was $18.28, and he tells us now that under the present regime the duty has been reduced on the average something like $2. The hon. gentleman does not tell the House and tell the country that he has changed his system, he does not tell the country that he is bringing into this country every year an enormous amount of corn on the free list, the bulk of which is exported, and that in the calculation of the average duties he takes that free corn into consideration and by that means shows a reduction in the average rate of duty at the present time. I need not tell him—the Finance Minister of this country has told him in his place in this House—that he is wrong and that he ought to make that correction. But notwithstanding that he goes on, year after year, deceiving the people of this country by his system of subterfuge in manipulating the accounts as given to us in the blue-books. He has not told us that the government has added to the taxation of the people about a million and a half in duties on tobacco as excise, which addition is pure taxation. He has not included that in his estimate when he says the taxation has been reduced by $2 per $100, on the goods coming into this country.

He has not told us that he has changed his system of protection, because we all know that he is a protectionist pure and simple, I do not think he will deny it. He has not told us that he has changed the system of protecting the industries of this country by taking the hard earnings of the farmers and others out of their pockets and handing them over to those who manufacture iron and steel in the shape of bounties, which is additional taxation ; but not one cent of that additional taxation is taken into consideration by the hon. gentleman in striking his average rate. What about the sum that is paid to the producers of crude oil ? That is another very large sum taken out of the pockets of the farmers, but not one cent of that is taken into consideration by the hon. gentleman when he tells us that the taxation has been reduced.

Another sum has been taken out of the pockets of the farmers and handed over to the manufacturers of binder twine. What is the result of all this manipulation ? The farmers know that they are paying two prices in some cases instead of one. It is not a reduction of 2 per cent but in the case of binder twine it is an addition of about 100 per cent in price because we know that they are paying to-day about twice as much for their binder twine as they formerly did. I think the hon. gentleman had better revise his figures. This is a standard speech of his ; we have heard it eight or ten different times, and I think the people are getting so accustomed to it that they pay very little attention to it. I have made a calculation for several years, and have presented it to this House, and my figures are just as reliable as those of the hon. gentleman—even more so, because they are not stuffed or padded. The hon. gentleman cannot show by an honest calculation that he has reduced the taxation on goods coming into this country, dutiable and free, by one-half of one per cent. When he says that he has reduced the duties by 12½ per cent what does he want the ordinary farmer to understand? That on an article on which he formerly paid a duty of 25 per cent he is now paying 12½ per cent.

Mr. PATERSON. Oh, no.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is the impression given in the country, that is the deceptive way in which the hon. gentleman puts his case. Of course, we know that he means 12½ per cent of the duty. Then, why does he send his speeches broadcast throughout the country, telling the farmers that he has reduced the duties 12½ per cent when he knows that the duties are not decreased 12½ per cent ? He keeps to himself the idea that this means only 12½ per cent of the duty. I do hope this House will not have a repetition of this kind of exhibition again, which we have had too often already. I believe the people are getting tired of it, because they know that the average duties have not been reduced. They know that they formerly paid 20 per cent on their binders and they are paying the same now; they know that they formerly paid 20 per cent on their ploughs and harrows and that they are paying the same now. It is true, the hon. gentleman has reduced the duties on some things which the farmers have ceased to use—on the old-fashioned flail with which they used to thresh their grain, on scythes, on snaths, on sickles. He has reduced the duty on the old ten cent hand-rake that he and I used to rake hay with. But so anxious was he to get revenue that when he took the duty off the scythe and the snath, he actually doubled the duty on the grindstone. Let the hon. gentleman read the speech delivered by the Minister of Finance in this House about three years ago, and he will get the secret of the whole matter. The Minister of Finance told us that he had never intended to reduce the average duty, that he could not afford to surrender the revenue, and I believe he has carried that out. I fail to see that the average duty has been reduced; I am satisfied that it has not. But what I object to is that the hon. gentleman will parade this old horse year after year until it is unfit for use any longer. I think he had better lay it aside, and take up some other line of argument if he expects to convince the farmers of this country that this government have placed them in any better position than they were before in the matter of taxation.

Mr. PATERSON. I did not commence this; I tried to get my estimates through. It is an interesting discussion, which my hon. friend from East Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) is responsible for, and if we are to pay a little attention to the question that has been raised, I am quite ready to debate it. My hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) has spent a good deal of time in belabouring what he called a dead horse. He wants me to change my tune, but I cannot do that and tell the truth; and I cannot tell a lie, you know. My hon. friend says that when I stated that the rate of taxation had been reduced 12½ per cent I meant to convey the impression to the people that 12½ per cent had been stricken off the duty. What I did was to ask hon. gentlemen to take the trade and navigation returns, and find the total amount of goods, dutiable and free, that were imported into this country, and then take the total amount of revenue derived and divide the one by the other. The result gave you in 1896 $18.28 of average taxation taken from the people to go into the treasury on every $100 worth of goods. Take the same returns and pursue the same course with regard to 1905, and you get $16.04, as the average of taxation, which some people would say was a reduction of only $2.24 ; but it is $2.24 on $18.26 a reduction of 12½ per cent on the rate of taxation.

Mr. HENDERSON. Ah!

Mr. PATERSON. Ah! My hon. friend begins to see it now. I grant you that there has been an increase in the excise duties on whisky and tobacco ; but we are discussing the customs revenues. I have no objection to the hon. gentleman discussing excise.

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) was only discussing the customs revenue, why did he include the free goods ?

Mr. PATERSON. Cannot my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) understand that the burden upon the people is affected by making the

goods free as well as by making them dutiable ?

Mr. SPROULE. Cannot the minister understand that there is no customs revenue from free goods ?

Mr. PATERSON. But if twenty per cent had been levied on a certain class of goods by the old government, and this government made those goods free, would not that be reducing the burdens of the people ?

Mr. SPROULE. If the hon. minister is dealing with customs revenue, let him deal with that ; if he is dealing with free goods let him deal with that.

Mr. PATERSON. But if you are stating the revenue on imported goods you must take all the goods imported—does not my hon. friend understand that basic principle ?

Mr. SPROULE. Not at all.

Mr. PATERSON. No ! Well, we understand it. And that is the principle we follow ; and that is how we have lowered the rate of taxation. As to the matter of more goods being consumed, and more money coming into the treasury, who ever said that if a Liberal government came into power there would be less revenue ? We knew there would be more ; and everybody knows it now. What we said was that we would reduce the rate of taxation that the people had to pay, and that has been done.

Mr. TAYLOR. You said that you would reduce the expenditure.

Mr. CROCKET. In view of what the minister has told us, I would like to have his views on the statement in the statistical year-book concerning the per capita customs taxation. In the year 1896, it was $3.90 per head and in 1904, it was $7.26 per head.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not know what basis the statistical year-book took for the population of Canada. But, in any case what we are concerned with is not the taxation per head but the rate of taxation on goods imported. If the people now buy far more than they did before, if any man or woman spends more money over the counter of a store than formerly, that is no matter that the government can control. The question is, how much have the government required the merchant to pay on the goods before he can put them in his store for sale. We have reduced the rate of taxation 12½ per cent—I have to reiterate it so that my hon. friend will remember. As to the per capita revenue, assuming that the figures of the year-book are correct—which I neither dispute or affirm, but only assume for the purposes of this argument—it would simply show that the people are in a better financial condition than they used to be and are able to spend more money. I will tell the hon. gentleman another thing that he ought not to forget—

Mr. COCHRANE. Better say 'Amen' and sit down.

Mr. PATERSON. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cochrane) is ready to say 'Amen' he started this discussion. The point I refer to is this : Millions upon millions of money have been paid into the public treasury that have not been paid by individual consumers directly. During this era of prosperity, largely brought about by the action of this government, many millions of capital have been invested in manufacturing enterprises in Canada, and hundreds of thousands, and even millions of dollars have been paid in by capitalists, on machinery and other things brought in, duties which are not directly a burden upon the farmers or any other producers in the country. That is one great source of the additions to the revenue. Now, about this $23,000 extra that I want : Am I to have it ? If so, we will call the item carried and proceed.

Mr. BLAIN. This item includes an amount for overtime for officers. In the customs report, I see that in the Sault Ste. Marie office, A. W. Howe receives a salary of $600, and for overtime salary of $330, another one, Mr. T. Hugli received a salary of $600 and for overtime, $318.50. The overtime seems very large as compared with the salary.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) will remember that this item increased our estimates, I think it was two years ago, by $80,000. It will be understood that, of course, we cannot interrupt trade and commerce, we cannot say to a transportation company. 'You must stop your boat or train at six o'clock when our customs officer quits work.' We must have our officers and men on hand at the times when they are required, even during the night. We used to require the transportation companies to pay for overtime. They paid the money, not to the officers direct, but to the government, and the government paid the officers. The rate prescribed is twenty-five cents per hour. The transportation companies for years, under the old government as under the present government, made representations that this was not reasonable. We could not expect them to tie up trains at six o'clock, and if our revenue wanted watching it was our duty to pay the men to watch it, not that of the transportation companies. I confess that during the years I did stave them off, as they had been staved off by the previous administration, I was never able to satisfy myself that their claims were not right. I became clearly convinced that it was our duty to pay our own officers for the work they did. Consequently we adopted the new rule, thus adding $80,000 to our ex-

penses. Of course, it would not be fair to ask the officers to do for nothing the work for which they were formerly paid, indirectly, by the transportation companies. I do not know where the officers are located to whom the hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) refers. I suppose they are at the ferries at Sault Ste. Marie. The hon. gentleman will find the same thing with reference to Niagara, Fort Erie, Montreal and the eastern townships where the roads cross the boundary, and elsewhere.

Mr. FOWLER. Before this item is passed, I think the House may congratulate itself that this little breeze has arisen. Some months ago we read in the newspapers that the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), in common with some other members of the cabinet from Ontario, had become almost imbecile through senility, that he was, in fact, in an almost moribund condition. But I think the hon. gentleman has shown this afternoon that his mind is still active, that his physical strength is not at all impaired; and the hon. member who I believe is present, and who made the statements to which I refer, must be very glad to observe that the hon. gentleman has not reached that stage that he said he had reached, but is still able to turn a hard corner with his old agility. It might be that there is some little indication of age in the hon. minister in one respect; garrulity is one thing which, I understand, usually accompanies age, and the hon. gentleman seems to be talking a great deal in connection with his estimates.

Mr. BERGERON. If I understand rightly, we are now paying $80,000 for work occasioned by the transportation companies. Are we recouped for that, or are we paying that much more than we paid before ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, in round numbers.

Mr. BERGERON. If the work was well done before, why do we pay that ?

Mr. PATERSON. It was fully explained at the time. I could not see but what the contention of the transportation companies was just, that we could not expect railroad trains and steamboats to tie up at six o'clock at night and remain there until office hours in the custom house next morning. They contended that we should let the traffic move night and day, and take measures to guard the revenue. Their argument was that traffic and commerce must go on, but that it was for us to provide for guarding the revenue. I say we have to yield to that argument. These collectors are our officers, they are doing our work, they are collecting revenue for us. We were getting that amount for many years out of the transportation companies, and I was never able to satisfy myself that it was a just charge for us to levy upon them. They do pay however for holidays, and if there is any Sunday work necessitated they have to pay for that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That may be removed by the new legislation, I suppose.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. On what basis is the overtime calculated ?

Mr. PATERSON. It is 25 cents per hour.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Is that the same rate as they are paid during the ordinary day work ?

Mr. PATERSON. In some cases it would be more.

Mr. DANIEL. If the government recognize that it is their duty to pay these customs officers additional in connection with the transportation companies, what about the payment of the officers who attend bonded warehouses the obligation of the bonded warehouse keepers to pay the customs officers when they go there ? Why is it not the duty of the government to pay these customs officers themselves, and not call upon the bonded warehousemen to pay the salaries of these officers, or so much per hour for their duties ? They are still looking after the revenue of the country, and it appears to me that if it is the duty of the government in the one case to pay these officers, it is the duty of the government equally in the other case.

Mr. PATERSON. That might seem to be so at first sight, but if the hon. gentleman will think for a moment he will see the distinction. Bonded warehouses are warehouses in which merchants place their goods, and only pay duty upon them when they are taken out of bond; the accommodation then is wholly to the merchants. The customs laws of Canada in the interests of the revenue require that the duty should be paid before a man gets possession of his goods, and we practically say to every man who is importing goods: Pay your duty today. But parliament in its wisdom has said : You may establish warehouses in which these men may store their surplus stock and let it remain there for weeks and months, and when they find a market for it and have to take it out, then they must pay duty upon it. But the hon. gentleman will see that there is a saving in interest of a very large amount to an individual when we allow him to defer paying that money to the government for days or months. It is a benefit given to the individual merchant for his own purpose; therefore the department takes the ground that he should pay that expenditure. But it is different with the railways who are carrying on the general trade and commerce of the country, they do not derive any additional benefit from it.

Mr. DANIEL. Has that course always been pursued, or is it a new departure ?

Mr. PATERSON. No, we think it is a reform that we instituted last year. As I said, the individual importer is benefited

by allowing him to defer paying the duty and getting interest on his money. For these warehouses we charged $40 a year, it was a uniform flat rate. The merchant who might require the services of an officer once a week had to pay $40 for his warehouse, the same as any other merchant who required the services of an officer every day in the week, or perhaps the services of an officer continually. That was inequitable to start with. So we decided not to levy a uniform rate upon all, not to charge them for the bonded warehouse at all, but to charge according to the hours that they required the services of an officer, and they pay for that. If a man requires the services of an officer for a whole day, he must pay for it, and in his case that would run up $480 a year. They pay that to the government, and we pay the officer. Now that man, instead of paying $40 a year for his warehouse, will have to pay us $480. But as the bonded warehouse is a benefit to the merchant and he is individually profited by it, we thought it was only fair that he should pay the services of the officer, for if we had no bonded warehouses we would not need as many officers as we have. I trust I make plain to the hon. gentleman the distinction between them and transportation companies.

Mr. DANIEL. I can see the point, but it appears to me it is really adding a little more duty to the goods which the merchant takes out, it gives the government a little more revenue. But the payment must after all come out of the party who buys the goods, and it is so much additional taxation.

Mr. PATERSON. No. it does not affect the revenue, but it would affect the expenditure of the department. It reduces our expenditure somewhat. But it would not if we had to pay these men as we did before and did not get anything back.

Mr. BERGERON. It increases the amount of money paid by the importer. My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Daniel) holds that the importer must pay so much more which was before this time paid by the government.

Mr. PATERSON. He does not pay any more in duty, but he has a larger business expenditure to that amount.

Mr. BERGERON. And he charges that afterwards ?

Mr. PATERSON. I do not know whether he does or not, but that is not the government's business.

Mr. BERGERON. But the government gets from the importer $480 a year for the services of the customs officer. How much is that employee paid, generally, by the government ?

Mr. PATERSON. He gets about $600.

Mr. BERGERON. He does only that work ?

Mr. PATERSON. That applies only to a few cases.

Mr. BERGERON. That is the way the government increases its surplus.

Mr. PATERSON. It reduces the amount I have to ask from parliament.

Mr. BERGERON. By $425.

Mr. PATERSON I have to ask parliament for that much less money.

Mr. BERGERON. $425. Suppose the government pay an employee, getting $600, $175 the importer pays him $425. That makes up the $600. Then the hon. minister comes to parliament and asks for less money, but that $425 that the importer has to pay must be paid by some one. The importer will charge this increased amount to his customers and they will pay more for their goods.

Mr. LALOR. It seems that the principle is wrong that the warehouse man or the man who pays the duty should pay the salary of this officer. Whether it places the officer under an obligation to the warehouseman or not it gives him the impression that he is under an obligation to the man who pays him his salary.

Mr. PATERSON. He does not pay the money to the officer. He has nothing to do with the officer. He asks us to allow him to have that officer so many hours a day. We detail an officer for that work and we charge the warehouseman so much for doing it.

Mr. LALOR. The principle is much the same, it indirectly comes out of the warehouse man. It seems to me it would be better for the government to charge some fee to the warehouseman and let him have nothing to do with the salary of the officer. There is a question that probably does not come under the department of my hon. friend the Minister of Customs, but under that of the Department of Inland Revenue, and that is that where a vinegar factory is established the man who controls that factory has to pay the officer his salary. The result is that small factories cannot start and that the larger factories have a complete monopoly of the business thereby increasing the cost to the people of the country. It seems to me that the principle is wrong of having an officer, whether an excise or customs officer, paid directly or indirectly by those who are in control of these works. It should not be paid in that way. If we want more revenue we should collect it in the way of an increased duty rather than by taxing a man, firm, or company manufacturing vinegar by compelling them to pay the salary of the officer in charge of their works.

Mr. PATERSON. I think the hon. gentleman has not fully thought it out. Putting on an increased duty would not remedy the thing at all. My hon. friend from North Grey is not engaged in business. If I were at liberty I might be engaged in business. I want a man to help me in my business, to meet my convenience in order to store goods, to defer payment and to get the interest on that money. I ask the government to allow me to have a public officer to do that. Why should my hon. friend from North Grey or any man who is not in business be called upon to pay part of that which is going to benefit me ? Why should the farmers be taxed to pay this officer's salary when this officer's services are devoted to one merchant who is getting the benefit of it and who is saving ten times the amount in deferred payment and interest ?

Mr. BERGERON But they will have to pay it all the same in another way.

Mr. LALOR. Why not levy a special rate on the goods that are left in bond and relieve the warehouseman entirely from having to do with the officer in charge ? Then the officer would be under no obligation to the warehouseman.

Mr. PATERSON. He has nothing to do with the officer directly or indirectly. It is not always the same officer who does this work ; it may be one man to-day and we may send another man to-morrow. There is no one particular man. We can change our officer. We can send a different man every day if it is necessary. So, there is nothing in that.

Mr. DANIEL. The only point I wish to make is that the hon. minister was telling us this afternoon that he was reducing the taxes of the country, referring to the tariff in that regard, but he has not brought to the notice of the country the fact that in other ways he has been adding to the taxes of the people. This, he does not refer to, but he says that he is reducing taxation. The only point I wish to make is that this one charge is so much additional taxation, so much additional cost to the man who buys the goods, that the merchant has to pay this additional cost to the Customs Department over and above what he formerly paid. This is additional taxation, yet the government does not get any discredit for putting on that additional taxation in so far as its tariff rates are concerned.

Mr. PATERSON. Just let us give that a moment's consideration. The hon. gentleman will see that he is entirely wrong. It is not adding to the taxation of the people. It is reducing the taxation of the people. If we paid the officer the warehouseman gets the direct benefit and the whole country pays for it. If we make the man who is benefited pay it the country has that much money to its credit. It is a reduction of taxation and not an addition.

Mr. DANIEL. This charge is added to the cost of the goods which the consumer, of course, has to pay ?

Mr. PATERSON. What different position would he be in if we paid the whole amount to the officer.

Mr. DANIEL. He would save that much money.

Mr. PATERSON. But we would be paying out of the public treasury to the officer.

Mr. DANIEL. You would, but still you would not pay so much.

Mr. BLAIN. In regard to the question of overtime, what objection would the hon. minister have to paying these men proper salaries rather than paying so much money as overtime ? Here are two men getting $600 each and their overtime amounts to more than half their salary each year. Why would it not be very much better and more in the interest of the country for the hon. minister to fix these men's salaries at a set amount and pay them a straight salary to do the work ? It seems to me to be a very large amount of overtime.

Mr. PATERSON. That $330 is based upon a service of two hours per week day and ten hours service on each Sunday and statutory holidays. If what the hon. gentleman suggests could be arranged and were practicable it would be simpler for us, but, I am afraid it is not practicable.

Mr. BLAIN. Why not ?

Mr. PATERSON. There are certain seasons of the year in which extra services might be required and there might be other times in which they might not be required. There are certain places where extra services are required more than they are required at other places, and there are different officers at the different ports. At one port you perhaps have several men and you want to have some extra service performed. You might not want to give to one man the same work to do all the time. It may be divided among your port officers and their being paid by the hour enables you to send any officer you may detail for that purpose to do the work without raising the salary.

Mr. BLAIN. It is not difficult to understand where the amount is $14 or $15 as it is in many cases, but where it comes to half of the salary it seems to be rather difficult of explanation.

Mr. PATERSON. Well, it does, but we have thought it out carefully and we have come to the conclusion that this is the only way in which we can work it equitably and have as free a hand as we would like to have and say to these officers : Go there and do that, or go here and do that. That is the basis upon which it is fixed. I ought to

state that an officer receiving extra pay for over time has to send in a statement of the number of hours he serves which has to be certified by the collector.

Mr. PERLEY. I would like to ask the hon. minister how, when there are a lot of applications for new ports of entry, he decides whether he will grant an application or not. On what basis does he decide ?

Mr. PATERSON. We make it a point generally when there is an application for a new port to send out to the different ports at which goods for that particular town or village in which they may be asking for an outport have hitherto been imported. The people in this village or town may hitherto have been importing their goods through three or four different ports. We obtain from the collector a statement of the amount of duties paid during the year by the people living in the village or town, and we make up our minds as to whether the public interest requires that a port should be constituted.

Mr. PERLEY. If any place which applies to be made a port of entry has a revenue equal to the minimum revenue of already established ports, is the application granted ?

Mr. PATERSON. Our object is to give to the business community such convenience as we feel reasonably justified in giving. Every additional port means additional expense, and we would like the revenue to be such as to warrant the payment of a salary upon which the officer can comfortably exist. It is rather a selfish view to take, that the department would get the revenue any way whether the port is constituted or not. Another point that comes into consideration is the distance that a place may be from an existing port ; perhaps the town may be situated on a main line of railway and there may be a customs port between it and the boundary at which the goods could be entered and sent right on, by a person who has a power of attorney for that purpose. All these things have to enter into our calculations.

Mr. PERLEY. Alexandria, Ont., was constituted a new customs port during the past year ; was that done on account of the revenue or for some other reason ?

Mr. PATERSON. I am sorry to say there has been a fire at Alexandria. It was not without justification from the revenue point of view, and it was further urged that a new post office building had been erected in which there was accommodation provided for a customs office.

Mr. PERLEY. Do I understand that because a public building was erected with a customs office in it, that was the reason the port was established there.

Mr. PATERSON. I would not say that, but there was the fact that provision was made for customs officers and we would be relieved from the cost of rent and caretaking.

Mr. PERLEY. Now that the Alexandria building has been burned down, will that affect the judgment of the minister as to establishing a customs port there ?

Mr. PATERSON. Now that it is created a port it will remain. I don't know what the plans of the Minister of Public Works are, but we will have to get accommodation somewhere.

Mr. BERGERON. And you will appoint a customs officer of course ?

Mr. PATERSON. There is one already appointed.

Salaries and travelling expenses of inspectors of ports and of other officers of inspection and preventive service, including salaries and expenditure in connection with the Board of Customs and for the compiling of statistical returns of exports and imports, $142,125.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. For some years past the method of collecting customs statistics has been completely changed. Formerly statistics gave the port of origin as the port from which the goods were exported, but now only the port of exit at which the goods leave the country is given in the returns. This is a matter of more than passing interest to the commercial community. For instance, Toronto may have manufactured $5,000,000 worth of exports last year, but it is only credited with $5,000 ; the balance being credited to small ports of exit like Niagara Falls, Bridgeburg, Windsor, or Sarnia. In this way the Customs Department credits these smaller places with the export of the manufactures that originate in Toronto, Brantford, Hamilton and other cities. I asked a question last year with regard to the export of seeds, principally clover seed, and I found that was the system adopted. Last year, Bridgeburg, Ont., a place that is hardly ever heard of and that perhaps has not more than 100 people in it, was credited with $15,000,000 of exports. If this system is thought desirable by the department, it should also be provided that the place of manufacture should be credited with the goods exported. The foreign countries which receive these goods look in our statistical year-book and they naturally think that Bridgeburg, which exports $15,000,000 worth, must be an important centre, whereas when you come to pass through it you cannot tell whether you are in it or out of it. The city of Brantford, which used to be credited with $1,000,000 worth of manufactured goods exported, was last year credited with less than $1,000 worth, the city of Hamilton got about the same credit for export goods, and Toronto very little more. I do not believe it would

cost the department a great deal to see that the port of origin is credited with the business which originates in it. It is a serious matter for the merchants and manufacturers of Canada not to be able to ascertain from the statistics the export trade which their own towns are doing. I wish the minister would give this matter his attention. When a town originates goods it should get credit for them. In that respect the old system that was abolished was a good system and if the change was found necessary in the interest of the department —and I am not going to say that the minister has not full justification for the change, I ask him if it would not have been possible also that the former statistics should be maintained and that we should know exactly the business of the various towns and cities that originate these goods, so that we might know what they are doing and that we might inform our constituents of what is going on in our particular centre. I have paid some attention to this, and 'The Monetary Times' has written several strong articles on the subject, which I do not think were very strongly answered by the minister's deputy. I do not know whether the minister can give a better answer than his deputy did.

Mr. PATERSON. The change was effected for this reason. While I admit the difficulty in the present system, on the other hand we used to collect the statistics of exports and the statistics were taken from the entries at the local customs houses in the different provinces. Some years ago — and the same conditions would continue to a modified extent to-day if we were returning to the old system—when the province of Manitoba and the Northwest Territories were raising and selling some millions of bushels of grain, when attention was being turned in the old country to Manitoba and the Northwest, and these districts were being advertised as great grain producing countries to which immigrants might go, that export wheat came down largely, as it does now, to Fort William and Port Arthur, where it was stored in elevators. It went out in the spring or in the fall, but it was going to Buffalo, millions of bushels of it. Thus if you turned up the records you would find that Manitoba and the Northwest, which were being advertised as producing millions and millions of bushels of wheat, exported 100,000 bushels of wheat in a certain year, although millions had been exported.

Mr. BERGERON. How was that?

Mr. PATERSON. Because they were exported from Port Arthur or Fort William in Ontario and, therefore, were credited to Ontario. We had the same difficulty with our imports, because goods, for Manitoba and for many parts of Ontario, for the Northwest and perhaps for British Columbia, coming into this county would pay duty at Montreal.

Mr. BERGERON. I understand that.

Mr. PATERSON. Montreal will get the credit. But the consumption took place in other provinces.

Mr. BERGERON. You cannot help that, but the other way—

Mr. PATERSON. So in the other way you cannot help it. It is the port from which you ship that gets the credit. If it originated in Brandon or Regina, it would be shipped from Port Arthur.

Mr. BERGERON. Why would it not be marked as from Brandon?

Mr. PATERSON. Because it was not exported from Brandon.

Mr. BERGERON. But it is.

Mr. PATERSON. No, it is sent from Brandon to Port Arthur; it is not billed any further than that; it goes into the elevator and lies there. When a sale is subsequently made, it may be sent to the old country, but it is a sale out of the country and it is credited to Fort William or Port Arthur.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not see why it could not be easily changed and marked as from Brandon.

Mr. PATERSON. If it went from Brandon you could not tell whether it went to the old country or not. It might go into consumption for the local mills in Ontario or Quebec.

Mr. BERGERON. As long as you know it is exported from these places, it would be easy to say it is wheat from Brandon or the Northwest Territories.

Mr. PATERSON. How could we keep track of it coming from all the different points? I can understand what has been said about the difficulty, and that each town would like to be credited with the goods it originates, but after all we thought it was better to do away with the provincial subdivisions and all that sort of thing. This is the Dominion of Canada, and if goods go out of this country they are exports of the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is the minister going to do away with this classification by ports or provinces? At the present time in the minister's report we find the exports from this province and that province. If he looks up the exports of cattle from Ontario he will see that Ontario exported only a few thousand and that Quebec exported the great bulk. Is he going to do away with that classification?

Mr. PATERSON. You mean the port to which it is sent for export?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Yes, the Canadian port.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I see some of the difficulties in the points the minister raises, but I do not think it alters the case because there is an export entry with every shipment that leaves the town. Nothing can leave Brantford, for instance, for export without an entry showing the amount and the value of the goods. That entry is in the hand of the department the same as ever; all the information is in the hands of the government and all they have to do is to collect it and publish it as they used to. The objection of Fort William getting credit for Brandon's business is not overcome by sending the grain to Montreal; that only increases the difficulty. Brandon sends to Fort William and Fort William to Montreal or Halifax, and these ocean ports finally get the credit for shipping, although the goods came from Ontario, Quebec or the Northwest Territories. In the same way Bridgeburg gets credit for all the manufactures of Ontario that pass out of the country in that way. What I point out is that the export entry showing the point of origin is already made and all they need to do is to collect the entries as they used to, and they have all the information there. It would not cost much, one or two clerks could do the whole thing each year and could give us the statistical information to which the towns and cities, and for that matter the farmers, are entitled. The port of origin should have credit for what it originates. Everything else only multiplies the difficulty which the hon. gentleman has pointed out. Montreal gets credit for the wheat of the Northwest and Manitoba, for the cheese and other products of Ontario and for every thing that is exported, whereas these provinces and the towns and cities that originate the goods get no credit whatever and have nothing to show they are doing an export trade at all. This, I think, is an injustice to the points at which these goods originate, and I think the minister should remedy that. It would not cost much and I commend it to his consideration during the coming year in order that he may see if it would not be possible to have the statistics collected as previously and also, if he wishes, to give the present statistics as well. I do not think it would multiply the work much.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The minister referred to bonding. Suppose goods in bond are lost, how does the department recoup the owner of these goods?

Mr. PATERSON. How lost, through fire?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Through fire, theft or in any way while in charge of the customs officers.

Mr. PATERSON. If goods are destroyed by fire there is provision made that upon the certificate of the proper officer the owners are reimbursed. I suppose they insure the goods.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Suppose goods of the value of $500 are in the custom house at Ottawa and $250 worth of these goods are lost while there. How does the minister recoup the owner of the goods ?

Mr. PATERSON. We do not assume any liability or responsibility for them.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I would like to have an answer to my question, whether the minister thinks it would increase the work of the staff very much to have the statistics compiled as they used to be ?

Mr. PATERSON. We think that to take the port of exit as the basis for our statistics of exports secures much greater accuracy. If some system can be devised whereby that accuracy can be maintained and we could at the same time meet the hon. gentleman's view, I would be very willing to adopt it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Of what use is the Department of Trade and Commerce ? It issues a report in addition to the trade and navigation returns which are isued by the Customs Department. The report of the Department of Trade and Commerce ought to give credit to each town for the value of the goods exported from that town. We have a town which manufactures goods very largely and ships them to foreign countries, but it does not figure in the reports as having exported a dollar's worth, although we have to make entry for the export of the goods. They are credited to the port from which they take their departure. If the Department of Trade and Commerce is going to do any work in the interest of the country, I think it ought to take up that matter.

Mr. PATERSON. If it is done, it will have to be done through the Customs Department, which gets the original invoices. The information on which the report of the Department of Trade and Commerce is based is obtained from the Customs Department.

Mr. TAYLOR. Then, what is the use of duplicating the work ?

Mr. PATERSON. The Department of Trade and Commerce has other branches, such as commercial agencies and the tariffs of other countries.

Mr. TAYLOR. I do not see that the Department of Trade and Commerce is doing much for the country, but this is something that ought to be done.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. I do not think I made myself clear to the minister. Suppose the goods are shipped from some port in England to Canada and are in charge of the government officers in the government warehouse, and some of these goods are lost. Surely the government would make the deficiency good ?

Mr. PATERSON. No, we do not.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Never have done it ?

Mr. PATERSON. No, I believe not.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Would it not be a very good time to begin to do justice ? How is the owner of the goods to be recouped for his loss ?

Mr. PATERSON. We would not compel him to pay the duty if the goods were destroyed; but we could not hold ourselves responsible for losses. The owners put the goods there at their own risk. It is our bounden duty to give care to them, but it would not do for us to admit liability for them.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Another matter. Some four or five years ago the Minister of Trade and Commerce promised to publish an annual statement showing the freight rates and passenger rates on the various railways between important points in Canada, the rates between the seaports of Canada and the principal seaports of various outside countries, and also the through freight rates from various points in Canada to important points in foreign countries. These were all to be compiled so that we would know the local rates and the through rates. I would be very pleased if the Minister of Customs would draw the attention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce to that matter.

Customs—miscellaneous—printing and stationery, subscriptions to commercial papers, flags, dating stamps, locks, instruments, &c., for various ports of entry, legal expenses and uniforms for customs officers, $37,500.

Mr. PATERSON. We are asking for as much for nine months as we asked last year for the whole year. There will have to be a considerable amount of extra printing done during this year, if the tariff is to be revised in November, and in other ways.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister spoke of some reduction in expense on account of the new arrangement made with regard to bonding warehouses. Has he decreased his estimates any on that account ?

Mr. PATERSON. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why do you not ?

Mr. PATERSON. We need that as well as this. We would have had to ask for a little more than we have here if we had not had that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How much does it amount to ?

Mr. PATERSON. Under the old arrangement, about $16,000.

Customs—amount required to meet expenditures in the Yukon Territory, $37,500.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why do you keep that separate ?

Mr. PATERSON. For comparison as much as anything, I suppose.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think the Post Office Department has done away with the system of keeping a separate account for the Yukon Territory, and I think that the sooner the same thing is done by the Customs Department the better.

Mr. PATERSON. Of course, so far as the percentage of total expenditure is concerned ; the Yukon is included with other branches of the service, that is, the cost of collecting the revenue is not shown to be less by keeping the Yukon separate. I do not see why the suggestion made by the leader of the opposition should not be carried out. But, as this was a new item arising after this government took office, it was commenced in this form and has been carried on in that way. I am inclined to agree with the hon. gentleman that the time has come when it might be fairly dealt with in the same way as the other provinces.

Mr. HENDERSON. That is, as in other things, the government in this case adopted, largely, the policy of their predecessors.

Mr. PATERSON. We could not do that with reference to the Yukon, for there was practically nothing of it before our time,—only a little gold dust came down for a year or two before we came into office.

Miscellaneous — amount required to pay Messrs. I. G. Baker & Company customs duties paid by them at customs stations in the Northwest Territories in the fiscal year ended June 30, 1880, on supplies for the Department of Indian Affairs and for the Northwest Mounted Police, $2,033,07.

That is an item, hon. members will see at once, requires some explanation. I have all the papers here. I would not ask parliament to vote the money now unless hon. members are perfectly satisfied with the explanation I shall give. I have here the full file of papers in the case, which hon. members can look over. I cannot formally lay it on the table, because this is not a copy and is required in the department. This is a very old claim dating back to 1880. I suppose the department could have dealt with this itself, at any rate through the Governor in Council. But, as it dates back so far, I did not think it wise to deal with it in that way, but decided to ask for a vote of the House. I believe that it is a just claim, but I believe that the judgment of parliament with regard to it should be asked.

Mr. HENDERSON. Every man who is interested could not have an opportunity to peruse the documents. Could not the minister give us an idea of what they contain ?

Mr. PATERSON. I shall be glad to explain the matter in a general way. This firm of I. G. Baker & Co. were a mercantile firm in Montana, in the early days, before the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway. No doubt, the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) would remember them. In those days the government made purchases, from this firm of goods for the Indians and the Northwest Mounted Police, as it was easier to get the goods in from Montana—from Fort Benton I believe it was—than by the long overland haul from Winnipeg. Large quantities of goods were bought from I. G. Baker & Co. in that way. Up to 1880, these goods were bought on the basis of free delivery—no customs duty to be charged. In 1879-80, orders were given for goods on that same understanding. There had been a change of government meanwhile, and, when the new government came in, there was an alteration in the plan, and the policy was adopted of charging customs duty.

Mr. BERGERON. Where was that new government ? Not in Ottawa ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Not in 1880.

Mr. PATERSON. They came in 1879.

Mr. BERGERON. No ; there was a change of government in 1878.

Mr. PATERSON. Very well, that would be the change of government referred to ; —the papers disclose the whole transaction. The goods were brought in with the understanding with the government that they were to come in duty free.

Mr. BERGERON. For whom were these purchases made ?

Mr. PATERSON. For the Northwest Mounted Police and the starving Indians.

Mr. BERGERON. That is the reason no duty was paid—because they were imported for the government ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, it was perfectly legitmate. The point I am getting at is that there was a change and it was decided that the goods must pay duty. Messrs. Baker & Co. say that they were not notified of that change, but from the time they were notified they paid duty on goods sold in the same way. This $2,033.07 is to refund duties paid by them on the goods brought in before they were notified that duty would be charged. If hon. gentlemen will look at the papers in the case they will see that nowhere did the government dispute—so far as we can see—the justice of the claim. But the position seemed to be this : The Customs Department took the ground that they would not remit these duties, but that the Indian Department could get a vote from parliament and pay them. And so it went backward and forward between the two departments until we came into office in 1896. It can readily be understood that when I became minister and an old claim of this kind came before me, I hesitated about it, for, if the claim was a just one it should have been settled before. And so it went on year after year, the firm constantly pressing their claim. So far as the money is concerned, I suppose it does not amount to anything, because, I understand this is a millionaire firm. But Mr. Conrad, the man with whom we have dealt has maintained his right. Finally I said, we will go into the matter thoroughly and see what it means. I should have explained that a further cause of delay was that some of the papers were lost for a time as a result of transmission between the departments. But Mr. McDougald, the commissioner of customs, making a diligent search, found the missing papers. He is satisfied that there is absolute proof of the bona fides and the justice of the claim, and we think that, in justice, it ought to be paid.

Mr. BERGERON. Does this firm still exist ?

Mr. PATERSON. I suppose they are in business yet.

Mr. BERGERON. It was an old firm in 1880.

Mr. PATERSON. This Mr. Conrad, I believe, is a member of the firm. But, if parliament will vote the money—

Mr. BERGERON. The government will find some one to accept it.

Mr. PATERSON. The commissioner, of course, will see to it that the money goes to the person who is entitled to it. As the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) asked me to read the papers, in the case I will.

Mr. BERGERON. Before the minister goes on with that, there is one point I would like to have cleared up. Why should the government repay the money paid by these gentlemen for customs duties on these goods ? Did not they repay themselves in the price at which they sold the goods to the officers of the government at the time ? After all, that money went into the treasury through the customs, and it was paid for goods delivered to the government through another departement. How can it be that the government owes this money ?

Mr. PATERSON. The government owes the money because the goods were ordered by the Department of the Interior, and ordered on the understanding that they were to come in free as goods ordered by a department of the government. When they came in the Customs Department insisted upon duty being paid.

Mr. BERGERON. And when the goods were delivered to the Mounted Police or to the Indians, how were they paid ?

Mr. PATERSON. The Department of the Interior paid them their contract price for the goods. The Customs Department had no right to take this money from them.

Mr. HAGGART. When they presented their bill did they charge for the goods plus customs ?

Mr. PATERSON. No, the goods were all brought in as they had been for years before under that clause of the tariff respecting goods ordered by a department of the government.

Mr. BERGERON. Did they make a claim immediately ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, immediately, and renewed it from year to year until I came in. Then they renewed it with me, but it being an old claim and some papers being mislaid, I did not take it up.

Mr. HAGGART. But when they sent their bill to the Department of the Interior they charged the value of the goods plus the customs they had to pay ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. They probably did that, but I suppose the answer was that the goods were purchased at a contract price, and that was the only price the Department of the Interior would pay. I imagine they have done what the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) has said, otherwise they would not be making a claim now. As I understand, the Department of the Interior purchased the goods at a fixed price, which price contemplated no payment of customs duty, as it had not been the practice to charge customs duty in the past. The Department of Customs altered its policy, and the company was obliged to pay customs duty. If they had known that in advance they would have added the customs duties to the price which they demanded from the Department of the Interior. Not having done that, they ask for a refund.

Mr. PATERSON. Quite so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But we would like to know when they first made the claim. If they did not make the claim at the time the hon. member for Lanark mentions, when did they first make it ? I would suppose they made it when they sent in their bill for the goods.

Mr. PATERSON. There is a memorandum prepared by the Customs Department on the subject, and I will read that.

Mr. HENDERSON. I did not mean that the hon. gentleman should read all the items but make a general statement.

Mr. PATERSON. I may say that Col. Fred. White, of the Northwest Mounted Police, says that he has actual knowledge of the facts, and that the claim is a just one. He knows that the question passed backwards and forwards between the company and the department.

Mr. BERGERON. I suggest that we let the item stand for a couple of days until we make some inquiry.

Mr. PATERSON. As the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) has asked me about it, and now that the subject is commenced, I will read the memorandum of the commissioner of Customs.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have got all the information from the Minister I expected to get. I only wanted a history of the transaction, I am not particular about the items.

Mr. PATERSON. The history of the claim is as follows :

Mr. BERGERON. There is no use reading it if it is allowed to stand.

Mr. PATERSON. Having said that much, I think I will just read the memorandum of the commissioner of Customs. I cannot lay it on the table of the House, for it is not a copy.

The particulars of the claim are as follows :

For Indian supplies—	
On cattle delivered at Battleford..	$1,050 40
On 8 ploughs delivered at Fort Walsh.	40 00
On axes and hardware delivered at Fort Walsh..	28 65
On 1,000 sacks of flour..	250 00
	1,369 05
Vouchers for above forwarded to Deputy Superintendent General Indian Affairs, April 29, 1881.	
On seeds for farmers, May 26, 1880, vouchers attached..	76 67
On Pemmican sent to Battleford.. ..	52 00
On 723 sacks of flour, April 7, 1880.. ..	180 75
On 260 sacks of flour, June 23, 1880..	65 00
Total for Indians..	1,743 47
For police supplies..	289 60
Amount..	2,033 07

Mr. BERGERON. Those were goods imported from the States ?

Mr. PATERSON. Certainly.

The Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs in a letter to the Commissioner of Customs on the 12th June, 1883, makes the following statement :

I have the honour to transmit to you herewith for perusal a file No. 15282 of papers relative to a claim made by Messrs. I. G. Baker & Company, of Fort Benton, United States, for the refund of customs duties paid by them at Fort Walsh, Northwest Territories, in 1879, on cattle, flour, seeds and implements of husbandry purchased from them at various dates in 1879 for this department, to be used for the relief of distress amongst starving Indians within the Territories, and for aiding Indians in the cultivation of their reserves.

In connection with this subject previous correspondence has passed between our depart-

ments, but I desire now to call your attention particularly to the letters herewith of the 12th of January, 1881, 7th March, 1882, 14th August, 1882, and 8th May, 1883, addressed by the Messrs. Baker to this department and that from Colonel McLeod, of 29th May, 1882, in the closing paragraph of which he distinctly states that the agreement made by him with Baker & Company in 1878-9 was, so far as the supplies for the Northwest Mounted Police are concerned, on the express condition of free entry, a condition which was renewed for 1879-80, and this statement appears to be corroborated by the letter of the 31st ultimo addressed to this department by the Comptroller of the Northwest Mounted Police.

The history of the purchases on which this department is asked to procure a refund of duty for the Messrs. Baker & Company appears to be as follows : That in September of 1879, Colonel McLeod was directed while at Fort Benton to purchase supplies for this department, to be used for the relief of starving Indians in treaties 4 and 6, and that acting on his instructions he purchased beef, cattle, flour, &c., from Messrs. Baker & Company, who had always furnished supplies for the Northwest Mounted Police on the distinct understanding that they should be entered duty free, that nevertheless customs duties were collected on those supplies to the amount of $1,369.05 by Capt. Crozier, as per receipts herewith, and that duties were levied on other articles which are alleged to have been imported for the use of the mounted police, but were diverted to the use of this department prior to the 1st July, 1880, which dues were paid by Baker & Company, amounting to $374.42, that the traders in Montana declined to deliver supplies in the Northwest Territories on any condition than that of free entry up to 30th June, 1880, and that the Messrs. Baker & Company, in having been compelled to pay duty on supplies purchased under an agreement that no such charge would be made, are being unfairly dealt with.

It is hoped that favourable consideration may be given by the Department of Customs to the application of Messrs. Baker & Company, and that there may appear to be no obstacle in the taking of such steps to procure a refund of the sum claimed as may appear to you necessary.

That is the way in which the Deputy Minister of the Interior vouches for the correctness of the claim.

Mr. Fred. White, comptroller of the Northwest Mounted Police, writes as follows to the Commissioner of Customs on the 28th April, 1896, in respect to this matter :

On the 20th October, 1893, I forwarded to the Commissioner of Customs a file of papers respecting a claim of Messrs. I. G. Baker & Company for a refund of $289.60, representing duty collected from them on supplies imported for the Northwest Mounted Police under a contract covering the fiscal years 1879-80.

In early days, provisions, &c., for the mounted police in the southern part of the Territories were obtained from the United States via the Missouri river, and it was distinctly understood that no customs duties would be charged thereon.

This privilege was discontinued on the 1st July, 1880, since which date duties have been paid by the contractors on all dutiable goods, but the collector of customs at Fort Walsh collected duties on the last shipment of supplies received under the contract for the fiscal year 1879-80, hence this claim.

As Messrs. Baker & Company are persistently urging a settlement, I beg that you will be good enough to place me in a position to give them a definite reply as to whether the refund can be made by your department.

The comptrolller further certifies that the vouchers showing the payment of the above duties ($289.60) were forwarded to the Customs Department with the letter of 20th October, 1893.

The payment of customs duties by Messrs. I. G. Baker & Company in the fall of 1879 and spring of 1880 to the extent claimed is established by the returns of the customs officers for that period, the following amounts being specifically noted :

For Indian Department—		
Fort Walsh—		
October, 1879..	No. 346	$1,050 40
March, 1880..	" 347	260 90
March, 1880..	" 348	182 75
October, 1879..	" —	52 20
May, 1880..	" 365	76 67
June, 1880	" 373	65 00
June, 1880..	" 369	20 00
For Northwest Mounted Police—		
May, 1880..	No. 36	269 60

Mr. BERGERON. It covers more than one year?

Mr. PATERSON. No, the year 1879-1880.

Mr. BERGERON. And 1881.

Mr. PATERSON. The demand started in 1881, but the claim covers a little under a year, from October, 1879, to May, 1880.

Mr. BERGERON. When were they notified of the change of policy of the government?

Mr. PATERSON. At the end of the financial year 1880.

The Deputy Superintendent of Indian Affairs states that receipts for $1,369.05 customs duties were sent to the Customs Department with his letter of June 12, 1883.

In the customs returns from Fort Macleod for the quarter ending 31st December, 1879, the customs officer transmits a statement of goods delivered free, being supplies for use of Northwest Mounted Police force, duties uncollected as per agreement made with department.

In the tender of I. G. Baker & Company, April 23, 1877, it is stipulated that the articles are to be delivered relieved of custom house dues.

The Deputy Minister of the Interior states (in regard to Indian supplies) that 'an arrangement will be made with the Customs Department to have the cattle so to be delivered to this department admitted free of all customs charges or dues.'

Provisions for free entry of articles for the government were contained in the tariff of 1879, as follows :

Articles imported by and for the use of the Dominion government, or any of the departments thereof, or for the Senate and House of Commons.

Duties on supplies for the mounted police and Indiass appear to have been collected in 1879 and subsequent years, in pursuance of instructions from the Customs Department, as a matter of policy.

I. G. Baker & Company contend, however, that their contract for 1879-80 provided for exemption from customs duties.

This does not appear to be denied, nor the merits of the claim disputed.

The delay in adjusting the matter appears to have been caused in some measure by the loss of the vouchers and claim papers sent to the Customs Department in 1881. When the matter was brought up again in 1893 and 1896, while the claim was admitted, the departments concerned did not agree as to whether a refund should be made by the customs or the amount voted by parliament.

This is a summary of the case. The Department of Customs is satisfied that it is a case in which a refund in justice, ought to be made and I suppose one which might have been made under authority of the Governor in Council, but, of course, we did not think that would be a proper thing to do with a claim as old as this one. We want this money voted by parliament after being placed in full possession of the facts. If hon. gentlemen feel that they have sufficient information we might pass the item now or we will let it stand and give them an opportunity to go through the papers.

Mr. BERGERON. It is not a big item, but it is an extraordinary procedure. This claim is 26 years old.

Mr. LANCASTER. I would like to ask the hon. minister if the claim is still the property of the original claimant or has he assigned it to some one else?

Mr. PATERSON. A gentleman representing the firm of I. G. Baker & Co. has been pressing this claim personally, and the correspondence is in the name of I. G. Baker & Co. It is the same firm.

Mr. LANCASTER. There has been no assignment of the claim to anybody?

Mr. PATERSON. No, and as I said before, I do not think it is the matter of the money they care about. This is a millionaire firm.

Mr. LANCASTER. Millionaires are fonder of money than some of us poor people.

Mr. PATERSON. Well, I know, but they feel that this is a just claim and that they have not been treated right. I feel that it was only right that we should pay it. Mr. White, the comptroller of the Mounted Police, who has personal knowledge, says that he knows it is right.

Mr. BERGERON. How was it that if Mr. White knew he never convinced the minister that it should be paid?

Mr. PATERSON. The whole difficulty, as far as I can make out, was that the Customs Department made this new rule that they were to pay the duties and they did so, I suppose, in ignorance of the fact that this contract had been made previously with this firm. Then they got the duties and since they got them the Customs Department was not ready to give up any money they should not give up. They said: 'No, we will not reduce our revenue that much, Let the department that ordered these goods take a vote in parliament and pay the Customs Department. Then it was thrown backwards and forwards in that way.

Mr. BERGERON. These contractors knew very well the kind of a contract they had signed. They signed a contract by which they were to bring in goods, paying duty, and if the party who received the goods was informed of one thing without the other being informed of the same condition, it is something that I cannot understand. Neither can I understand why it was not paid before if it is really due.

Mr. PATERSON. The accountant of the department who has gone through the papers says that these duties were collected by Capt. Crozier ; he got ten per cent on the collection, and he stipulated that they should pay although they were entitled to free entry.

Mr. BERGERON. We will look over these papers.

Mr. PATERSON. I am in no hurry. In fact I am not concerned whether it is paid or not, but I think it should be.

Item allowed to stand.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am in the hands of the House whether we shall proceed or adjourn.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the government is ready with any business I presume we had better go on.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 19) respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Guthrie.

Bill (No. 20) to incorporate the Canadian Bible Society, Auxiliary to the British and Foreign Bible Society.—Mr. Cockshutt.

Bill (No. 21) respecting the Huron and Erie Loan and Savings Company.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 22) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 23) to incorporate the Quebec Midland Railway Company.—Mr. Bureau.

Bill (No. 24) respecting the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Railway Company.—Mr. McColl.

Bill (No. 25) respecting the Niagara, Queenston and St. Catharines Railway Company.—Mr. Clarke.

Bill (No. 26) respecting the West Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Pardee.

Bill (No. 27) to incorporate the Kamloops and Yellow Head Pass Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 28) respecting the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company.—Mr. Sloan.

Bill (No. 29) respecting the Vancouver and Lulu Island Railway Company.—Mr. Macpherson.

Bill (No. 30) respecting the Kootenay and Arrowhead Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 31) respecting the White Horse and Alsek Railway Company.—Mr. Macpherson.

Bill (No. 32) respecting the Nakusp and Slocan Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 33) respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 34) respecting the Columbia and Kootenay Railway and Navigation Company.—Mr. Galliher.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Post Office, outside service—salaries and allowances, including salary of $950 for Mr. P. C. N. Dorion, a railway mail clerk, reinstated in the service on the 30th September, 1898, and salary of $626 for Mr. John McAfee, to be reinstated as a letter carrier at Montreal and to be classed in grade 'D,' under the amendment to the Post Office Act, 1902, hereby restoring them to their former status under the Civil Service Superannuation Act on payment of a sum equivalent to the statutory deductions on their respective salaries from the date of dismissal, their services to be considered as continuous, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service or Superannuation Acts, $1,335,134.44.

Mr. BERGERON. Will the Postmaster General explain this ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Postmaster General). This is an increase of $83,940.75 for the twelve months, or about $63,000 for the nine months.

That increase is distributed in this way : An increase in the post office inspectors' offices of $8,330; in the railway mail service of $31,640; and in the city post offices, $43,970.

The $8,330 increase for offices of post office inspectors arises from five increases of $100 a year each, $500; twelve of $50 a year each, $600; three of $20 each, $60; and eight additional clerkships. The items I have given aggregate $8,530, but there is a deduction of $200 in respect of the difference between the salaries of clerkships that have become vacant, amounting to $4,500, and the $4,300 which we pay to the persons appointed or promoted to fill these vacancies.

Mr. BERGERON. Would my hon. friend explain the cases of Dorion and McAfee ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. These were two cases each of a special character. Mr. Dorion was a railway mail clerk in the Quebec district. He was appointed in 1885 and in December, 1897, he was dismissed from the service on the ground that he had taken an unduly active part in the Dominion elections of 1886. On the 1st of October, 1898, that is ten months after he was so dismissed, he was reinstated in the service, having expressed regret for what he had done. Since his reinstatement his services have been satisfactory. His explanation, I am told, was that what he did was done in thoughtlessness rather than with any intention of being a partisan, and he was reinstated accordingly in October, 1898. Before his dismissal he had been under the Superannuation Act. On being reinstated he came under the Retirement Act which had in the meantime been passed and provision is now being made to restore him to his original status under the Superannuation Act.

Mr. BERGERON. I presume he has taken no part in elections since then.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Not that I am aware of. He was reinstated under an order in council, a copy of which I have, in September, 1898.

Mr. BERGERON. Is it the same in the case of Mr. McAfee ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Not quite. Mr. McAfee was first appointed in 1882, as a letter carrier in Montreal. In October, 1903, he failed to report for duty and although repeated efforts were made to find him the postmaster reported that he was unable to do so for several days. When McAfee did appear he pleaded illness as the cause of his absence but as there had been previous occurrences of the same character and those instances at all events had not always been what would ordinarily be called illness, his explanation was not considered satisfactory and his services were dispensed with by an order in council passed in December, 1903. It was subsequently found that his illness was, on this particular occasion, real.

Mr. BERGERON. Not like the others ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. And, as he had been dismissed in the view that his illness was a pretense, when it was discovered that his illness was bona fide and that he had been at his father's house during the time he was being sought for, he was re-employed, in the first place temporarily, in June, 1904, and from that time forward his services have been reported as being entirely satisfactory. What is now being done is to reinstate him in his former position as a letter carrier at $2 a day in grade 'D' under the provisions of the amendment of 1902, that being the grade to which

his previous services would have entitled him if he had never been suspended or dismissed. It is proposed to reinstate him to the status he had under the Civil Service Act. He had been a carrier since 1882, some twenty-one years at the time of his dismissal.

Mr. BERGERON. Do I understand that all the money he would have earned in the service is to be paid to him ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. He is not paid for the time he was not in the service.

Mr. BERGERON. Each of these men was under the Superannuation Act at the time of dismissal ? But when they were dismissed would this not all be at an end ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. It would be but for this legislation to restore each man to his original status, so all they will lose is the time they were out of the service.

Mr. BLAIN. Was any investigation made at the time when these two mail clerks were dismissed ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The circumstances, I am told, in regard to Dorion were that he was practically the candidate for the county of Quebec in 1896, that he stumped the county actively and retired from the service to all intents and purposes before the election day. It was a matter of notoriety in the locality at the time; I do not think there was any official investigation.

Mr. BERGERON. He did not expect there would be any change of government so soon.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Presumably. The other one was a case where there was an effort to find out and it was supposed at the time of dismissal that the man's absence was not due to any real illness but that that was a pretense. When it was discovered a few months afterwards that the case had been one of real illness, the mas was reinstated by order in council.

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask if it is necessary now for railway mail clerks to pass the civil service examination before they are employed ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. To be regularly employed, yes, but under the statute, a man may be appointed to the position of porter, and serve as a railway mail porter for a period of probation.

Mr. BENNETT. What wages per diem are paid to the railway mail porters ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. They start at $400 a year. The amount is regulated by statute, I think.

Mr. BERGERON. Does my hon. friend know that there is a great demand for more letter carriers in Montreal ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I have not heard of it.

Mr. BERGERON. The newspapers have been complaining about it very often.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The report of our superintendent is to the contrary, that the letter carriers are not working other than reasonable hours, and that there is not a deficiency of men. I may say that petitions have been received from letter carriers' associations in nearly, if not quite, every city in the Dominion asking for amelioration of their conditions in the way of shorter hours but none have asked for additional help so far as I have seen.

Mr. BERGERON. I suppose the two things may be taken together: if there were more help the hours would be shorter. I imagine that is the meaning of what I have read, and also that they asked an increase of wages. I was under the impression that some memorials had been sent to the Post Office Department to that effect.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. A number of such memorials have been received, as I have just stated, and are under consideration. No deputation has been here, however.

Mr. BERGERON. I believe my hon. friend from Jacques-Cartier the other day had a question on the paper in regard to more letter carriers.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I have not answered such a question.

Mr. BERGERON. While on this subject I may say that there have been demands for a post office in the eastern part of Montreal. Some very strong demands were made last year upon the predecessor of my hon. friend, and they have continued all the year round. The merchants of that part of the city suffer great inconvenience from not having a building where they can transact business instead of going to the only post office that we have in Montreal to-day. I understand that there has been some discussion as to whether the post office should be in St. James division or in St. Mary's division, but it should be somewhere.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The circumstances to which my hon. friend has referred have been brought to my attention by the members for St. James and St. Mary's divisions, and steps have been taken to relieve the conditions to which he refers. A sub-post office is to be established in the vicinity of St. Catherines and St. Denis streets.

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask the Postmaster General if these so-called mail porters take runs on the trains and act in the capacity of ordinary mail clerks ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. They assist in the service. They are learning their business while acting as porters.

Mr. BENNETT. They have not to pass any examination ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. They have to pass an examination before they can be appointed railway clerks. They are simply on probation as railway mail porters learning their work.

Mr. BENNETT. How many of these approximately have been appointed in the province of Ontario ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Speaking approximately, the number would probably not exceed a dozen.

Post Office Mail Service, $2,250,525.

Mr. BENNETT. I suppose that alludes to the ordinary carriage of mails throughout the country ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Mail service by land and water.

Mr. BENNETT. I am going to make an appeal to the Postmaster General in this connection. Prior to 1896 the custom had prevailed that where tenders had been called for a mail service and a man had placed a vehicle on the road and had got engaged in the service, it was sometimes thought well to give him a contract for the same service for an additional term of three years at the old figure. I think that system was concurred in by all persons as being a fair one, because the fact of tenders having been called for three years before was an evidence that the rate charged was a reasonable one. The late Postmaster General, on coming to power, reviled that system as a very bad one, and there was a famous blue-book published and circulated throughout the country to show that these renewals of contracts were an outrage, and in many cases they were annulled and the service put up to competition. A case has arisen in the east riding of Simcoe to which I am going to draw the attention of the Postmaster General. He is starting out with a clean sheet, great things are expected of him, and he is not to be saddled with the crimes of his predecessor. In this connection I will read an answer which the Postmaster General gave to a question in regard to the mail service between Coldwater, Lawson and Lovering, and which is to be found at page 347 of the unrevised Hansard. It is as follows :

Hon. Mr. AYLESWORTH (Postmaster General). A contract for this service was let by tender in 1897 and awarded to the lowest tenderer, W. H. Lovering, at $130 a year. On its expiring in 1901 it was renewed for four years ending on the 31st March, 1905, and it was then renewed for another term of four years from 31st March, 1905, with the same contractor at $156 a year.

This contract had originally been placed at $130 a year after fair competition, and it was renewed for three years; and last year the then Postmaster General added $26 a year to the amount of the contract without putting it up to public competition. Politically I would rather have the Postmaster General leave it where it is, for this reason. This Mr. Lovering, I need not say, is a follower of the hon. gentlemen opposite, and a very strong one ; but his own neighbours, Liberals, are anxious to tender for this contract ; and yet the Postmaster General takes $26 of the people's money and makes a present of it to Mr. Lovering. The Postmaster General had as much right to give Mr. Lovering a contract at $1,000 increase as at $26. On the question of principle it would be exactly the same; on the question of money it would be different. The Postmaster General of last year stultified himself in doing that. The present Postmaster General has this case before him ; he is ratifying it if he continues the contract. Personally and politically, I say I prefer that he will, because he will simply disgust the Liberals in that neighbourhood. They have an idea of common honesty and common decency, and they think that this contract should be put up to public competition. This Mr. Lovering, whom no doubt through the defeated candidate or somebody else succeeded in persuading the late Postmaster General that he was the whole thing in that neighbourhood, is not it by any means. I have expectations of the Postmaster General that he is not going to come down to that sort of thing, but will see to it that there must be fair, honest public competition ; that he will see to it that Liberals and Conservatives alike have the opportunity to tender. So I am going to ask the Postmaster General if he intends to continue this contract to Mr. Lovering at $156 for the balance of the term which expired four years from the 31st of March, 1905 ; or will tenders be called for, leaving the contract open for the competition ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I am afraid I am not able to give my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) a categorical answer without giving the circumstances also. The course which the circumstances seem to call for, if the difference in the amount was sufficient to be talked about, would be to compare with the cost of similar services in other parts of the country the amount being paid to this contractor. Everything depends on the frequency of the service, the distance travelled, the amount of work done. And it may be that, though there has been an increase of $26 upon the original contract price, the amount is still far below what would ordinarily be expected to be paid for services of the character performed. Of course, tenders cannot be called for without advertisement, and this is attended with more or less expense. It might well have been considered by any one in charge of this department that, if the service could be arranged for at an increased expenditure of only $26 a year or 50 cents a week, it would

be better to make the renewal on those terms than to go to the expense of calling for tenders.

Mr. BENNETT. I am surprised to hear the Postmaster General (Mr. Aylesworth) talk as he does with the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) sitting beside him. When tenders were desired for the supply of flour for the Kingston penitentiary, the Department of Justice thought fit to advertise in the Acton 'Free Press,'—now the Postmaster General knows what the Acton 'Free Press' may be and what it is—the Alexandria 'News,' the Collingwood 'Bulletin,' the Eganville 'Leader'—where is Eganville? Somewhere in the county of Renfrew, is it not?—the Listowel 'Banner,' the Milton 'Reformer,' the Ridgetown 'Plaindealer'—that is rather a misnamer for such dealing—the 'Register,' of Toronto—I do not know of that paper at all—some paper with an unpronounceable name published in the village of Athabaskaville, and so on through the list. To cap the whole thing, they went away out to British Columbia to advertise for tenders for flour to be supplied to the penitentiary at Dorchester, New Brunswick. In view of the action of his colleague the Minister of Justice, the Postmaster General can hardly justify his plea for not calling for tenders. As I understand his argument, he intends to disregard, whenever he thinks fit, the healthy principle of competition by public calls for tender. If he thinks it right, or his officers think it right, they intend to let these contracts without competition. If, when a contract is to be given, the Postmaster General thinks that nothing is to be gained by public competition, he will give the contract to his political friends. The Postmaster General must know that in these country districts a large number of people wish to tender. The route in this case is only four or five miles and a lad can carry the bag in and out from the station at Coldwater. I can tell the hon. Postmaster General that more Liberals than Conservatives are disgusted at this paltry policy. It is such a picayune thing for a great department of the government to be pulled this way or that by a little political pooh bah and compelled to employ him at his own figure. If I were to consider this thing merely from a political point of view, I would say that I hope the Postmaster General will stick to the position his predecessor took. His predecessor did a number of these acts in East Simcoe, and the more he did of them the more he disgusted Liberals there. And it was the same way with every department of the government that gave out contracts, whether the Marine Department, the Public Works or the Post Office. In that view I could hope that the Postmaster General would leave this where it stands and that Mr. Lovering will have this advantage. His neighbours will have a way of getting even with the government, even though they will have to wait two or three years.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. So far as the hope, expressed by my hon. friend with regard to this particular matter are concerned, I think they are likely to be realized. I think this will be allowed to stand exactly where it stands to-day. I notice by the statement that he has made that this route is five miles—

Mr. BENNETT. Both ways.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I understood the hon. gentleman to say that this was five miles from the station. The mail carrier makes a journey of five miles each way, or ten miles for the round trip. This he does six times a week, which means that he travels sixty miles a week, or for the fifty-two weeks of the year, 3,120 miles. So, he is getting paid at the rate of five cents a mile. I should think that that was eminently reasonable.

Mr. BENNETT. Then, if I understand the Postmaster General, wherever he thinks it eminently reasonable, these contracts will be let without public competition.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I can only say, in answer, that if I find a contract expiring where the service is being performed at the rate of five cents per mile, I would hesitate—unless the amount involved was very large—to call for tenders. And, I may say, that, in the short experience I have had in the department, I have found more than one instance where calling for tenders produced no tender at anything like so small a figure as that at which the service was being performed.

Mr. BENNETT. And, I take it, not only will he make arrangements at the old figure, but he will, if he sees fit, increase the amount as in the present case.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I think I should hesitate about increasing the amount. But, of course, every case must be regarded as one for the exercise of good, common sense judgment.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the department is to proceed on the principle of public calls for tenders, it could hardly be a matter in the discretion of the minister, as he might exercise his discretion to do away with tenders altogether. The Postmaster General may not be aware that his predecessor cancelled nearly one hundred contracts of this character given shortly before the late government went out in 1896, and he cancelled them for the very reason that tenders had not been called for. I do not think there was a claim in any of these cases, that the amount was not reasonable, and I should doubt very much whether the new advertisements brought in contracts for smaller amounts. Not only that, but, when these contractors sought to assert their rights against the Crown on account of the

cancellation of their contracts, the Postmaster General of that time refused to certify for a petition of right. I think that in every case, so far as my recollection goes, the men were refused any recourse in the Exchequer Court in respect to the claims which they were advised by counsel they had against the Crown. I merely allude to this for the purpose of showing that the policy of the government seems to be very different from that announced in the first instance.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I want to draw the minister's attention to a matter which has been recently brought to my notice concerning the postmaster in the town of Leamington. I understood the policy announced by the government the other day was that a postmaster should receive enough salary to remunerate him properly—and I understand the salary was placed at about $1,000 by the Postmaster General—so that he might not need engage in any other business. I find on looking into the matter that the postmaster at Leamington is getting $1,250 per annum, and in addition to holding that position I find that he is police magistrate, he is treasurer of the town, he is collector of water rates, he is collector of gas rates, he draws by-laws for the town of Leamington, he is secretary of the public school board and treasurer of the public school board; he also works a fruit farm of about four acres; he is operator of the government telephone to Pelee Island, and also overseer of repairs to the Pelee Island cable. I am not going to ask the minister now to say whether it is the fact, but I understand this gentleman was also engaged as inspector of the cable to Pelee Island in the year 1905. I also find that his son is a clerk in the post office, with which I have no fault to find, but the information I have is that he also has an office as collector in the post office building. The son is collector of the town of Leamington, and holding his office in the post office building is very much to the detriment of those who get their mail there. Now, if the rule laid down the other day by the Minister is to be carried out, a rule on which I would congratulate the Postmaster General, I would ask him to look into this matter and take some action.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I shall be happy to do so. I should think that the circumstances as narrated by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clements) indicate that the postmaster of Leamington enjoys to a very large extent the confidence of the community.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Then I understand that the minister has changed the policy which he announced in the House the other day?

Mr. FOWLER. It seems to me that in view of the fact that only the other day we heard of a postmaster being dismissed because he was engaged in other occupations besides that of postmaster, that the answer which the new Postmaster General has given to my hon. friend from West Kent (Mr. Clements) was a very flippant one, and a very improper answer. Now, the hon. gentleman is new to this House and he had better understand at once that ministers are not in the habit of giving answers of that kind to proper inquiries made on this side of the House. It is not the best course for the hon. gentleman to pursue. This is not his first offence either. The other day he offended in a similar manner, and it would perhaps expedite the passing of his estimates if he were a little less flippant. Now, it seems to me that in view of the statements made by my hon. friend from Kent, some consideration should be promised by the minister with respect to this poo bah; this gentleman who holds so many offices besides that of postmaster. He is violating the rule laid down that a man holding an office and getting a salary of $1,000 or upwards should hold only the one office of postmaster. This man, I understand, gets a salary of $1,250, yet he has all these other positions. Not only that, but he used the post office for the purpose of carrying on his own private business, and his son uses it as well. Now, all these things are certainly a violation of the rule laid down, and the minister should promise to investigate this matter. If he finds the facts as stated by my hon. friend from Kent, this postmaster, dyed-in-the-wool Grit though he be, and no doubt he is—because no decent Tory would take such an advantage of his position—should be brought rigorously within the rule.

Mr. BENNETT. I was mistaken in saying that the service was a daily one, I find it is only three times a week. Now, for the benefit of the Postmaster General I will tell him this, that a pretty good Grit, and one who has a great deal more influence than Mr. Lovering, is carrying the mail in that neighbourhood, and he makes six trips a week. Mr. Lovering has $156 a year for his services and this other contractor only receives $137. Both carry the mails about the same distance, but the one makes six trips in the week instead of three, and he gets $160 a year, although he makes twice as many trips, he only gets $160. Here is another one, practically the same distance, who gets $200 and makes double the number of trips The report will show that men making twice as many trips are only getting paid about $160 or $170. Now, here is a case where, without a doubt, if the service were put up to honest competition, it would be done much cheaper. If the Postmaster General wants to stick to the position taken by the late Postmaster General, I should be pleased to see him do it. But the action taken by the present Postmaster General now will serve as a precedent in respect to competition. When a local candi-

date, whether he is a defeated candidate or a member, wishes to make a representation, then the Postmaster General will not be bound down by any rules of competition, but he is going to give the contract at his own will and pleasure. Well, we will see what the result will be in a political sense.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) misunderstood me if he thought I said that I intended to follow the recommendation of any member of the House or of any defeated candidate in regard to awarding mail contracts; I made no reference to any such thing, and so far as my experience in the administration of the Post Office Department goes there has been no question or instance, of any such thing. I was referring in what I said when on my feet before with regard to this item, entirely to my own judgment of what a service of the character that this contractor seems to be performing would reasonably be worth. The statute provides that when the amount of the contract exceeds $200 tenders must be called for, but where the amount is less than $200 parliament in its wisdom, I take it, thought it might cost more to call for tenders than to award the contract even though a larger figure was involved. The very figures that my hon. friend has given seem to indicate that for services approximately of this character, a figure from $137 to $160, is a fair one to pay for the work done. In this case the amount paid to this particular man is between the limits mentioned.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think that answer covers the case. The practice followed by his predecessor for years was that in all cases there should be an invitation for public tenders. Now, it is a known fact to those who have been in parliament for some years, though it may not be to the new Postmaster General, that his predecessor cancelled many contracts that had been renewed at a figure below $200 when it was believed by the department that the work was being done very much cheaper.

He gave as his justification for so doing that it was his duty to ask for tenders and in many of these cases, some of which I have knowledge of because some of them were cancelled in my own constituency, tenders were asked for the same work and they were not received at a lower price. Some were given at the same price and some were given at a higher price, but notwithstanding the fact that the same work was tendered upon at a higher price it was justified on the ground that it was the result of public competition. It was contended that the practice which the hon. Postmaster General now defends was not a proper one, that where a contract was less than $200, and that when it knew or believed that the contract was performed for a reasonable figure the department was justified in exercising its judgment and renewing the contract without calling for tenders. That was strongly, vehemently condemned and the contrary principle was supported by many hon. members on the other side of the House. For some time they carried out their views, but after a while the late Postmaster General fell away from his own contentions and he began to renew not only contracts that were under $200, but I am told—and I believe correctly—some contracts that were over $200. It is not whether the judgment of the departments be correct that it is being done cheaply to-day, but it is whether the principle was wrong before. If it were wrong before it must be wrong now. It was declared to be wrong before. It is a principle that the hon. gentleman's predecessor declared was radically wrong. If I understand the principles of the incoming minister he is obliged to adopt the policy of his predecessor and defend it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, the policy of the government. No incoming minister can differ either on the platform or in this House from his colleagues; otherwise he would not be in the cabinet, because the fact of his being in the cabinet is an acknowledgment that he is in accord with the Prime Minister and his colleagues. The fact that he took the place of his predecessor as Postmaster General imposes upon him the obligation of defending the principles of his predecessor. Instead of that he takes the very reverse ground. He takes the ground we took years ago and he stands exactly on the same ground which was contended over and over again by his predecessors was wrong.

Mr. LENNOX. Mr. Chairman, I would like to call the hon. Postmaster General's attention to some questions in connection with the post office that probably he has not yet taken into consideration and which might lead him to believe that the statement that the rate charged in the case brought up by my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) was reasonable was a somewhat hasty judgment. I have before me a statement of the actual expenses in connection with a number of post offices that I collected last year, which will be found at page 2074 of 'Hansard' of last session. I find that in South Simcoe the average rate per mile is not ten cents as in the case brought forward by the hon. member for East Simcoe, but the average rate is 3·94 cents a mile. It is true that in some ridings the rate is higher, but there are peculiar circumstances that occasion that, perhaps. For instance, when I go from South Simcoe to North Simcoe I find that the rate advances a little, but in that case the government have an ardent supporter in the person of the representative of North

Simcoe, and in that case the average rate is 4·53 cents per mile. There is one higher still and I think it is probably the highest in the province of Ontario. There is perhaps even greater reason why it should be higher still as it is in a riding whose interests will commend themselves no doubt to the favourable consideration of the Postmaster General and that is North York. In that riding it is higher than in North Simcoe, but it is only 5·30 cents per mile, even in North York ; so that the hon. Postmaster General probably will have reason to reconsider his position. When he says that he would think the rate in the case of the Coldwater mail carrying contract reasonable, it might be worth while for the hon. Postmaster General to consider this peculiar discrepancy. I find too in comparing South and North Simcoes, represented by members of different political complexions, that some peculiar discrepancies occur in the cases of short distances. For instance, distances of less than a mile. In that case the average per trip in South Simcoe is only 8·42 cts. a trip whereas in North Simcoe it is 12·62 cts. per trip; a difference which might be capable of explanation in some way, but which suggests explanations not favourable to the theory of proper administration of the department. From what the hon. member for East Simcoe says he hopes great things of the new Postmaster General and I hope that his hopes may be realized, and that among the things that will be improved will be that the rates in these different municipalities, lying alongside one another, and existing under similar conditions. will be more uniform in future than they have been in the past.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think the question which was put to the hon. Postmaster General by my hon. friend from Kent (Mr. Clements) is deserving of a different answer. It was a question that was courteously put, but it was scarcely courteously answered. We are endeavouring to know what principle the post office department will act upon in such cases. I would say to my hon. friend the Postmaster General that from my knowledge of the practice of this House and of the passage of estimates it is not an unreasonable request and is one for which the opposition are justified in expecting a reasonable answer. The answer of the Postmaster General in regard to the postmaster of Cannington was supposed to lay down a certain principle which, we understood would be of universal application. I would like to ask the Postmaster General if that principle does not cover the case which has been referred to. I suppose there is not to be one principle employed for the postmaster at Cannington and another for the postmaster at Leamington. What has been the principle that the Postmaster General acted upon in respect to the postmaster at Cannington and in what respect does that principle not apply to the facts referred to ? Of course, it is not an answer to say that this gentleman enjoys the confidence of his friends. The question is : What is the policy of the Post Office Department ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The subject which the hon. gentleman has just spoken of has been a matter of formal answers which are on the pages of 'Hansard.' In regard to the post office at Leamington I stated in answer to the hon. member for Kent, that if any complaints were made the matter would be investigated. No complaints have been made that I am aware of. If any complaint is made by some person interested in the office as a patron of the office, or not interested, the matter will be dealt with precisely as the Cannington matter was dealt with ; an inspector will be sent to investigate, and depending upon the circumstances reported by the inspector the action of the department will follow.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman has not given an answer as to what the principle was. The answer dealt with the circumstances of the Cannington case but I am still at a loss to know what the principle is. Would I be correct in understanding that a postmaster receiving a salary of $1,000 or $1,200 a year in a small town, is not to be permitted to engage in any other business than the performance of his duties as postmaster. It seems to me that is a very simple question, and one upon which we are entitled to know what the policy of the government is.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I gave an answer the other day as laying down the policy that, where the salary attached to the office seemed adequate to the maintenance of the postmaster, it was undesirable that the postmaster should engage in other duties. I cannot speak with regard to the facts of any particular case without knowing what these facts are, nor make before hand any statement of what may be done in any particular case until the facts of that case are investigated.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understand the Postmaster General to define the principle in this way : That where the salary is reasonably adequate, a postmaster will not be permitted to engage in outside business or employment, and that if the facts are brought to the attention of the Postmaster General he will act accordingly. If that is the Postmaster General's position I understand it, if it is any less than that I do not understand it.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I cannot say more as to the matter of general policy than I have said. In my judgment such a condition of things as is indicated in the answer I made to the hon. member for East Simcoe was an undesirable condition.

Mr. SPROULE. In the answer given to the question of my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett), the Postmaster General set forth what he regarded as the proper principle. The question was :

1. Is it the policy of the Post Office Department to compel postmasters to attend personally to the duties of their office, and not to engage in any other calling ?

2. If so, is regard to be had to the salary paid to the postmaster, or what rule, if any, prevails ?

The answer of the Postmaster General was :

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Postmaster General). It is and has always been the policy and the practice of the department to require postmasters to give personal attention to the duties of their offices, and where a post office is sufficiently important to call for the full time and attention of the postmaster, and the salary adequate for his maintenance, it is considered undesirable that he should engage in any other business.

I understood the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Clements) to say that in the case he cited this postmaster was getting a salary of $1,200 a year and yet he was engaged in several other undertakings, and the Postmaster General has no objection to make. And this, note the fact that the postmaster at Leamington violates the rule which the Postmaster General has laid down as the first act of his official career. That conduct does not come with very good grace from even a new Postmaster General though an allowance should be made for him. Human memory is short, but it is not so short as to forget the rule laid down plainly by the Postmaster General within a week, when to-night we see him attempting to justify a rule the very reverse of that so recently announced by him. The Postmaster General is inconsistent with himself.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The Postmaster General has announced a principle with regard to this matter which he will doubtless find very embarrassing during his tenure of office. I have no quarrel with the postmaster at Leamington. He may be a Liberal or a Conservative so far as I know ; I am not certain of his politics nor do I care. The minister says he has had no complaints in this case, but I can tell him that I have had very serious complaints from Leamington to-day and I was asked personally to bring the matter to the attention of the House. My correspondents in Leamington ventured to congratulate the Postmaster General on the policy which he announced he was going to carry out in this fair Dominion ; to not allow postmasters who get a salary sufficient to keep them comfortably to engage in any other business. The complaints made to me set forth that a number of prominent citizens in Leamington would like to get a chance of tendering for or holding some of the positions now held by the postmaster there. It is mentioned that the postmaster's son is town clerk while at the same time he is clerk of the post office, and the fact that the government pays light, fuel, office rent, and so forth enables him to accept the office of town clerk at a much cheaper rate than can other gentlemen who are not so favoured by the government.

Mr. FOWLER. I can quite understand the difficult position in which the new Postmaster General is placed in a matter of this kind, in view of the fact that he himself, the head of a department, is not satisfied with the salary he receives from this country for performing the duties of his office, but is attending to his private practice in violation of the well known rule that Ministers of the Crown are not supposed to do that kind of thing. Naturally he has a certain kind of sympathy for his fellow pooh-bah the postmaster at Leamington. The Postmaster General thinks it necessary for his friend and co-worker in the cause to eke out the salary which he receives from the Dominion by working along other lines, because the Postmaster General himself is so important a personage in this Dominion that he is not able to get along with his salary from the people of this country, and has to help it along by his private practice which is in direct violation of that well-known rule which prevents Ministers of the Crown attending to private business.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The Postmaster General stated the other day that the postmaster at Cannington had engaged in some other occupation than that of postmaster, and that therefore he retired him. I want to know what the other occupation of the postmaster at Cannington might be.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I have no personal knowledge on the subject ; he was reported to me to be engaged in the business of a grocer.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Upon what authority does the Postmaster General base that statement. A few days ago the Postmaster General in a rather bumptious sort of manner undertook to quote from documents which he professed to have in his possession, as to the occupation the postmaster at Cannington was engaged in. The House and the country now want to know what was that other occupation ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The answer in reply to that question appears at page 442 of the unrevised Hansard :

The business which the former postmaster at Cannington was said to have been carrying on was that of a grocer. Different residents of the village complained of the fact that the postmaster should be, as they put it, subsidized by the government against them, and expressed suspicion that their mailable matter did not re-

ceive fair treatment in the Cannington post office when supposed to relate to their busines affairs. Investigation was made by an inspector who made personal inquiries from the postmaster himself and from other persons, and reported to the department the result of such investigation.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. And what was the result of the investigation ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. He reported to the department that the charges were in his judgment well founded.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Had not the Postmaster General data from leading reformers in the village of Cannington, at the time he made that statement in the House showing that there was not one word of truth in it. At the time he made these statements to the House he had in his possession declarations from prominent Liberals in Cannington that there was not one word of truth in the statement he gave to this House and the country. He knows he had.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The hon. gentleman is scarcely accurate. After the postmaster at Cannington was dismissed a protest against the dismissal came to me signed by a gentleman who stated that he was a leading reformer of the vicinity, and he inclosed a statutory declaration of the late postmaster himself in which the postmaster averred that the charge against him was not true, and attached a copy of a promissory note which was still current and which, to my mind, went a long way towards establishing the charge to be true.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What is the promissory note, let us have particulars ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I cannot give the particulars from memory.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The hon. gentleman was very apt in standing in this House and reading that

> Different residents of the village complained of the fact that the postmaster should be, as they put it, subsidized by the government against them, and expressed suspicion that their mailable matter did not receive fair treatment in the Cannington post office when supposed to relate to their business affairs.

He stood before the House and read that statement when he had in his possession from the leading Liberals in North Ontario —I will not accept the supposed representative who does not live in North Ontario— he had the documents and had the hardihood to stand before the House and make the statement. If that is the way he begins his career in this House, it is no wonder that people read of the announcement of his association with the Gamey affair with credence.

Mr. BENNETT. Has the Postmaster General a report of the inspector, and what is the name of the inspector who made the report ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The report is on file. I really do not recollect the name.

Mr. BENNETT. He might ask the deputy, it would be Mr. Henderson, I presume.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. It is Mr. Henderson, I am told.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps the minister would have no objection to bringing the documents down before the item is concluded, because I think it would be of public importance to have the policy of the government settled and stated. It might be of assistance to know just what were the facts on which the Postmaster General proceeded. I would like to know after a charge was made against the postmaster which amounts practically to malfeasance in office, whether the postmaster had an opportunity of meeting the man who made the allegations against him, had an opportunity of cross-examining him, had the usual opportunity given to every man in this country who is charged with anything that practically amounts to a very serious offence. I notice that the Postmaster General refers to a charge against this postmaster, as one which is alleged. It was not worth while to put that forward as a reason for dismissing him unless there was something more than allegation. Allegation would not be enough to justify the Postmaster General in dismissing him, and I would suggest the man should have had some opportunity of knowing what was charged against him, of meeting the men who made the charges and of making his defence after he had heard the charge and the evidence on which it was based. The instincts of the Postmaster General as a lawyer, ought to surely indicate that to him, but up to the present time we have not any suggestion from the Postmaster General that any such course, as that was pursued. I would think it highly desirable that the documents—which ought to be laid on the table of the House in any case because the Postmaster General has referred to them—should be brought before the House for our information.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The Postmaster General is familiar with this reference to a note for $200. He knows, he was not born yesterday, he poses before the country as a great legal light, he is not fit for a lunatic asylum because he has a good memory. This document proves that the postmaster's brother, who was formerly in the grocery business, owed him $200, and when the brother sold out to another gentleman, the note was simply transferred from the brother to the present grocery man, and he knows, so far as declarations can prove it, that neither directly nor indirectly had the postmaster one farthing of interest in the

grocery business, and yet he stood in the House and sought to mislead the House and country by making it appear that this man was engaging in another business. Possibly by bringing this gentleman into a sense of his responsibility here we may benefit him in the conduct of his department and his bearing in the country. Supposing the man had $900 a year and had a little grocery business, is that any worse than for the Postmaster General to have the hardihood to go to the Supreme Court with briefs, appearing before judges of his own appointment. I wonder which is the more scandalous before the people of the country. We shall endeavour, before the Postmaster General has been many months in his place, to put a little of the higher sense of honour into his position so that he will not be able to put on the lordly manner he did when Gamey went to him for money, ignore it and go to the man who handled out the money a little later and finish up the deal behind the scenes.

Mr. BENNETT. I think the Postmaster General stated these railway porters are paid $400 a year. Does the Postmaster General think that is adequate for their maintenance ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. That is the salary that is fixed by statute, I have no opinion about it.

Mr. BENNETT. Well then I suppose he thinks that is adequate for their maintenance. The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) once made use of that somewhat famous word 'adequate' in another connection and he has been held very strictly to it. I think we must ask the Postmaster General to stand to his guns on the words 'adequate for his maintenance.' It being the case that $400 is adequate for the maintenance of a railway porter, must a postmaster who receives $400 or upwards be considered as receiving an amount 'adequate for his maintenance' and will the rule that prevailed in the Cannington case apply in other cases, that if a postmaster does not attend to his duties, although he is receiving a sum adequate for his maintenance he will be dismissed.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I can only deal with cases as they arise.

Mr. BENNETT. I will bring a case and make a formal complaint. The postmaster at Victoria Harbour receives $500 a year. I say advisedly that he pays no attention whatever to the office, he has nothing whatever to do with it. He is the Grand Trunk Railway agent at that point and devotes his attention entirely to that and not to the post office at all. His salary is in round figures $500. I am not going to ask the Postmaster General for an offhand opinion on that case, but I suppose he will take that into his consideration. A postmaster with $500 has nothing whatever to do with the office, he is the Grand Trunk agent at that point, which of course compels him to give his attention to the railway company's interest. Is that such a case as the Postmaster General considers should call for the dismissal of the man, assuming that state of facts is correct.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Surely the hon. gentleman does not wish me to give an opinion on a case of that character. I should not in any case express an opinion without making inquiry into the circumstances.

Mr. BENNETT. I make the facts provisional, if the facts are correct. Let us take the Cannington case. I think it is fair to the present Postmaster General to put him in his right position, because he is in an unfair position before the House to-night. The Postmaster General of to-day is not responsible for the dismissal of the Cannington postmaster except in carrying it into effect. It was stated by the 'Globe' newspaper that the dismissal of the Cannington postmaster had been decided upon by Sir William Mulock before he left office and that it was only left for the present Postmaster General to carry it out. Whether that statement of the 'Globe' is true or not, I know not, but I know it has gone uncontradicted by the Postmaster General. With regard to this postmaster at Cannington, the inspector, Mr. Henderson, was sent there, and from what I know of him, and from what others know of him, he did just what might be expected of him. He never went near the postmaster at all. Why? For fear that he would get true information. I hold in my hand a copy of the 'Ontario Gleaner' of March 15, a newspaper published at Cannington, and here is the challenge thrown down to this inspector:

> If this man (Inspector Henderson) wanted to know anything concerning my affairs, it would have been more manly to come to me personally and ask for the facts instead of acting on the evidence of persons who had no means of knowing my affairs, and who were blinded by prejudice.

This is a letter written over the signature of Mr. Kift, the man with whom the postmaster at Cannington was said to have been in business, and Inspector Henderson dare not deny the statement there made. It is notorious that Dr. Bingham, who no doubt will be the next candidate in North Ontario in the Liberal interest—

An hon. MEMBER. What is the matter with the present member?

Mr. BENNETT. The present member does not count in the matter of North Ontario. Dr. Bingham, I am credibly informed, remonstrated with the department about the dismissal of the postmaster at Cannington—why? Because it is unpopular with the Liberals there. They know that this

man Talbot has been harassed for the last two or three years since the present member has had the patronage of the riding. He had spacious premises of his own in which be carried on the post office to the satisfaction of every one there, and the Postmaster General at the time, Sir William Mulock, forced him to move from his own premises and go into a place that was not as suitable for any kind of business in order that he might be harassed and be deprived of the advantage of carrying on the business in his own premises—because of course he received a rental. There is the conduct of Inspector Henderson, and it is on a par with the whole proceeding—first, the action of the member who has the patronage in urging the late Postmaster General to dismiss the postmaster, and it would be fair for the present Postmaster General to let the country know that this position was forced upon him. It is true, he had the right to refuse to carry it out, but he has seen fit to shoulder it. The whole matter has been conducted in an underhand manner, and it is reprobated by the leading Liberals not only of Cannington, but of the surrounding country. I am going to ask the Postmaster General to take into serious consideration the case of the postmaster at Victoria Harbour. He will find on inquiry—I do not care whether he sends Inspector Henderson there or not—that the postmaster does not attend to the duties of the office, although the salary is over $500, and he can only find one thing to condone his conduct, that is the fact that he goes on the public platform at election times and makes speeches. I would dislike to prevent him doing that, because he always helps me; he adds to my majority. I see the Minister of Customs smiling. I am not directing that remark to him, although he comes to East Simcoe, and I hope he will come again, and the premier too—the more visits the more majority for me.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am anxious that the Postmaster General shall bring down the papers in the case of the Cannington postmaster. I understand that he promises to bring them down.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. If they are moved for.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In regard to these matters which come up in connection with the estimates, ministers have not been in the habit so far of asking us to move for the papers relative to the discussion. I do not suppose that any new rule is intended to be introduced.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Certainly not.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think my hon. friend the Minister of Customs will bear me out in saying that.

Mr. PATERSON. There has to be a motion made.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. A motion has been made. I desire to say to the Postmaster General in regard to the promissory note to which he has alluded, that I have under my hand a written statement, which can be sworn to if the matter is investigated. It is from the gentleman who took over the business when the note was given, and who declares most explicitly with regard to the purchase of that business in 1902 from Mr. Talbot, that the postmaster at Cannington never had the slightest interest therein. He gives an explicit statement of the reason why the note was given. The late postmaster had a young brother who went to South Africa and fought the battles of the empire. After he came back he went into business; the business was sold out, and the note was given in connection with that. There is the explanation which is under my hand at the present time. If that evidence had been presented to the Postmaster General in any such way as to indicate that the late postmaster was interested in that particular business, I think he has not been fully seized of the facts as they actually exist. I do not know whether the principle to which the Postmaster General alluded is sufficiently definite to enable him to answer a question which I propose to put to him. It is this: I have reliable information that a postmaster in the province of Ontario who enjoys a salary more than twice that which was enjoyed by the late postmaster at Cannington, is at the present time carrying on a large business in buying horses and shipping them to the Northwest, and is also dealing in grain. What I desire to know is whether the principle alluded to by the Postmaster General is sufficiently definite to impel him to dismiss that gentleman if these facts can be substantiated?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Answer.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I have already declined to answer hypothetical questions. Upon the facts of any case being placed before me, I will take such action as I think right.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have given facts. We are inquiring about the principle which shall govern them. Apparently there is no principle to which the Postmater General is willing to commit himself, although the first explanation was that there was no partisanship or political pressure in this, but that he was simply exemplifying a principle of universal application to post office servants.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am sorry that I cannot be so charitable as the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) towards the Postmaster General. The hon. member for East Simcoe excuses the Postmaster General on the ground forsooth that this matter had been before his predecessor.

Mr. BENNETT. The 'Globe' said so.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. But the former Postmaster General though he seemed ready to stoop to the lowest actions, as witness the case of the postmaster at Thessalon and McLeod, at least he would not stoop to dismiss the postmaster at Cannington but left that for the present Postmaster General to do. Nor can I be so charitable as the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) in excusing the Postmaster General on the ground of not having full knowledge of the facts. The Postmaster General had before him all the data that are before the leader of the opposition in the form of a declaration over the signature of the leader of the Liberal party in North Ontario. I do not refer to the present occupant of the position of member of parliament for that riding but the gentleman who is head and front of the Liberal party in North Ontario. This statement shows that the ex-postmaster had nothing to do with the grocery business but simply held a note of $200 by his brother which was assumed by Kift when he took over the business. Sir William Mulock could not be induced to stoop to the act of dismissing this postmaster. It was left for the gentleman who, when he sought election in Durham, made his campaign on the basis of a town clock for Bowmanville and a canal for Port Hope, and who, when he went into North York, still carried the canal with him and spoke of making it run up hill to Newmarket. And this is the same gentleman who comes to give the parliament of Canada lessons in political morality, decency and courtesy. He will find that that class of talk will not go down with this House or with the country.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I wish to bring to the attention of the Postmaster General a case with which he is acquainted, or can make himself acquainted—the case of the postmaster at Napanee, Dr. Leonard. Dr. Leonard is a very respectable man. He was appointed postmaster after the election of 1900, in which election he had been a candidate of the Liberal party. He is to-day the medical officer for the Grand Trunk Railway and also medical officer for the counties of Lennox and Addington, and also he practices his profession as he used to do, although the income from the postmastership, I believe is about $2,500. I do not make these complaints because I wish to have Dr. Leonard dismissed; although when he was appointed Sir Richard Cartwright, then and now Minister of Trade of Commerce, stated in this House that he would not be allowed to practice. The ground I have taken and the reason I have made no complaint is that if the medical men of Napanee are satisfied, I have no reason to complain. But I think the principles under which our post office system is governed should be the same throughout. I do not think that the postmaster at Cannington, who gets less than $1,000—for he has to pay his rent, fuel and light—should be dismissed because he is supposed to have an interest in another business, while other gentlemen are allowed to farm their offices out when those offices yield much larger income than the postmastership at Cannington.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to say, on behalf of the government, to my hon. friend from Lennox (Mr. U. Wilson) that the principle on which the government has acted is altogether too nebulous to permit any observation to be made in response to my hon. friend.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I desire to call the attention of the Postmaster General to the carrying of the mails in a part of Prince Edward Island. From Charlottetown to Belfast, Belle River and Murray Harbour, which are connected by railway, is a distance of about 50 miles. We have the railway passing through that section, and the mail courier travelling between these points, and, in many cases by a route just along side the railway. Now, what is the result ? Take, for instance, Murray Harbour south, which is a distance of about 50 miles from Charlottetown. The train leaves Charlottetown direct from Murray Harbour. But in place of the train carrying the mails, these are sent forty miles in a different direction to Cardigan Bridge. Thence they are transferred by mail courier, to Montague Bridge seven miles, they are held over night and thence to Murray Harbour about twenty miles. The result is that instead of the Murray Harbour mails being delivered on the day they leave Charlottetown, they do not arrive until the next day. The only explanation we can get for this state of things in the province of Prince Edward Island is that there is a dispute between the Post Office Department and the Railway Department as to the price at which the mails shall be carried. The Post Office Department wants the work done at a low figure and the Railway Department thinks it ought to get a high one. And so the mail couriers are employed to carry the mail with a government railway running alongside of it. I do not know whether this matter has been brought to the attention of the department, but I think that in the interest of economy the people ought to be given a service fairer and better and so I ask the Postmaster General's attention to this matter. I hope that within the next few months, when the summer railway arrangements are made, the proper and economical delivery of the mails will be provided for. I would like to know if the Postmaster General has any information on this point.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The matter to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. A. Martin)

refers has not come to my personal knowledge, though, since he rose I have been told that the subject has been under consideration in the department. I can only remind the hon. gentleman that there are many parts of this country, perhaps not in his own province or in any of the older parts of the country, but particularly in the Northwest, where the condition of affairs he describes necessarily exists. A new railway is constructed—and the road to which the hon. gentleman refers is a branch that has recently come into operation—and before arrangements for carrying the mails on the railway can be perfected, of necessity the old form of service by couriers must be maintained. Of course, it may seem anomalous that the mails should be carried by horses when the trains are running, but that is only temporary.

Mr. A. MARTIN. The railway has been in operation some five or six months. There is no doubt that conditions prevailing in Prince Edward Island are not the same as those prevailing in the Northwest. The railway in Prince Edward Island is a government railway and is not like many of the other railways in the Northwest, which are owned by private parties. They could have a daily service to many of those places, but they have only two or three mails a week, although the train passes there two or three times a day.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister has not yet explained the increase of about $150,000 in the second item, I have not observed any great increase in the other. So far as I can compute, the total vote for the year would amount to about $3,000,000, that is the mail service item. The vote last year was $2,846,000.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. There is an increase for the twelve months of $154,000, and three-fourths of that for the nine months. That $154,000 if distributed among these four items: The ordinary land service, $105,000; mail service by railway, $36,700; mail service by steamboats, $7,300; supply of and repairs to mail bags, $5,000. The increase of $105,000 for the ordinary land service is to provide for new post offices, principally in the Northwest, increasing the frequency of the existing service, and the increased prices that we find it constantly necessary to pay upon existing contracts expiring and new contracts being awarded upon tender. The $36,700 in respect of mail service by railways is the amount estimated for the conveyance of mail by rail, and extensions of the service principally in Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and the Territories. The details as we estimate them in the department upon the services that are presently necessary to be provided, I can give, if it is desired, and if the House has patience to listen to a couple of pages of figures. But each item, I may say, has been estimated with the utmost accuracy. The largest item, being $1,750, is the cost of establishing a baggage car service semi-daily between Brantford and Tilsonburg in the province of Ontario, a distance of 35 miles. There is a similar service in the Northwest between Arcola and Regina in the province of Alberta, $1,300 for which we ask in respect of mail in different parts of the country, aggregating $36,700. The additional amount of $7,300 for which we ask in respect of mail service by steamboats, is to provide for renewal of service between Vancouver and Port Neville and other points in British Columbia, at the increased rate of payment, $3,500 instead of $1,200; and to provide for extension of other services by steamboats, $5,000. These are the details of this increase.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I will take the liberty to draw the attention of the Postmaster General to the fact that in the Northwest, in many places where new post offices are being established, the people are given a service twice and three times a week. I am not finding any fault with that, I believe in giving the people in the new provinces all the advantages it is possible to confer upon them. But I wish to draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that there are many places in the older parts of Ontario, especially in the region between the farming districts and the lumbering districts, taking the counties of Renfrew, Lanark and all this range of counties to the Georgian bay, there are large settlements where the people have only one mail a week, and those mails are not at all as expeditious in the carriage of weekly newspapers as they might be. The people were given one mail a week in the beginning, and in many places they are confined to that to the present time. I am satisfied that these people who have long been settlers in the province of Ontario are entitled to an extra mail a week at least, if not a tri-weekly mail, and I would ask the hon. gentleman to see that his inspectors turn their attention to this matter.

Miscellaneous, $295,875.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. There is an increase of $65,000 for the twelve months, or $48,000 for the nine months. The items aggregating this increase are for stationery, printing and advertising for which there is an increase on the footing of $10,000 for twelve months; manufacture of postage stamps, an increase of $12,500; miscellaneous items, which I can give in the fullest detail if desired, amounting to $45,000. That however, is offset by an amount voted for rent of premises that were leased for post office purposes for 1906-07, but not required, $1.740. So the aggregate increase on that item of miscellaneous is $65,000 for the twelve months. The increased expendi-

ture upon printing, advertising and stationery, is simply the result of the general expansion that is going on in all branches of the service commensurate with the growth of the country. The increase of $12,500, which it is estimated in the department we will require, is for the manufacture of postage stamps, post cards, envelopes and post bands. Out of this vote of miscellaneous items we have to bear the expense of letter carriers' uniforms, street letter boxes, hand stamps, scales, weights, wages to labourers and charwomen, telegrams, telephone messages, local expenses for rent, mail stamping machines, which it is estimated will necessitate an increase of $45,000 on that branch of the service.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I would like to ask the Postmaster General if there is any limit of population above which a street delivery service may be established in towns and cities ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. No, there is no special limit. It is a pretty expensive luxury to indulge in, and as yet we have not been able to give that superior service to any but the largest cities and centres of population.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I think the Postmaster General must be acquainted with the city of Chatham in the county of Kent, and he knows that it is one of the most prosperous cities in the Dominion. The citizens of Chatham are looking forward to great things from the present Postmaster General, and they think they are entitled to this additional service, free city delivery. I want also to suggest to the hon. Postmaster General that we are hampered there at the present time and I think that if the corridor of the post office was left open on Sundays, so that the mail could be taken from the boxes, it would be a great advantage to us. A great many commercial men who would remain over in the city of Chatham and spend their Sundays do not remain simply because they do not get their mail. The result is that they go to Windsor and remain there over Sunday.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. As far as letter carriers are concerned, no doubt it would be a very great boon to the residents in any large centre of population, or for that matter, in the smaller centres of population, if we could feel that we would be warranted in incurring the large additional expense that a house to house delivery necessarily entails. The position of the city of Chatham, in which the hon. gentleman is especially interested and with which I am fairly well acquainted personally, is in no respect peculiar or special. I am not sure whether the population of the city of Windsor is greater than that of Chatham at the present time, but it is a neighbouring city on very much the same footing and one from which there is a substantially larger postal revenue annually than there is from Chatham. The city of Peterboro is a city in the central part of the province which has a considerably larger revenue than Chatham and it must be, I think I am safe in saying, considerably more populous than Chatham is. Neither of these places has a mail delivery any more than Chatham has and there are many other places in the province of Ontario and in other provinces of the Dominion where, if we could afford it, it would be of very great advantage to the people that there should be a house to house mail delivery. In regard to the other question the hon. gentleman has started, I am sorry to say that it is too much, I am afraid, to hope for a unanimity of opinion in perhaps any community that may be singled out. The hon. gentleman advocates the opening of the post office on Sunday, or at all events suggests that as being a course of procedure which would be for the advantage and convenience of the travelling public. I can only say that it is a matter of almost daily occurrence in the department that the strongest representations are made by clergymen and others of the opposite way of thinking desiring to have all post offices rigidly and inflexibly closed from Saturday night until Monday morning and it is just one of those matters in regard to which, perhaps like any other question of Sunday observance, it is very difficult to meet the wishes and views of all the different classes of the community.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I think that possibly the hon. Postmaster General misunderstood me. I do not propose or would not suggest that the post office staff should remain at the post office on Sunday.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I did not so understand the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I only suggest that the corridors be left open so that the business people could get their mail from their boxes. I thought that noticing the large increase in the estimates here I would only make the suggestion that we in the city of Chatham might have the advantage of some of the money that is being voted for these services.

Mr. A. MARTIN. If the amount is to be largely increased I would like to say a few words in favour of Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, a city with a larger population than either Windsor or Chatham, although I would like to see my hon. friend (Mr. Clements) get every accommodation for Chatham that he possibly can. I think that the department in regard to this as well as other things should come to a decision as to the population or the revenue or something by which to extend and control the free delivery of mail. It is not altogether fair that one city should have mail carriers and another city, perhaps con-

tributing just as much and with as large a population, should not have the same privilege. I think that it would be well for the Postmaster General, on assuming his position now, to lay down some rule which might be followed in establishing this as well as some other improvements. I hope he will carefully consider the claims of the province of Prince Edward Island.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. One thing I regret is that such a large amount of money is placed under the head of miscellaneous in these estimates. The hon. minister gave us a detailed statement of quite a number of things that this vote covers. I think these items should be put in the estimates. I do not see why this large amount cannot be set out in detail. It is a very large amount. It will be considerably over $350,000 for the year. It does seem to me that we should have that in detail in the estimates.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I can assure my hon. friend that it would be a matter of such difficulty as to be practically impossible to provide in the estimates for these various items.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. The hon. minister enumerates a lot of items although not more than two-thirds are detailed in the estimates. I do not see why these miscellaneous items could not be given just as well as the others.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I was just about to show the hon. gentleman the difficulty. Take this item which is perhaps the largest single item of increase—this $12,500 increase which we estimate we shall require for the manufacture of postage stamps, post cards, envelopes, post bands, &c.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. What is the amount you will pay for that during the year ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. We pay for that by contract according to what we use and we cannot tell what we will use.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. Can you not tell how much you used last year ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. We have not the information at hand. I will ascertain it to-morrow. But, we pay for it by contract at a fixed price according to the quantity we require and we can only keep track of our output from month to month and by compiling figures from that record estimate how much we will need for nine months. It is the same in regard to the item for stationery, printing and advertising. We cannot tell what we will require accurately. If we get a grant of this amount from the House we do not consider ourselves called upon to expend it. We expend what we have to expend upon these various items all of which are of course essential for the carrying on of the service. The same thing is true in regard to the uniforms of letter carriers. They are manufactured under contract and the amount of the vote we exhaust depends entirely on the quantity used.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. That is all very well but these are only estimates at best, and it does seem to me that by keeping track from year to year you would have a very good idea of what you want for each class and a smaller amount might be taken to cover miscellaneous. You can use the money appropriated under the head of miscellaneous for anything you wish in your department and that is why I think you should be able to give a fair estimate of all these items, add them to the estimates and then ask a smaller vote for miscellaneous.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. As illustrating the impracticability, even with the assistance of considerable experience, of being accurate upon such matters, I may say that the vote the year before last upon this item was $290,740 and that the actual expenditure, although that estimate had been made with the utmost care possible in the department, exceeded the vote by some $38,000.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. How much worse would it have been if you had the items?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The total expenditure in the year 1904-5 upon that item was $328,530, although the estimate had been $290,000.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I quite understand what the minister says, but I cannot see any difference. If he had made a different estimate on the different items, and even if he had come a little short, he would still have taken, perhaps not such a large vote for miscellaneous, and he might have applied that as he did.

Mr. BOYCE. Is there any fixed principle in the Post Office Department as to keeping post offices openon Sunday so that box holders may if they wish have the privilege of going to their boxes and getting their mail ? In what post offices, if any, is this practice allowed?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The subject is one of very considerable difficulty and one in regard to which, as we all know, there is a very great divergence of opinion among different classes of the community. The position, which I was informed on taking office, my predecessor had taken in regard to this matter seems to me to be a proper position. It is, that no postmaster would be required against his own conscientious convictions to keep his office open on Sunday, but that where the postmaster had no objection and where any considerable portion of the community seemed to desire it the office would be allowed to be opened during certain hours on Sunday for box-

holders to have access to the mail boxes. I am unable to state with any greater accuracy any definite line of policy in the matter. If postmasters are willing to permit their offices to be open under the circumstances I have described and a substantial portion of the patrons of the office desire it, there is no objection at least offered by the department.

Mr. GUNN. Do postmasters receive extra pay if they open their offices on Sunday?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Postmasters are paid by fixed salary or percentage on the income of the office, so that they would not receive additional remuneration.

Mr. GUNN. How could the opening of a post office be brought about; is it by requisition?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. There is nothing formal necessary. If there were assurances that the people genrally desired it the matter would be taken into consideration no doubt. It would be a question as to whether the community in general desired it.

Mr. BOYCE. What disposition was made of the request from Sault Ste. Marie for the privilege of having the lobby of the post office kept open on Sunday? I have never been advised directly of any disposition having been made of that, but I have been advised indirectly through some strictures that have appeared in some newspapers upon the audacity of myself as member for the constituency asking such a thing. I would be glad to know whether the cause for such strictures has emanated from any decision of the Postmaster General?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. There is no special decision in regard to Sault Ste. Marie, and so far as I am aware the post office there is not open at the present time.

Mr. BOYCE. The old post office is not open, but my question is with respect to the new post office.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. There has been no direction made with regard to the matter by the department, but there have been the most vigorous protests by clergymen and citizens against any such thing.

Mr. GUNN. That is, as involving extra work on the officials?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. No, in regard to keeping the lobby open to box-holders and distracting their attention from religious matters on the Lord's Day.

Mr. BOYCE. I want to ask the Postmaster General in regard to a matter which has interested my constituents for some time; I refer to the irregularity of the mail service to the Michipicoten district—

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Pardon me; that is under consideration at the present time. There have been complaints and they are now being investigated.

Mr. BOYCE. By what route is the mail now carried to Michipicoten?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The 'Minnie M.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The winter service is by the Canadian Pacific Railway; the summer service by water from Sault Ste. Marie.

Mr. BOYCE. How often is the winter mail delivered and who is the contractor?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I cannot answer that off hand.

Mr. BOYCE. Has the Postmaster General received a petition from the people of Belleview, Algoma, for the establishment of a post office there, and if so what action has he taken? There are some curious circumstances in connection with that petition. Belleview, in comparison with other places in the neighbourhood that have post offices, is entitled to have one also. The receipt of the petition was acknowledged by the department, and I am informed on the very best authority that a gentleman was told that under ordinary circumstances a post office would be established there, but as there was no Liberal resident of the district who could be appointed postmaster at the princely salary of $25 a year, the community would be deprived of the benefit of a post office, as the gentleman who made the recommendation to the Postmaster General would not counsel the appointment of one of these horrid Tories.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. No such statement was ever made by me nor did I ever hear of it before. I have no recollection that I ever heard of that post office till just now.

Mr. BOYCE. What about the disposition of the petition that was filed a year ago?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I have no recollection of ever having heard the name of Belleview and therefore I do not in the least know anything about the petition. I shall have a search made at once.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Can the minister tell me anything about the petition in reference to the mail service at Wicksteed in my riding?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I never heard of that name.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Perhaps not; I think it was about the time the Postmaster General took office the petition was sent in. There is a very large community there, but somewhat like the Belleview case the people are very intelligent and there is only one Liberal in the entire locality—he has gone away recently. I trust the Postmaster General will see his way clear to give that settlement a semi-weekly if not a tri-weekly mail. A great many communities in the

Northwest have semi-weekly and tri-weekly mails where there are not so many people to serve. I do not complain of that, for I believe in giving an efficient mail service to every part of Canada. I ask the Postmaster General to give his serious consideration to an improvement in the mail service to Wicksteed.

Mr. BOYCE. In the last days of the last session of parliament the late Postmaster General promised the House he would make further investigation in regard to the irregularities at the Thessalon post office and that at the opening of this session he would make an announcement in regard to that matter. Has any further declaration been made; what is the result, and will the new Postmaster General lay the report on the table of the House?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I will make inquiries with regard to that. I have not heard anything of the matter except what I saw in the newspapers a year ago.

Mr. BOYCE. Has any further investigation been made as promised ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I am not able to state. I have not heard of the case or the post office since I took charge of the department.

Mr. BOYCE. Might I ask the hon. gentleman now to take up the matter ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I will certainly investigate it.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. In this matter of miscellaneous the minister referred to uniforms. I do not know if he has the names of the contractors or the manner of letting the contracts.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. There are two firms contracting for the major portion of the uniforms, the Crown Tailoring Co. of Toronto and the Sanford Manufacturing Co. of Hamilton.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I presume they are let by tender.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. Certainly.

Yukon Territory, $105,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why is this kept separate from the general appropriation.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The circumstances in regard to the Yukon are of course of a special character, the service is one of unusual expense. The amount my hon. friend will observe does not show any increase.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No, I observe it is exactly the same.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. And the cost of the service there is very much in excess of the revenue derived from that portion of the Dominion.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think at one time at least it did go into the general amount. Some years ago, before the post office revenues had increased very largely, the late Postmaster General kept that separate so that he might show a surplus for the rest of Canada. But afterwards the conditions improved, and I thought the accounts were brought into one general total both for expenditure and receipts.

Mr. PATERSON. I think they are so far as the statement is concerned.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps they are only distinguished in the estimates.

Mr. PATERSON. I think so.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The surplus which the late Postmaster General was able to show for the last year was so large that there could be no reason for such separation now.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I thought that was the explanation, so that the only reason for such separation has ceased to exist.

If I might be permitted to return for a moment to the celebrated Cannington case, might I inform the Postmaster General that the returns in regard to similar cases, in Ontario at least, are coming in with alarming rapidity. I have another statement which has been placed in my hands by a reliable informant who tells me that in a certain town in Ontario where the postmaster has a salary of between $1,600 and $1,700, the postmaster spends, if not all, the greater part of his time at an industrial establishment in which he holds an important position. I do not of course suppose this explicit statement of fact will elicit an opinion from the Postmaster General as to whether or not that man should be dismissed, but it is well to put it on Hansard and possibly at a later time we may have an answer, if not from the Postmaster General at least from the Minister of Customs, who I observe is taking a deep interest in these cases as they have been disclosed to the House.

Mr. PATERSON. In all cases.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Paterson, House adjourned at 10.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, March 26, 1906.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 46) respecting the St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Company.—Mr. Tisdale.

ESTABLISHMENT OF FOREST RESERVES.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 47) to provide for the establishment of forest reserves.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister kindly explain his Bill ?

Mr. OLIVER. It has been the policy of the government to constitute forest reserves in the Northwest Territories, with a view to conserving the wood, and thereby conserving the water supply contiguous to the reserved areas. This has been done, so far, merely by the withdrawal of the lands from sale and settlement. But it is found difficult to provide for the complete protection of the forest within these areas unless provision is made with regard to lands within such areas already privately owned. It is also thought desirable that where there are forest reserves these areas should also be game preserves. This will require a good deal of consideration because of the legal questions involved, and so it is thought well to introduce a Bill covering these points.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SAFETY OF SHIPS.

Mr. JOHN SINCLAIR (Guysborough) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 48) to amend the Act respecting the safety of ships and the prevention of accidents on board thereof. He said : This is the same Bill that I introduced last year. It did not progress further than the committee stage, —not because there were any objections to it, so far as I was able to understand, on the part of members of this House, but because it has not been our policy to make amendments to the Merchant Shipping Act unless those amendments are assented to by the Board of Trade of Great Britain. The object of the Bill is to enable shelter-deck vessels to carry timber between the main deck and the shelter-deck during the winter. This privilege under the existing law is prohibited. The Merchant Shipping Act, as hon. members know, is an old Act and its provisions relating to this trade, were more applicable to the conditions of years ago than they are to the conditions of to-day. Shipping has been greatly changed, a new type of vessel known as the shelter-deck ship has been constructed, and there is no good reason why these old laws should be maintained prohibiting ships of this class from carrying deals and lumber in the space referred to during the winter season. It is admitted, I understand, by the authorities in England that the Act ought to be amended. There was correspondence between the Dominion Department of Marine and Fisheries and the British Board of Trade on this subject last year. The result of the correspondence was a statement on the part of the British authorities that there was an intention at the earliest opportunity to bring before the Imperial parliament a measure to amend the Act in relation to this and other matters. A Bill amending the Merchants Shipping Act is now before the Imperial parliament. My object in introducing this Bill now is to have it so far advanced during the present session that, if this amendment happens to pass the Imperial parliament, it can also come into force here without waiting for another session.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RAINMAKING IN THE YUKON.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called I wish to refer to a matter of some considerable importance which is made known to us by the press that constantly alert medium of communication. It seems to me to justify some statement with reference to it by the government. If I have to put myself in order by moving the motion to adjourn, I will do so at the conclusion of my remarks. I find in the Dawson 'Daily News' of Thursday, March 1st, 1906, a joyful communication, headlined in large letters, 'Rainmaker is coming—Yukon will give Hatfield $10,000—Is due in 8 weeks'. And here is this important announcement.

Charles M. Hatfield, the famous rainmaker of Los Angeles, California, has been engaged by contract with the Yukon territorial government to make rain in the Klondike during all the coming mining season, and will be here within eight weeks. According to the contract Hatfield must be on the ground by May 1——

H is now hurrying thitherward, I have no doubt.

—with an assistant and the rainmaking apparatus.

Mr. Hatfield is evidently a modest man. An assistant and himself, it would seem are enough to carry the apparatus. It cannot cost very much for freight.

In the terms of the contract, which is on file in the government offices in the administration building in Dawson, Hatfield is to receive $10,000 provided he makes rain to the satisfaction of a board of seven men, three of whom shall be chosen by the government of the Yukon, three by Hatfield, and one by the first six. The contract is made on the terms of no cure, no pay. Should Hatfield fail to produce rain to the satisfaction of the board or the majority of the board, he will receive only his cost of transportation to and from the Klondike, and maintenance for himself and assistant and cost of shipping the apparatus.

Hatfield is a wise chap. He does not propose to lose anything, anyway. He will have his trip in, and he may make a stake or two while he is there; and, if he fails to

produce rain, he may produce something equally remunerative to himself.

Of the $10,000, half is to be paid by ten of the largest operators in the Yukon. The other half is to be paid by the Yukon government. The funds for the government share was voted at the last session of the Yukon Council. The other half was subscribed by the mining people during the big drought of last summer. The contract, in virtue, has been a fixed thing since August, but has just been made public. The fact that the sum was voted for such a purpose was made public last fall, but the consummation of the contract has been unknown to the public generally. Hatfield agrees to produce rain to the satisfaction of the board. No stipulated quantity of rain by inches is required, but it is specifically stated in the contract that he 'shall increase the rainfall and renew it from time to time for four months as may be named by the board and sufficient to insure, as far as ample rain will, a successful and prosperous summer for the placer mining industry of the Dawson district.'

Hatfield is to be given a fair show, for :

Five days will be allowed after each seance for the rain to come. Ten days after Hatfield comes, the money subscribed by the big companies is to be paid into the government comptroller's hands.

And so on. Now, there are a great many considerations that occur to one's mind in thinking about this contract with Hatfield. I would like to see that contract, and I sincerely hope the First Minister will lay it on the table of the House. I would like to know its terms. We must be just before we are generous; but generous we should certainly be if we paid Hatfield $10,000 for making rain. It has been generally conceded that it is Providence that sendeth the rain on the just and on the unjust—Providence is impartial. But if the Yukon Council, which is by no means impartial in its constitution, is to be installed as the great Rainmaker of this Dominion, it may come to pass that no Conservative will ever get a drop of rain, but it will all be brought down in fruitful showers upon the faithful who stand by the government.

Well, there is another thing that suggests itself. We should be just before we are generous. It has been conceded generally that it is Providence that sends the rain. I believe scientific men also state that one season being exceedingly dry is almost sure to be followed by a season with a good rainfall directly thereafter. Now, I think the contract ought to provide that Mr. Hatfield should not be allowed to commence his operations until Providence has had a chance this year to show what it can do. Having been rather parsimonous in its outpourings last year, with the design perhaps of giving the people good showers this year, why, it would be a most ungrateful thing if Mr. Hatfield is allowed to set his apparatus to work and Providence is not given a chance to give us gold producing showers during the coming season. I do not think that would be a good thing for this country, and I doubt if that were persisted in whether Providence would be quite satisfied over that arrangement. But there is another suggestion also. Suppose that man Hatfield gets his apparatus at work and tinkers with the vast and delicate atmosphere of the universe ; is it not possible that he may pull out a plug or slip a cog, and this machinery of the universe once started agoing wrong may go on to the complete submersion of this continent ? And does the contract provide that the operation should be supervised by one of the minister's officials, for instance, to make certain that this delicate far reaching system of the universe is not put permanently out of order ?

Or, suppose that something happens as is said to have happened to Mr. Hatfield last year. He went down into California and he set his apparatus at work. He wanted to get some water for a section in California and they were to pay him well for it. He set his machinery to work, and somehow he interfered with the mechanism of the universe to the extent that the rain began to fall and it did not stop until it poured in torrents from San Francisco down to the very end of Mexico, and there were more people cursing Mr. Hatfield than there were blessing him. He did not seem to have the thing under such control and under such grasp as to bring his rain where it was wanted and not submerge portions of the country where the rain was not wanted. Now has that been provided for in this case ? If this government starts Mr. Hatfield shooting up into the sky, discharging his wondrous and mysterious combination of chemicals into the atmosphere and interferes with the vast chain of atmospherical mechanism to which the United States has some claim as well as ourselves, what about the Monroe doctrine that my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence seems so careful to observe ? International complications, international conflagrations may take place, and for aught we know we may be involved in a tremendous bill for damages. Well, the trouble may go further. The Minister of Agriculture, for instance, having done everything he could with regard to experimental farms, having taken Dundonald by the beard, if Dundonald has a beard, having done numerous other things, and wound up by declaring that the perference is no good for England and we don't want it here, after having exploited the newest method of fattening chickens and all that sort of thing, what a vista this opens up for the Minister of Agriculture. He can gather his faithful farmers on the ground and say to them, Mr. Hatfield is coming, I have got a cinch on Mr. Hatfield. If you will do right by me I will see that Mr. Hatfield is very kind and merciful to you, and these obdurate Tories

who do not treat us well and do as we want them to, will not get a single drop of rain. And the Minister of the Interior talking to-day about the useless trouble of getting legal lights, and financial assistance to preserve the forests in order that the rainfall may be kept for this country ? What is the use of the legal lights and setting aside tracts of forest, and the like of that ? He has a simple method provided, and he can have just as much rainfall as he pleases, and wherever he likes. I submit that to my hon. friend as being a great deal cheaper and easier than going into the experiments with forest preserves. And the Postmaster General—he is not here, but if he were here, there would be a suggestion in this to him. I believe a hundred thousand dollars was voted to build a canal where there is no water somewhere in a constituency which I think now is near his own, may be is in his own constituency. Let him feel perfectly at rest now, all that will be necessary is to dig a ditch and get Mr. Hatfield down to flood it with water clear into Newmarket.

But aside from all these things, I really think the government ought to set our minds at rest as to whether this contract is sufficiently inclusive to prevent these grave dangers of which I have spoken, and also they should give us any other information that they may have in the matter. I know that there are obdurate unbelievers in the country. We have a very good and a very high class weather bureau. I believe the United States Bureau have been sitting on Mr. Hatfield, and they have been sitting on him for the last year and a half or two years, and they give it as their scientific opinion that he is an unmitigated fake and that anybody who has truck with Mr. Hatfield is very close to being bereft of good common sense. But that is only a weather bureau. What is a weather bureau compared with the Yukon council and the Dominion government ? Really, I think that this is sufficiently important to give us a day off, and I therefore move, Mr. Speaker, that the House do now adjourn.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I read in the newspapers the report of that contract which is said to have been made by the Yukon council with Mr. Hatfield, as my hon. friend has read it; but I did not attach to it the importance which my hon. friend attaches to it, in fact I never gave it a second thought. I did not think it was worth while giving my attention to it and certainly I do not think it is worth while adjourning the House for the purpose of discussing it. My hon. friend went over the many benefits which the Yukon Council, the government of Canada and the people of Canada would derive if Mr. Hatfield were more successful than he has been in the past, if he were successful in producing rain in the Yukon after having failed to produce it in California. My hon. friend with that wealth of imagination which everybody admires, went all over the cabinet and told us, if Mr. Hatfield were successful, what would happen to my hon. friends the Minister of the Interior, the Minister of Agriculture and the Postmaster General. But, he forgot to tell us the advantage it would be to the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) in bringing down a lot of cold water, for which he had a fondness at one time. True, it was only in a moment of weakness, and he does not attach the same importance to it now that he used to. Let him not forget his own welfare in considering the welfare of others. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I welcome the contract, if it is true that it exists, but of that I have no information at all, nor has the Minister of the Interior. But we would need to have the ordinances of the Northwest to see whether there is any such contract in them or whether my hon. friend has merely been too credulous.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is only this to be said about it, that my right hon. friend seems to forget that this government controls that council, and this rain making policy is no more the policy of the Yukon council than of this government, and we may expect to see it extended, I suppose, to other departments. But surely the government, with the Department of Labour presided over by the hon. Postmaster General, might well have inquired whether we have not equally efficient rainmakers in Canada before going to the United States. It does seem to me that the Alien Labour law has not been wholly respected in this particular and I would invite the special attention of my hon. friend the Postmaster General if he were in his place—I have not the pleasure of seeing him just now—or I would invite the special attention of the Department of Labour over which he so ably presides to the question as to whether or not the statute has really been violated in the way which is set forth in the public press of this country. If one were disposed to criticise the contract at all. I imagine it might be effectively done along the line which has been suggested by my hon. friend from North Toronto. It is drawn on terms exceedingly favorable to Mr. Hatfield, inasmuch as it provides that any rain that does come down is to be credited to him whether he produces it or not. But, speaking seriously, it seems rather absurd that the government of this country should be involved in a ridiculous contract of this kind.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. But, are we?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.—I should think that the government ought to know whether they are or not. I would be inclined to think that as this contract is said to have been

made three or four months ago the government should have inquired whether the contract had been made or not. I would be disposed to expect them to have some information as to what is going on in the Yukon and to be able to inform parliament whether or not the council which is controlled by them—a council of which one half of its members are appointed by this government and the casting vote of which is given to the chairman appointed by them—had actually made such a contract as this. It does not seem unreasonable to expect that after the lapse of months information of that kind should be available for parliament and that the subject had engaged the attention of the government. However, it seems that they have no information on the subject. If they had been keeping a little more in touch with affairs in the Yukon, we would in all prabability have this information, but it would appear that the appointed majority of the council and the chairman are able to conduct the government of that country just as they see fit, and that the government do not pretend to exercise any control whatever over its affairs.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Mr. Speaker, I think the debate, so far as the remarks that have been placed before the House in this connection might be called a debate, will remove the impression, if such an impression existed, that there is no difference in principle between the party on this side of the House and the party on the other side of the House in regard to the question of government. There is, it seems from the utterances of the hon. leader of the opposition and the deputy leader of the opposition, just the same old difference as that which has always prevailed between the Tory and Reformer, between the Liberal and Conservative in regard to matters of government. There is in the Yukon an autonomous government called the Yukon Council which has a fund at its disposal for purposes in accordance with the judgment of the council, and as I understand it this government—government according to well understood Liberal principles—concedes to that council the right in practice which it has conceded to it in law. If the council on the ground, in its wisdom or unwisdom, has seen fit to make a certain disposal of a certain part of its funds and this government has conceded to that government the control of its affairs it has no right to interfere with that control. On the other hand, our friends on the other side of the House take the bold position that this supposed autonomous council shall not be autonomous, that it shall not control funds that under the law are placed at its disposal, and they even go so far as to say that, outside of the acts and the facts, this government must exercise pressure—outside pressure—upon such members of the council as happen to be in one measure or another under the control of this government, that it shall exercise pressure upon those members of the council to legislate as we at this end of the country think fit and not as the people at that end of the country think fit. I think that we on this side of the House are quite prepared to take issue with hon. gentlemen on that point and to stand for Liberal principles in the gov ernment of the Yukon, just as we stand for Liberal principles in the government of the Dominion.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think that a strong Liberal association in the Yukon did rather insist that the whole council should be elective, and that very recently.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not aware that there has been and I am not aware that there has not been such a sentiment expressed. I must say that it is in accordance with Liberal principles that when and so soon as it shall seem desirable in the public interest that any legislative body shall be absolutely and entirely elective, then that principle goes into force, but in the meantime it is a well established Liberal principle that those who are appointed to a legislative body for the purpose of legislating in the interests they are appointed to conserve shall be free to legislate in regard to those interests, and that because they hold salaried positions it does not follow that this government shall interfere with their freedom of action in regard to the responsibilities which have been laid on their shoulders. I wish to emphasize the position to the House that this government is not nearly or remotely responsible for the legislation or action of the Yukon Council in this connection. Whether that action is well advised or ill-advised this government is not responsible, and it does not accept any responsibility in the matter. The eloquent and clever argument of the hon. leader of the opposition and his deputy would have been properly placed had they been addressed to the Yukon Council, and I would suggest to them that they go the expense of cabling to the Yukon authorities so that they may be aware of their sentiments, but I would suggest to them that they do not bring into this House matters which do not concern the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether it is worth making any reply or not to this very peculiar argument that we have heard from the hon. Minister of the Interior. I do not think I will take up the time of the House at this juncture in traversing those opinions any more than to say that so long as this government has a government in the Yukon, to which it claims the right and actually does appoint a majority of the governing board, we will hold this government responsible for the acts of that council. When the time comes

that the people of the Yukon have legislative and provincial freedom to elect their own representatives through and through up to the governor then we will concede to that country the right to do what it likes with its own, but not until that time. In the meantime I do not think it argues well for the government to have a Minister of the Interior who practically refuses to be the medium of communication for information between the council in the Yukon and this parliament, and who suggests the utterly absurd thing that any persons who wish information in reference to the doings of the council shall go to the expense of cabling themselves and get this information or shall send a deputation to that country.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, might I correct the hon. gentleman?

Mr. FOSTER. We do not propose to do that. We propose to ask the government for such information as we have a right to.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the hon. gentleman to order.

Mr. FOSTER. All right, go ahead.

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. gentleman took the liberty to state to this House that I had suggested that if information was wanted in regard to the doings of the Yukon council, private persons who wished for that information might telegraph and ask for it. That is not what I said, and I am within the judgment of the House that it is not what I said.

Mr. FOSTER. I am quite prepared to leave it to the judgment of the House.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

INTERNATIONAL WATERWAY COMMISSION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When do the government purpose to lay on the table of the House the report of the Canadian section of the International Waterways Commission. I understand that report has been sent to the Minister of Public Works and that he has submitted it to his colleagues. It is alleged in the public press that negotiations are going on between the government of Great Britain and the government of the United States through the British ambassador at Washington, in reference to a proposed treaty respecting further development of power at Niagara Falls. I would like to know whether the government has any information to give on that subject.

Hon. CHARLES HYMAN (Minister of Public Works). The International Waterways Commission has presented an interim report to the government. That report is now being printed and the moment it is ready it will be laid before the House. I do not know of any negotiations being carried on with the government of the United States in reference to the matter, as the whole question is practically being left to the International Commission.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is it the understanding of the Prime Minister that the Canadian government has no notice of negotiations between the United States and the Imperial government?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I have no doubt at all that there are no such negotiations, because the matter, so far as the two countries are concerned, is in the hands of the commission. There are some negotiations going on with regard to the whole question of the fisheries in all contiguous waters.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But not with regard to this matter.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). When will the government measure dealing with the Railway Act be brought down? The people of the country who are interested in telephone matters would like to know at as early a date as possible what the policy of the government is to be in regard to that question.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I expect that the Bill will be introduced on Wednesday next.

STEAMSHIP SUBSIDIES.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). The government is so often like Ethelred the Unready that I fear when we come to the Trade and Commerce estimates we will run against a snag. I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Customs (who represents the Department of Trade and Commerce in the House) to the fact that last year a distinct promise was given that before the steamship subsidy estimates were taken up there would be presented to the House a thorough report of the operation of all the steamship lines that are subsidized. I ask the Minister of Customs to bring this to the attention of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. We must have that report for a week or so before the estimates are brought up so that we may be able to understand the question.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT REPORT.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have asked for the report of the Interior Department on two different occasions. When may we expect it?

Mr. OLIVER. The Indian Affairs report will be laid on the table to-day. The Interior Department report is in the hands of the printer and will be brought down to-morrow or next day.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 35) to incorporate the Western Loan and Trust Company.—Mr. Adamson.

Bill (No. 36) respecting the Canadian Niagara Power Company.—Mr. German.

Bill (No. 37) respecting the Montreal Park and Island Railway Company.—Mr. Geoffrion.

Bill (No. 39) respecting the Canada Atlantic Railway Company.—Mr. Macdonald.

QUESTIONS.

LAND SALES IN BLOCKS.

Mr. SPROULE—by Mr. Bergeron—asked:

1. What land sales have been made in blocks or area of more than one-half section, during the years 1903, 1904 and 1905, in Manitoba, the Territories and British Columbia ?

2. To whom sold ?

3. The price per acre, and the date of sale ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The information asked for is such that it cannot be conveniently replied to in question form, would the hon .gentleman move for a return.

VENTILATION ON STEAMSHIPS.

Mr. E. D. SMITH asked :

1. What steps, if any, have been taken by the government to ascertain whether the system of ventilation of each and every chamber of every steamer carrying any kind of perishable products across the ocean from Canada was efficient during the season of 1905 ?

2. How many sailings of steamers were there from the ports of Canada during the season of 1905 that carried perishable farm products across the ocean ?

3. What was the total number of chambers in which such cargo was carried ?

4. How many chambers were ventilated by (a) forced draft by fans ; (b) forced draft by the Cowl system ; (c) forced draft by any other system, if any ; (d) gravity only through openings provided for this purpose ; (e) unventilated except as the hatches might be lifted ?

5. Where the system of ventilation on ocean steamers carrying perishable produce was by means of fans driven either by steam or electric power, what means has the government taken to ascertain if these fans were in operation, during all the voyage, or such portion as was necessary to secure the maximum amount of coolness for the chamber and beneficial to the contents ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture):

1. During the season of navigation, in 1905, the Department of Agriculture maintained a staff of cargo inspectors at the port of Montreal and at ports in Great Britain, for the purpose of ascertaining the condition of food products when loaded in the steamers at Montreal and the condition of these products when landed on the docks in Great Britain. The reports of these inspectors were closely compared, and the department was thus kept informed as to the degree of efficiency of the system of ventilation in the different holds of the several steamers plying between Montreal and ports in Great Britain. In addition to this method of judging the ventilating systems by actual results, the temperatures, throughout the voyage, of many of the holds, have also been obtained by means of thermographs.

2. Two hundred and eighty-five.

3. Nine hundred and sixteen holds ; two hundred and twenty-eight refrigerator chambers ; seventy-three cooled air chambers.

4.

Number of chambers (holds) ventilated by fans	385
Number of chambers (holds) ventilated by cowls	473
Number of chambers (holds) ventilated through 'openings'	11
Number of chambers (holds) unventilated, except through hatches	47
	916

(In holds having no ventilation, the hatches are usually fitted with gratings for purposes of ventilation.)

5. Through the courtesy of the ships' officers, the department's inspectors in Great Britain have access to the chief engineer's log, which contains a record of the operation of the refrigerating machinery and of the fans during the voyage. The thermograph records and the actual condition of the products when discharged, also indicate whether or not the fans have been kept steadily in use from port to port in warm weather.

SELECTION OF RAILWAY LANDS.

Mr. ALCORN—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. Is it the policy of the government to induce or compel railway companies or their assigns entitled to select lands in western Canada by way of subsidy or otherise, to make and complete such selection within any, and what, definite period of time ?

2. Have any, and what, steps been taken, or are any such in contemplation by the government, in the cases of the Canadian Northern Railway Company, the Manitoba and Southern Railway Company, and the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway Company, respectively, or of any and which of them, to induce or compel such selection within any, and what, date or dates, respectively ?

3. Has it been claimed, notified or intimated to the government by or on behalf of either or any, and which, of said railway companies or their assigns, that they are or claim to be entitled to an indefinite or some other, and what, time within which to complete such selection of the whole or any and what part of their respective land grants or subsidies ?

4. Is such claim of title to an indefinite, undetermined or enlarged period, for selection in the case of any, and which, of said railway companies or their assigns, based upon matter of

any and what contract or legal right, or how otherwise ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. The department is making every possible effort to have the selection of the areas earned as land subsidies by the different railway companies, but not yet selected, surveyed, selected and patented at the earliest possible date.

2. The Canadian Northern Railway Company was required by order in council dated August 10, 1903, to have its selection completed by December 31, 1905, but while good progress had been made within the time specified the selection was not then completed. It is expected that it will yet take a few months to entirely complete the selection. There is no railway company bearing the name Manitoba and Southern Railway Company, which has the right to any land subsidy.

No special steps have been taken in the case of the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake & Saskatchewan Railroad & Steamboat Company for the reason that the lands were all selected except those which were retained as security by the government in connection with the transport subsidy contract of August 5, 1889.

3. No.

4. This question is answered by answer No. 3.

EXCISE AT BRANTFORD.

Mr. COCKSHUTT—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. What was the amount of excise duty collected at the port of Brantford for each year from 1900 to 1905, inclusive ?

2. What was the yearly cost of collecting the above duty ?

Hon. WILLIAM TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue).

1. The amount of inland revenue collections in the city of Brantford for the fiscal years named, were as follows :

1899—1900	$43,742 54
1900—1901	47,410 50
1901—1902	53,703 21
1902—1903	58,810 61
1903—1904	66,965 59
1904—1905	70,336 55

2. The aggregate salaries paid the officials in Brantford were as follows :

1899—1900	$3,650 00
1900—1901	4,599 86
1901—1902	4,586 58
1902—1903	4,502 05
1903—1904	4,283 14
1904—1905	3,799 53

The contingent expenditure of the whole inland revenue division for the years named, was as follows :

1899—1900	$1,032 35
1900—1901	910 72
1901—1902	$648 90
1902—1903	449 79
1903—1904	553 70
1904—1905	496 89

It is not feasible to determine the exact proportion of the contingent expenditure applicable to Brantford alone.

WHARF AT HIGGIN'S SHORE, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked :

1. Has any request or petition been received by the Department of Public Works regarding a wharf at Higgin's Shore, Prince Edward Island ?

2. Has anything been done in the construction of a pier at this place ? If so, what ?

Hon. CHARLES S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works). A petition to that effect has been received. The matter is under consideration.

DALY AND HANMAN DREDGES.

Mr. TAYLOR—by Mr. Lancaster—asked:

1. Were any of the dredges owned by Messrs. Daly & Hanman, of Ogdensburg, N.Y., employed by the government during the season of 1905 ?

2. If so, how many of the said dredges were employed, what are the names of the dredges so employed, and what was paid per day for the same ?

3. How long did each dredge work, and during what months ?

Hon. CHARLES S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works). None were employed by the Public Works Department. I have no reply from the Railway Department, but will ask for it and give the hon. gentleman the information.

ENGLISH PRINTER'S COMPLAINT.

Mr. VERVILLE asked :

1. Has the attention of the government been drawn to the following item, which appeared in the Ottawa 'Free Press' on March 19, 1906 : The Deputy Minister of Labour, Mr. W. L. Mackenzie King, has been sent to Winnipeg at the request of the imperial government to investigate the complaint of a party of English printers, who were brought to this country by an alleged agent of the Winnipeg printers' board of trade. The men claim that the promise was not kept, and petitioned King Edward for redress.

2. Has any correspondence passed between the imperial government and the Dominion government upon the subject of the petition sent by a party of British printers, who complain that they were brought to this country under misrepresentation as to existing labour conditions in Canada ?

3. Has the government any objection to placing the correspondence before the House ?

4. What action, if any has the government taken with respect to the matter ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). It is a fact that Mr. King, the deputy Minister of Labour, was sent by this government to investigate the complaint of

certain English printers brought to this country by an alleged agent of the Winnipeg Board of Trade and that these printers claim that the promise made them was not kept. There has been correspondence in the matter between the Canadian and the imperial government and there is no objection to bringing it down if my hon. friend will move for it. Mr. Mackenzie King is investigating the matter but we have not yet received his report. We expect it in a few days.

COAL STRIKE AT LETHBRIDGE.

Mr. VERVILLE asked :

1. Has the attention of the government been drawn to the following item, appearing in the Ottawa 'Citizen' on 20th March, 1906 ?

Detroit, Michigan, March 19.—A Great Falls Montana, despatch says the strike of the coal miners at Lethbridge, Alberta, Canada, has caused the Dominion government to render assistance. The Northwest Mounted Police have been placed in control of the town, and martial law prevails. This action appears to have irritated the miners still further, and the citizens fear grave disorders. More than 500 men, members of the union, are on strike, and there still are 100 at work, under police protection. These men are greeted daily by volleys of snow balls and stones as they go to work. F. R. Sherman, district president of the union works, says the strike may be extended to other coal mines in Alberta and British Columbia, unless an agreement is reached. Many smaller towns in Alberta are now on the verge of coal famine. All shipments to outside points have been stopped.

Lt. Col. Fred White, C.M.G., Controller of Mounted Police, being shown the foregoing despatch, stated that the strike mentioned had been going on for some days, and that mounted police, in the course of their regular duties, had been employed to preserve law and order at the mines. About 500 miners, Colonel White said, were on strike, and there was danger of their attempting to prevent the owners from working the fans and pumps, and thereby preventing the working of the mines, which were being operated by non-union men. The mounted police, reinforced by members of the force from other parts, were on hand to prevent the destruction of property and protect the persons of the men who were at work. The police in that region are up to the ways of the miners, and anticipate they may attempt to cause damage or intimidate the workers by use of bombs or dynamite. Up to the present, however, the police, with their well known efficiency, have been able to preserve law and order.

2. What authority had Lt.-Col. White to make the statements credited to him in the above ?

3. Upon what information were the statements based ?

4. What disorder has occurred in the district affected that would justify the interference of the mounted police ?

5. Who requested the help of the mounted police ?

6. What authority had Lt.-Col. White for anticipating that the miners may attempt to cause damage, or intimidate the workers by the use of bombs or dynamite ?

7. Has any correspondence passed between any department of the government and any individual or corporation upon the subject ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I have been informed by Mr. Comptroller White that the report published is substantially correct. In reply to questions 2 and 3, the authority of Lieut. Col. White to make the statements credited to him was information which he received from the officers of the Northwest Mounted Police in the west. In reply to question 4, there was no interference by the police beyond the necessary precautions for the preservation of order. About 500 miners were on strike and intimidating those who insisted on going on with the work. In answer to No. 5, the manager of the mines asked protection for the non union men and the companies' properties. In answer to No. 6, it was established that there had been an explosion of a bomb or other explosive substance in front of a house occupied by non strikers; there were warnings to non strikers of personal danger if they attempted to work; and there was the assembling at the mines before working hours of numbers of the strikers, necessitating police escort for those anxious to work. In answer to No. 7, there was one telegram from the manager of the mines to the comptroller and several communications between the manager of the mines and the commissioner of police in the west. There were also numerous communications between the police in the west and the department at Ottawa. From information since received, one man was arrested and immediately released, and since that time there has been no trouble, although the strike is going on.

ADVERTISEMENTS IN BRITISH PAPERS.

Mr. AMES asked :

Has the Department of the Interior any information regarding advertisements appearing in the British press, purporting to emanate from the Information Bureau, Concord, near Toronto ?

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

COLLINGWOOD DRY DOCK.

Mr. BENNETT—by Mr. Lancaster—asked .

1. By whom was valuation made of Collingwood dry dock, upon which bounty has been paid, on behalf of the government ?

2. What was the amount of such valuation ?

Hon. CHARLES S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works) :

1. Mr. Louis Coste, C.E.
2. $540,000.

STOCK FARM, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked :

1. Have representations been made to the government with a view to utilizing the Pro-

vincial Stock Farm in Prince Edward Island for the purpose of testing the suitability of various kinds of cereals, grasses, roots and fruits, in the interests of agriculture and horticulture in that province ?

2. Is the government aware that the soil, climate and system of cultivation are in many respects different from those of the other provinces, and that experiments conducted in the other provinces are practically of little value to Prince Edward Island ?

3. Is there any reason why the province of Prince Edward Island should be made an exception in regard to the establishment of an experimental station ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) :

1. Yes.

2. The government is aware of the nature of the soil and climate, and the system of cultivation of Prince Edward Island ; but is not aware that experiments conducted in other provinces are practically of little value to it.

3. Prince Edward Island has not been made an exception in regard to the establishment of experimental stations.

FRENCH TRANSLATION.

Mr. PARENT asked :

Is it the intention of the government to have translated into French the lectures given during last session before the Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization ? If not, why not ? If so, when ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). This matter is entirely under the control of the House of Commons. The departments of the government have nothing whatever to do with it.

GREAT LAKES FISHERIES.

Mr. BENNETT—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. Has the Department of Fisheries a commission inquiring into the fishery conditions of the Great Lakes, at present making an investigation ?

2. If so, who compose such board, and what remuneration, if any, is paid therefor ?

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

1. Yes.

2. Professor E. E. Prince, Commissioner of Fisheries, chairman ; John Birnie, B.C., K.C.L., Collingwood ; and James Noble, Little Current. With the exception of the chairman,—who being of the departmental staff, receives no extra remuneration for this work,—the commissioners are paid seven dollars per day and expenses for such days as are actually occupied by the work of the commission.

EXPERIMENTAL FARM, VANCOUVER.

Mr. HERRON asked :

1. Has the attention of the government been directed to the following statement made by the Minister of Inland Revenue at Victoria, British Columbia, on the 9th instant : 'With regard to an experimental farm desired to be established on Vancouver Island, Mr. Templeman stated that a policy had been decided upon, and that twenty or thirty such farms will be started, and Vancouver Island would assuredly have one.

2. Has the government determined upon the policy announced by the minister upon that occasion ?

Hon. WILLIAM TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue). The statement in the press as quoted in the question is not substantially correct. It is quite true that the question of establishing experimental stations by the government in Alberta and on Vancouver Island was discussed on the public platform. I said that I believed the Minister of Agriculture would establish such stations, that probably in the far northern country such experimental stations, instead of large experimental farms, would in the future be established, that I advocated such a policy. I announced my intention of assisting in the establishment of such experimental stations. But I announced no definite policy on the part of the government. I believe that it is the intention of the government as soon as possible to establish experimental stations such as I have mentioned.

WILSON'S BEACH BREAKWATER.

Mr. GANONG asked :

1. What was the total cost of the breakwater at Wilson's Beach, New Brunswick ?

2. What was the total amount paid to James M. Johnston, in connection with this work ?

3. What was the total cost of tools and other appliances supplied by the government, in any way connected with the erection of this work, and what disposition has been made of such tools and appliances ?

Hon. CHAS. S. HYMAN. (Minister of Public Works) :

1. $36,748.44.

2. $2,470,95.

3. $855.31.

Mr. GANONG. If the hon. minister will allow me a part of the third question was not answered.

What disposition has been made of such tools and appliances ?

Mr. HYMAN. If the hon. gentleman will allow the question to stand, I will give an answer to that to-morrow.

NORTH HEAD BREAKWATER.

Mr. GANONG asked :

Have tenders been called for the building of a breakwater at North Head, New Brunswick ? If so, when ?

Hon. CHAS. S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works) : Yes, on February 4, 1905.

SUSSEX RIFLE RANGE.

Mr. FOWLER asked :

1. What was the price paid for the farm on which the rifle range has been built at Sussex, New Brunswick ?
2. What was the contract price for building the range, and who was the contractor, and what extras, if any, were paid, and to whom ?
3. Who was the clerk of works, how many days was he employed, what was his daily rate of pay, and what was his qualification for the job ?
4. Who has been appointed to take charge of the rifle range and farm, and at what pay ?
5. What pay did the caretaker of the drill ground at Sussex receive, and to whom does the income derived from the farm go ?
6. What income was derived last year from military properties at Sussex, New Brunswick?

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

1. $4,850.
2. (a) $9,782 ; (b) Messrs. Bourque and Govang ; (c) S. E. Hunter, $125 for sodding target mound ; A. Keith, $50 for drains under firing point.
3. Capt. J. M. McIntyre ; from May 3 to October 7, 1905, at rate of $2.50 per diem for such days as he actually worked ; he has not been settled with as yet. He was recommended for the work, and was known to have performed, satisfactorily, similar work.
4. No caretaker yet appointed.
5. At the present time there is no income derived from the Sussex camp grounds.
6. None.

MILITIA SADDLERY AND HARNESS.

Mr. FOWLER asked :

1. Where are the saddlery and harness in use by the Canadian militia made, and by whom ?
2. Have contracts always been let by tender?
3. What contracts have been let during the last year, and what are the prices and amounts of each ?
4. What tenders were received, and from whom ?
5. How were tenders advertised for ?
6. Have any, and what, complaints been made as to the quality of the saddlery or harness?
7. Has any, and what, report been made to the department as to the quality of the saddlery or harness ?
8. Is the saddlery supplied since the South African war of the same pattern and quality as that supplied to the Canadian troops for service in South Africa ?

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

1. At Toronto by Messrs. Adams Bros. ; at Montreal by Messrs. Lamontagne, Limited ; and at Ottawa by Messrs. S. & H. Borbridge.
2. No ; prices are based upon those paid by the imperial war office for the same articles.
3. During the fiscal year 1904-05 orders for harness and saddlery were given as follows :

Lamontagne Limited :

1,000	sets colonial saddlery at $37.50..	$37,500 00
4	sets A. S. C. shaft harness complete at $86.37	345 48
	Spare parts for same	31 00
4	sets artillery harness, transport, near, at $90..	360 00
4	sets artillery harness, transport, off, at $85..	340 00
	Spare parts for same	49 30
40	sets breast pole bar. harness (artillery), near wheel at $73.70	2,948 00
40	sets breast pole bar. harness (artillery), off wheel, at $70.25..	2,810 00
80	sets breast pole bar. harness (artillery), off lead, at $58.12..	4,652 00
80	sets breast pole bar. harness (artillery), near lead, at $61.55..	4,924 00
36	sets ambulance harness at $80.50	2,898 00
1,000	colonial saddlery at $37.50.. ..	37,500 00

Adams Bros. :

1,000	sets colonial saddlery at $37.50..	$37,500 00
500	sets colonial saddlery at $37.50..	18,750 00

S. & H. Borbridge.

200	sets Universal saddlery at $40..	$8,000 00

4. No tenders were called for.
5. No advertisement was made.
6. None.
7. None, except department inspection reports.
8. Yes.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT SEAFORTH.

Mr. GUNN asked :

What conclusion has the government arrived at with respect to the erection of a public building for a post office and other purposes in the town of Seaforth ?

Hon. CHAS. S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works). No conclusion has been arrived at in respect to the erection of a public building in the town of Seaforth. Consideration will be given to it when the further supplementary estimates are under consideration.

EXPENDITURE ON BAYFIELD HARBOUR.

Mr. GUNN asked :

1. What has been the total expenditure on Bayfield harbour up to the year 1896 ?
2. What amount has been voted each year since 1896 ?
3. What amount has been expended on the harbour each year since 1896 ?
4. What is the name of the dredge or dredges that have done the work since 1896 ?
5. Who is the superintendent of the work under which the repairs to the pier and dredging are done ?

Hon. CHAS. S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works) :

1. $68,213.19.

2 and 3 :

1897-98..	$7,500 00	$2,231 36
1898-99..	1,200 00	1,200 00
1899-1900..	5,300 00	3,176 72

1900-01	$5,500 00	$1,620 46
1901-02	5,500 00	153 64
1902-03	3,600 00	366 55
1903-04	5,000 00	9,136 70
1904-05	3,200 00	3,151 13

4. Dredges 'Hacket' and 'Arnoldi.'

5. Foreman of pier work, James Thompso ; inspector of dredging, T. J. Marks.

ST. JOSEPH HARBOUR.

Mr. GUNN asked :

1. What amount of money has been voted for the improvement of St. Joseph harbour each year since 1896 ?

2. What amount has been expended on the same each year since 1896 ?

3. Is it the intention of the government to expend any more money on St. Joseph harbour ? If not, why not ?

Hon. CHAS. S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works) :

1.

In 1901-02	$5,000 00
1902-03	5,000 00
1903-04	5,000 00
1904-05	800 00

2.

In 1901-02	$4,999 84
1902-03	5,042 39
1903-04	4,604 11
1904-05	275 00

3. No further expenditure considered necessary at the present time.

PORT COLBORNE ELEVATOR.

Mr. LALOR—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. Is it the intention of the government to build an elevator at Port Colborne, Ontario ?

2. Have tenders been asked for the construction of an elevator at Port Colborne ? If so, what is the name of the tenderers, and the amount of each tender ?

3. Were tenders advertised for ?

4. Has a contract for the construction of an elevator at Port Colborne, Ontario, been awarded ? If so, to whom ?

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

1. It is the intention of the government to build an elevator at Port Colborne, Ont.

2. No tenders have yet been asked.

DREDGING GRAND RIVER.

Mr. LALOR—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. What was paid during the years 1903-4 and 1904-5 for dredging Grand river, at Dunnville, Ontario ?

2. What amount was paid for dredging Sunfish creek, Grand river, during the years 1903-4 and 1904-5 ?

3. What amount was paid during the years 1903-4 and 1904-5 for dredging at Port Maitland, Ontario ?

4. Was the work given by public tender, and was the work advertised ? If so, in what papers ?

5. Was the work awarded to the lowest tenderer ?

6. Is dredge 'General Meade' now working for the government ? If so, at what place ?

Hon. CHAS. S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works) :

1.

In 1903-04	$10,621 40
1904-05	17,376 00
	$28,007 40

2. The cost of dredging at Sunfish creek is included in that of Dunnville.

3. Nil. By Public Works Department.

4 and 5. No.

6. No.

WELLAND CANAL IMPROVEMENTS.

Mr. LALOR—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. What was the cost of the superstructure of bridge No. 11, Welland canal ?

2. Were tenders asked for by advertisement?

3. Who were the tenderers, and what was the amount of each tender ?

4. To whom was the contract given ?

5. What was the cost of repairs to foundation of locks Nos. 12, 15 and 16, Welland canal?

6. To whom was the contract given ?

7. Was the lowest tender accepted, and was the work advertised ?

8. What was the cost of stone protection between Thorold and Port Colborne, Ontario, on the Welland canal ?

9. Was the work advertised, and to whom was the contract given ?

10. Was the lowest tender accepted ?

11. What was the cost per yard for stone for this work ?

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

1. $31,760.

2. Tenders were invited by circular letter addressed to the different bridge companies in Canada.

3. Only one tender was received, and the amount of it was $31,760.

4. To the Canadian Bridge Company, Limited.

5. $34,967.25.

6. Joseph Battle.

7. Yes, lowest tender was accepted. Yes, tenders were called for by newspaper advertisement.

8. $7,880.

9. Yes, tenders were called for by newspaper advertisement. Contract was given to Joseph Battle.

10. Yes.

11. One dollar per cubic yard.

Mr. LALOR—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. What was the cost of superstructure of bridges at Allanburg and Marlatts Crossing, on the Welland canal ?

2. Was this work done by contract, and was the work advertised ?

3. What are the names of the tenderers, and the amount of each tender ?

4. Was the contract awarded to the lowest tenderer ?

5. What was the cost of extending the culvert under the Welland canal at Welland, Ontario ?

6. To whom was the contract given, was the work advertised, and was the lowest tender accepted ?

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

1. $32,162.

2. Yes, and tenders were called for by circular letter addressed to the different bridge companies in Canada.

3. Canadian Bridge Company, Limited, $43,940 ; Dominion Bridge Company, Limited, $32,162 ; Hamilton Bridge Company, $42,700.

4. Yes.

5. $3,852.70

6. Joseph Battle. Tenders were called for by poster. Yes, lowest tender was accepted.

TRADE AND COMMERCE REPORTS.

Mr. KEMP asked :

1. In what department are the annual, monthly and weekly reports of the Department of Trade and Commerce compiled ?

2. What department is responsible for the expenses in compiling, publishing and distributing such reports ?

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

1. The Department of Trade and Commerce.

2. The Department of Trade and Commerce compiles these reports. They are all published in the ordinary way at the Printing Bureau. The department has a mailing list for all three publications ; and the Printing Bureau has also an additional mailing list for the annual and monthly reports. The expenses of publishing the annual and monthly reports are charged to the usual vote by authority of the Printing Committee of the House of Commons. The expenses of publishing the weekly report are charged to the contingencies vote of the Department of Trade and Commerce.

OBSTRUCTIONS IN SEVERN RIVER.

Mr. GRANT—by Mr. Macpherson—asked:

1. Has the attention of the government been called to the fact that the Severn river, near Lake Couchiching, is being obstructed by rocks and debris, thrown in by reason of railway construction operations ?

2. What action does the government propose taking in the matter ?

Hon. CHARLES S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works). The attention of the government has been called to the fact that obstructions exist in the Severn river, and an officer of the department has been sent to report on the matter.

LOSS OF GOVERNMENT PROPERTY BY FIRE.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked :

1. What is the total estimated loss of government property by fire since 1896 ?

2. What is the itemized statement of different properties destroyed by fire since 1896, and the estimated amount of loss on each ?

3. Does the government insure any of the government properties ?

4. If insured on certain classes, what are they ? If in special cases, or risks, what are they ?

Hon. CHARLES S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works).

1. $464,302.29.

2.

Western Block, Ottawa	$150,000 00
Court House, Medicine Hat N. W. T.	8,667 63
Drill Hall, Windsor, N.S.	4,000 00
Public Building, Windsor, N.S.	32,995 80
Public Building, New Westminster, B.C.	33,904 80
Immigration building, Port Arthur, Ont.	700 00
Post Office, Hull, Que.	33,204 09
Post Office, Ottawa	160,000 00
Government House, Ottawa.	11,598 75
Detention hospital, Quebec.	20,231 22
Post Office, Alexandria, Ont.	9,000 00

3 and 4. No.

MISCOUCHE SHOALS, P.E.I.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked :

1. Have any representations been made to the government regarding the necessity of a buoy at Miscouche Shoals, Prince Edward Island ?

2. Is it the intention of the government to have a suitable buoy placed there ? If so, when ?

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

1. Yes. Application has been made to substitute a gas buoy for the bell buoy at Miscouche Shoals.

2. The matter is now receiving the consideration of the Lighthouse Board in the department.

PROPOSED WEST CAPE BRANCH, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked :

1. Has any survey been made for a branch line of railway from the main line of the Prince Edward Island Railway to or near West Cape, and for which a sum of $1,500 has twice been voted in this House ? If so, when ?

2. If not already made, is it the intention of the government to have a survey made, and when ?

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

1. There has been no survey.

2. The matter is under consideration.

MILITARY GAZETTE.

Mr. CLEMENTS asked :

1. Is the military 'Gazette' issued by the government, and does Canada pay all expenses connected with its issue ?

2. Who is the editor, how long has he been employed, and at what salary ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The Military 'Gazette' is not issued by the government, nor does the government pay any of its expenses.

PROPOSED HANDBOOK OF TOWNSHIPS.

Mr. AMES asked :

Has the Department of the Interior under consideration the idea of compiling a handbook showing in convenient arrangement the description of townships furnished by surveyors in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta ?

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The matter is under the consideration of the department.

ELGIN ROAD STATION, L'ISLET COUNTY.

Mr. PAQUET—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. Is the government aware that the farmers and lumbermen draw large quantities of pulp wood, boards and construction timber to the Elgin Road station, in the county of L'Islet ?
2. Is the government aware that the Intercolonial has no grounds for the piling of those forest products ?
3. Is it the intention of the government to lease or purchase land for the purpose of increasing our traffic facilities ?
4. If the government is not disposed to increase our traffic facilities, what reasons has it to give therefor ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. Yes, 71 carloads were received during the last fiscal year.
2. The right of way is now 90 feet wide.
3. The department have in contemplation the purchase of a further strip of land of 60 feet in width by 500 feet in length.
4. Answered by No. 3.

QUEBEC DEEP WATER WHARFS.

Mr. PAQUET—by Mr. Lancaster—asked.

Is it the intention of the government to build, at Quebec, deep water wharfs, supplied with every modern contrivance for the rapid transhipment of freight ?

Hon. CHARLES S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works). The subject of deep wharfs is now under consideration.

TRAFFIC RATES, ST. JEAN-PORT JOLI-LEVIS.

Mr. PAQUET—by Mr. Lancaster—asked:

1. Have the prices of transportation for second-class passengers, between the stations of St. Jean-Port-Joli and Lévis, on the Intercolonial, been increased since the 1st January, 1906 ?
2. If they have been increased, what are the reasons ?
3. Have the prices of transportation for first-class passengers, between St. Jean-Port-Joli and Lévis, been decreased since the 1st January, 1906 ?
4. If so, why so ?
5. Have the prices for the transportation of goods, between Lévis and St. Jean-Port-Joli, been increased since the 1st January, 1905 ?
6. If they have been so increased, why so ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILWRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. Yes.
2. To increase the revenue.
3. No.
4. Answered by No. 3.
5. No.
6. Answered by No. 5.

JACK STRAW, RED HORSE AND GANANOQUE LIGHTS.

Mr. TAYLOR—by Mr. Lancaster—asked:

1. What was the cost to the government of changing Jack Straw, Red Horse and Gananoque light on the St. Lawrence river to the acetylene gas system ?
2. What was the cost of maintaining Jack Straw, Red Horse and Gananoque lights for the season of 1905 ?

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

1. $7,270.71 ; 6 lights.
2. $1,090.19 ; 6 lights.

WASHEDEMOAK RIVER, N.B.

Mr. WILMOT—by Mr. Sam. Hughes—asked :

1. Has the attention of the Public Works Department been directed to deepening portions of the Washedemoak River, N.B.?
2. Has anything been done in this direction up to date ?
3. If not, does the department intend accomplishing this much needed improvement ? If so, when will it be begun

Hon. CHARLES S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works) :

1. Yes.

2 and 3. The matter is under consideration. Survey of the river has been ordered to be made.

SOUTH-EAST QUARTER, SECTION 28, TOWNSHIP 7, RANGE 2, WEST OF 5TH MERIDIAN.

Mr. HERRON asked :

1. Has any portion of the S. E. quarter of section 28, township 7, range 2, west of 5th M. been sold or leased to any person ?
2. If so, to whom, when, and what price per acre ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Yes.
2. The said south-east quarter of section 28, township 7, range 2, west of the 5th meridian was sold to Malcolm McKenzie on September 25, 1901, at the rate of $3 per acre.

TOBACCO CULTURE—DISTRIBUTION OF SEED.

Mr. ETHIER—by Mr. Bourassa—asked :

1. Has the government received, from the tobacco growers of the county of Two Moun-

tains or elsewhere, requests for the free distribution of choice samples of the different varities of tobacco, in the interest of tobacco culture ?

2. If so, when and in what manner will that distribution be made ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) :

1. Yes ; both from the tobacco growers of the county of Two Mountains and other parts of the province of Quebec.

2. On March 19 instant a distribution was made of some tobacco seed of an Havana variety (Comstock Havana), which has been found suitable to the province of Quebec. Ounce packages of the seed were sent by mail to the presidents of the agricultural clubs in the different localities from which the requests came, and they were asked to distribute the same among the growers.

CLAIM OF JOHN C. MUGFORD.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN—by Mr. Clements—asked :

1. Did the Department of Railways receive the claim of John C. Mugford, of Breadalbane, Prince Edward Island, amounting to about $35, for damages done to his crop in July, 1904, by fire from engine on the Prince Edward Island Railway ?

2. If so, has the claim been investigated and what are the intentions of the government in the matter ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Railways and Canals): There is no record of such a claim having been presented.

BROCKVILLE CHEESE CURING ROOM.

Mr. TAYLOR—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. What has been the total expenditure in connection with the Brockville cheese curing room ?

2. What has been the total revenue from the same ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) :

1. $18,661.34 to March 1, 1906.

2. $6,568.33 to March 1, 1906.

ACCIDENTS ON THE ST. LAWRENCE ROUTE.

On the order being called.

Mr. BERGERON—Inquiry of the Ministry—:

1. How many accidents have happened on the St. Lawrence route below Montreal?

2. How many below Montreal at Quebec, and how many below Quebec ?

3. What is the number of vessels wrecked, what are their names, and the date of the accident ?

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois) : That question does not read as I had intended it to. Therefore, I suppose my hon. freind (Mr. Brodeur) is not in position to answer it.

Mr. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I am ready to give an answer to the accidents that occurred last season. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) wish to go further back than that ?

Mr. BERGERON. If the question had read as I intended, it would have covered the accidents that have happened since 1890, also it should read as to ask how many accidents have happened between Montreal and Quebec and how many below Quebec.

Mr. BRODEUR. Will the hon. gentleman then drop the question and give notice of a new one ?

Mr. BERGERON : If I were to let the question stand could it not——

Mr. BRODEUR. I think the hon. gentleman had better let the question drop and give notice of a new one.

Mr. BERGERON. Very well, I will do so.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know whether we shall be able to give all the information he desires, but I will do the best I can to meet his wishes.

CLAIMS ON PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY—APPOINTMENT OF W. A. WEEKS.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN—by Mr. Clements—asked :

1. Did the government or some department thereof recently appoint Mr. W. A. Weeks, barrister, of Charlottetown, to take evidence of persons having claims for lands expropriated for the Murray Harbour and other branches of the Prince Edward Island Railway, and for other purposes ?

2. If so, what was the date of his appointment, and the scope of his authority ?

3. Did he enter upon the duties of his appointment, and make a report of the inquiry ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (for the Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. Yes, by order in council.

2. Date of his appointment was July 22, 1905. To investigate under oath into certain matters in dispute respecting lands taken for the Murray Harbour Branch of the Prince Edward Island Railway, and certain other matters in dispute connected with that railway.

3. Yes.

CHEESE CURING ROOMS—TOTAL EXPENDITURE AND REVENUE.

Mr. TAYLOR—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. What has been the total expenditure in connection with cheese curing at the following places : Bagotville, Brockville, Chrontine, Cowansville, Drummondville, Hebertville, St. Alphonse, St. Felician, St. Hyacinthe, Victoriaville, Woodstock.

2. What has been the total revenue received from the above named places ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) :

1. $107,886.14 to March 1, 1906.
2. $32,451.51 to March 1, 1906.

EXPROPRIATIONS AT POULTRY STATIONS.

Mr. TAYLOR—by Mr. Lancaster—asked:

1. What has been the total expenditure in connection with poultry at the following places or stations : Alberton, P.E.I. ; Amherst, N.S., Andover, N.B. ; Bondville, Que. ; Bowmanville, Ont. ; Calgary, Alberta ; Chicoutimi, Que. ; Eldon, P.E.I. ; Glenfinnan, P.E.I. ; Holmesville, Ont. ; L'Islet, Que. ; La Trappe, Que. ; Montague Bridge, P.E.I. ; Morden, Manitoba ; Mount Stewart, P.E.I. ; N. E. Margaree, N.S. ; Rogersville, N.B. ; Stanfold, Que. ; Vernon River, P.E.I. ; Virdell (Virden), Manitoba ; Northwest Territories egg business ?

2. What has been the total revenue from each of the above mentioned places or stations ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture).

1 and 2. Up to the 1st March, 1906, the expenditure and revenue have been as follows :

Station.	Expenditure.	Revenue.
Andover, N.B.	$ 5,677 35	$1,960 90
Alberton, P.E.I.	1,277 24	813 28
Amherst, N.S.	2,961 41	1,412 68
Bondville, Que.	11,864 25	3,465 70
Bowmanville, Ont.	6,173 96	1,358 11
Chicoutimi, Que.	2,436 14	636 46
Calgary, Alberta	359 16	121 65
Eldon, P.E.I.	1,777 17	968 31
Glenfinnan, P.E.I.	1,812 79	991 70
Holmesville, Ont.	7,797 32	2,295 91
La Trappe, Que.	1,574 55	734 72
L'Islet, Que.	647 91	250 68
Mount Stewart, P.E.I.	1,445 74	828 80
Montague Bridge, P.E.I.	1,194 77	780 30
Morden, Manitoba	181 54	96 96
North East Margaree, P.E.I	333 78	127 68
Rogersville, N.B.	1,191 62	637 09
Stanfold, Que.	450 20	231 14
Virden, Manitoba	326 70	142 50
Vernon River Bridge, P.E.I.	5,300 16	1,872 57

The egg business in the Northwest Territories had no connection with poultry stations whatever, but was run in connection with the government creameries and under the direction of the Dairy Commissioner. There was no expenditure or revenue on this account, as the eggs were collected by the butter-makers from the patrons at the different creameries. When the eggs were disposed of, the expenses in connection with the collection of the eggs were deducted from the proceeds and the balance paid over to the patrons.

JOHN McR. SELKIRK AND PELEE ISLAND CABLE.

Mr. CLEMENTS asked :

What amount of salary or wages was received, for how many days employed, by John McR. Selkirk, from the government, who was employed on the Pelee Island cable for the year 1905 ?

Mr TAYLOR.

Hon. CHAS. S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works). John McR. Selkirk was employed on cable during 1905, thirty days, at $5 per day, $150.

POST OFFICE AT LEAMINGTON.

Mr. CLEMENTS asked :

1. Does the government own the post office building at Leamington, Ontario, or if either owned or leased by the government, does the government receive revenue or rent from any portion of the said building not used for post office purposes ?

Hon. CHAS. S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works. There is no public building at Leamington. I am informed by the Postmaster General that there is an allowance of $180 for rent, fuel and light. There is no information in the department as to who the building is rented to, or whether there is any sub-lease.

WATERWAYS FROM BALSAM LAKE NORTHWARD.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES asked :

1. What is the estimate of cost of the opening up of the waterways from Balsam lake northward to Bosking, Beech, Maple and other lakes in Victoria and Haliburton ?

2. What locks, and where would they be placed, would be required to make these waters navigable ?

3. What is the date of the engineer's report upon this proposed work ?

4. Is it the intention of the government to construct these works this year ?

5. Is the government proceeding with the construction of the canal from Lake Simcoe to Newmarket this year ?

6. What is to be the total cost of said canal to Newmarket ?

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

1. A survey has been made, but no report of the results has yet been made to the department.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. Answered by No. 1.

4. No.

5. Tenders are being asked for that portion from Holland Landing to Lake Simcoe. The balance of the work will be dealt with as soon as the engineer can complete his plans and specification.

6. It is not advisable to publish this information at the present time.

BREAK IN THE TRENT CANAL.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES asked :

1. Is the government taking precautions that it will not be necessary to reduce the level of navigable waters in the county of Victoria to supply power to Peterboro', during the autumn of 1906 and subsequent years ?

2. At the time of, and previous to, the recent break in the Trent canal what was the depth of the water on the sills of the canal above the lift lock ?

3. What was the date of the break in the canal at the lift lock ?

4. When was it first noticed by the government officials ?

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

1. Yes.

2. There was no water on the sills of the lift lock, the water having been run off from Norwood road. However, the measurement at Nassau would give the depth of water in the reach in question, which registered on the 24th and 25th January, 1906, seven feet, which has been the average depth in the reach since June 1, 1905.

3. On the morning of January 26, 1906, a break occurred in the bank of the canal north of Norwood road.

4. The superintendent of the canal was notified at 5 a.m. on the day the break occurred. He and the overseer were on the ground at six o'clock. The exact time the break occurred is not known.

RIFLE RANGE AT LINDSAY.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES asked :

Is it the intention of the government to construct a rifle range at Lindsay this year, for the use of the 45th Victoria regiment and rifle range associations ?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK W. BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). The matter is under consideration. I may say in addition that the whole question of the selection and location of rifle ranges has been referred to a committee of the headquarters staff. The annual grant is small, the number of rifle ranges required is very large, and the construction must be spread over a number of years. The object of referring the subject to a committee is to have ranges selected in the order of their importance. I will be able later on to give the hon. gentleman fuller information.

McLAREN'S CREEK, VICTORIA COUNTY, ONT.

Mr. SAM HUGHES asked :

1. Is it the intention of the government to complete the roadway across McLaren's creek in Victoria county, Ontario, during the summer season of 1906 ?

2. What sums have already been expended upon this work ?

3. When were the sums expended ?

4. By whose request was the work stopped ?

5. How much will it require to complete the work ?

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

1. The appropriations in the past were contributions towards building a roadway between Lindsay and Fenelon Falls, and the government never undertook to complete it.

2. $1,696.61.

3. $1,308.29 during the fiscal year 1902-3, and $388.61 during the fiscal year 1903-4.

4. The work was stopped by order of the chief engineer.

5. An amount of $2,500 'contribution towards construction of a road across McLaren's creek' was voted in the fiscal year 1905-6, and as the municipality has not done any work, no expenditure has been made. It is not possible to state how much it will cost to complete the work, as the government have not undertaken it.

TRENT CANAL INQUIRY—R. J. McLAUGHLIN AND D. O'CONNELL.

Mr. SAM HUGHES asked :

1. What were the duties of Messrs. R. J. McLaughlin and D. O'Connell in connection with the recent Trent canal inquiry ?

2. Upon what specific days was Mr. McLaughlin employed ?

3. What is the amount of his account for his services ?

4. Why has not his account been paid ?

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

1. Mr. R. J. McLaughlin, K.C., was counsel for the government and Mr. D. O'Connell was his assistant.

2. His services covered a period of fifteen days.

3. The amount of his account was $1,500 which was taxed by the Department of Justice at $900 and paid.

4. Answered by No. 3.

COASTING TRADE OF CANADA.

Mr. A. H. CLARKE (South Essex) moved :

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend the Act respecting the coasting trade of Canada, and to provide that the Governor in Council may declare that the said Act shall not apply to any ship or vessel of any foreign country available in case of emergency for the transportation of goods and passengers to and from any place or places in Canada having at the time no other facilities therefor.

He said. I move this resolution as preliminary to the introduction of a Bill to carry out the intention of the resolution, if it meets with the favour of this House. It is designed to amend the Act respecting the coasting trade of Canada which was passed by this House in the year 1902. The Act was designed to protect the merchant marine of Canada, but in its terms and in its operation has proved very disastrous to a large section of the people, while not protecting those that it was deemed necessary to protect. Section three of the Act provides as follows :

No goods or passengers shall be carried by water from one port of Canada to another except in British ships.

Section six of the same Act provides :

The Governor in Council may from time to time declare that the foregoing provisions of this Act shall not apply to the ships or vessels of any foreign country in which British ships are admitted to the coasting trade of such country and to carry goods and passengers from one port or place to another in such country.

My desire is to amend the Act by adding to that section a provision that the Governor in Council may dispense with or suspend the operation of the Act in cases where no shipping facilities are provided, and where, for the very preservation of the people and their right to get to market, it is necessary to employ foreign ships. The fact which prompted me to introduce this resolution arose in my own constituency during the past year in Pelee Island, a very fertile island about sixteen miles from the mainland in Lake Erie. Intercourse with the island is precarious at best, but at that time the boat that was in the habit of plying between Pelee Island and the ports in the county of Essex was destroyed by fire. Efforts were made to get other Canadian boats, but the traffic was not sufficient to enable them to undertake it. Owing to proximity to the large shipping centre of Detroit and other Michigan ports, a vessel could have been got and could have been operated with a Canadian crew. Application was made to the government to enable this to be done, but the provisions of this Act were too stringent, and there was no power given except by parliament to suspend the operation of the Act. The result was that the people were unable to get their provisions to market, they were unable to get to market themselves, and they were in great danger of being deprived of their winter supplies. Fortunately the season was extended by mild weather, and by availing themselves of fishing tugs and other boats, in a measure, they got their produce to market. But they were not able to get to market themselves, and they suffered a very substantial loss; in fact the position became so extreme that there began to be talk of annexation to the United States. To the south of them, at the city of Sandusky, a little farther distant, they have greater shipping facilities and it is rather a disgraceful thing, that, under the Union Jack, the people of this country should have to look to the land of the Eagle in order to get relief. I do not want that condition of things to exist in a riding where we have such loyal citizens as we have there, and I do think that this parliament ought to so arrange the law that no such complaint as this could be made. I may say that the press of western Ontario on both sides of politics condemned the situation in unmeasured terms. The people were almost frantic with winter coming on, with their winter supplies not there, their coal not there, when these supplies could have been got by a steamboat had it not been that the laws of the country prevented the employment of this boat. I would ask the House to join in support of this resolution. I am not animated at all by any desire to aid the merchant marine of the United States. Their conduct towards us in the past has not been such as to invite consideration of their interests, but inasmuch as conditions arise when it is impossible to get a Canadian boat there should be some power whereby the government shall have the right to provide the facilities which are necessary to enable these people to market their produce.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin). Mr. Speaker, before that motion is carried I would like the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke) to say whether or not Canadian vessels passing over to any American port have the right to engage in the coasting trade and to carry passengers or freight ?

Mr. CLARKE. I understand that they do not allow Canadian vessels to do any coasting trade whatever, and if we had the vessels available I certainly would be inclined to apply the law to the strictest extent, but when these people who are entirely on an island cannot get their product to market their rights should be paramount.

Mr. INGRAM. This is a concession that might be abused very easily, and for my part I do not like the idea of having this matter left to the Governor in Council. I think that if the trade is sufficient at any of these ports to justify the employment of vessels, there is sufficient energy and ambition on the part of the owners of Canadian vessels to look after that trade. I know that the Americans are very particular about the coasting trade in their country, and that being so I think we ought to be just as particular about the coasting trade in our country. For my part I am not in favour of granting the hon. gentleman's request.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, the members of the House, I have no doubt, have in their mind the peculiar situation which confronted the people of Pelee Island last fall and to which my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke) has just alluded. They were in a land of plenty; they were within accessible markets, but there were no means of transportation to take their goods to the markets. This is a situation which certainly requires some attention on the part of the government, and I am free to say on the part of parliament. I have no doubt they will be willing to come to the rescue of these people in so far as it is possible to provide a remedy. But, I have to observe to my hon. friend that the resolution which he has proposed is one, which, while it might and would in part, remedy the evil of which he has spoken, at the same time would create another evil which the Canadian people, I think, are not prepared at this time to introduce. Our relations with the United States at the present time are very satisfactory. We have few grievances, and I hope as time goes on we shall have less and less; but one of the grievances we have at this moment is just this one in regard to our coasting laws. We have been always willing and we are willing yet to open to American shipping our own coasting trade if the United States will

open their own trade to our vessels, but up to the present time we have not been able to convince our American neighbours that this would be a policy which it would be in their own interest and in our interest to adopt. We have had no communication with them of late, but all the time there is—I will not say official communication or unofficial communication—but all the time the people on both sides are bringing to the attention of their legislatures questions of a similar character in order that the relations between the two people may be improved by mutual concessions. This very day, in answer to a question put by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R L. Borden), I stated that at this moment negotiations are going on with the view of settling a question which has been long pending, which has been a source of grievance and discontent, and with which my hon. friend from Essex is very familiar. He knows the difficulty we have had in maintaining a close season for fishing on the American side of Lake Erie. At the present time negotiations are going on with a view of having international regulations made which will apply to all contiguous water, to the American side as well as to the Canadian side, and I am sure that a settlement of this question will confer great benefit not only on one side, but on the other side of the lakes as well. In the same manner our relations in the matter of shipping with the Americans are very close upon the great lakes, and especially upon the St. Lawrence, where there is the closest communication every day. Steamers ply from one side of the river every day and almost continuously during 24 hours of the day at certain seasons of the year. It would be the best policy not only for Canada, but for the United States, that there should be in this respect an exchange of facilities and that we should have reciprocity in the coasting trade. We are and always have been willing, and we have signified more than once our readiness to the American authorities to have this coasting trade made reciprocal. But our efforts up to the present time have been unavailing. Our suggestions have not been received with favour. I doubt that the people of Pelee Island would derive any benefit if we were to make an exception of this case and allow American boats to come over and engage in the coasting trade. If we were to do that we would be introducing a principle which would absolutely defeat the end we have in view, which is to obtain reciprocity in coasting. Therefore, I have to say to my hon. friend that the position of his constituents is one which has engaged and is still engaging the attention of the government. I sympathize fully with him, I understand his endeavour, I understand his anxiety, and I know full well that he desires to find a solution of this most difficult problem, but if my hon. friend will allow me a suggestion I would say that the remedy is not there. I would ask him simply to withdraw his motion, and I will state to him that I believe we will be able to find a remedy which will cope with the evil he complains of.

Mr. CLARKE. Mr. Speaker, I beg to withdraw the motion.

Motion withdrawn.

WATER POWERS.

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

For a statement containing the following information concerning the water powers in the possession and under the control of the Dominion government :

1. The province and the locality within the province where the water power is situated.
2. A summary of the report or reports made to the government on such water power, if any report has been made, with date of the report and name of the party who has reported.
3. The power susceptible of being developed.
4. If under lease, or alienated in any way, the name of lessee or purchaser, date, duration and condition of lease or purchase.
5. If under lease or alienated, whether public tenders were called for through the newspapers before lease or alienation took place.
6. If under lease or alienated, whether any report was sought and obtained by the government previous to such alienation, and by what officer such report was made to the government, and the purport of such report, as well as its date.
7. If under lease or alienation in any way, the the amount due the government for rent or price of sale and arrears.
8. If under lease or alienated, whether the conditions of alienation have been fulfilled.

He said : Mr. Speaker, the terms of the motion explain sufficiently, I think the object which it aims at. It is in reality an inventory of all the water powers under the control of the Dominion government, the nature of those powers, their situation, the energies susceptible of being developed, whether these have been and are at present leased or alienated, what are the conditions of alienation and whether the conditions of the lease or alienation have been fulfilled ?

It is extremely desirable that this information should be in possession of parliament as soon as possible. In recent years the impression has grown that Canada, far from being relegated to the position of a mere agricultural country, possesses natural resources and vast quantities of raw material which destine her to play an important part in the manufacturing world. In connection with the development of these natural resources we have marvellous water powers, not only in eastern Canada but in British Columbia and generally throughout our country, the information in regard to which is at present extremely vague and unclassified. Many of these water powers are vested in the provincial governments, and it would be very interesting to have a com-

plete inventory made by these governments as to the extent of this treasure as it may be very well named—which they have under their control. In the meantime, there is no doubt that in our navigable and flotable rivers and canals we have under the control of the Federal government very extensive water powers, and it is most desirable that details of the extent of these water powers should be presented in the shape of a blue book where the information may be readily available. Since I gave notice of this motion my attention has been called to a very interesting treatise on this subject by Mr. T. C. Keefer, one of our most eminent engineers. In his presidential address to the Royal Society of Canada in 1899, Mr. Keefer dealt with this matter and I shall quote briefly from that learned address to show that this motion is timely at the present stage of our national development. Mr. Keefer said :

> Amongst the many partially developed resources of Canada, perhaps there is none more widespread or more far reaching in future results than her unsurpassed water power. The value of this has been enormously enhanced, first, by the expansion of the wood pulp manufacture, and the introduction of electro-chemical and metallurgical industries for which this country possesses the raw material; and, more recently, in the revolution which has been brought about by success in transmitting the energy of water falls from remote and inconvenient positions to those where the work is to be done.
>
> Electrical transmission brings the power to the work, and when the prime mover is water, we have the cheapest power, and perhaps nearest approach to perpetual motion which it is possible to obtain; one which is always 'on tap' and, like gravity, maintained without cost and applied without delay.

Further on in this very interesting address. Mr. Keefer makes a scientific calculation of our water powers, and particularly in the country which extends from the Great Lakes to and including Labrador. He makes a calculation founded on the precipation of rain and snow from which he deducts the allowance which must be made for that portion of the rainfall which the demands of vegetation or infiltration exact and making his calculation upon the elevation of the waters he arrives at the conclusion, that in this region can be found nearly 100,000 horse power per every foot of fall. He also calculates that the water power to be found in Canada's share of the St. Lawrence river from Lake Superior to Montreal, would be about 10,000,000 horse power. I quote from page 11 of his address :

> A still greater revolution has recently occurred which brings water power to the front again, by its amalgamation with electricity, whereby its economical power is transferred to the work, over many miles of distance, upon a single wire.
>
> Within the last ten years high voltage electricity has been firmly established with annually increasing power of extension, and this has brought Canada into the first rank of economical power producing countries. Water is thus represented by a power to which it can give birth, but which is superior to its own, in that, wherever transplanted, it can do nearly all the present power could do, as well as give light, heat and greater speed ; moreover it has given rise to industries only possible with abundant cheap electricity. What is more important to us is that such cheap industries are those for which Canada possesses the raw material, but which without water power, she could not engage in.
>
> There are important industries in which we have for some time utilized water power—for which electricity is not indispensable—but which equally require large amounts of cheap power, and are capable of indefinite extension, but while these may not need the intense electric current necessary for electro-chemical industries, they will find electrical transmission of inestimable value in many situations, while, for lighting and heating purposes, water power is invaluable to all.
>
> Heretofore we have cut our spruce into deals and exported it to Europe. and more recently into pulp wood and exported that to the United States ; but, manufactured by our water power into paper, the raw material would yield this country ten times the value it is now exported for.
>
> The extension of railways combined with electrical transmission, will promote the local manufacture of such wood products (including all valuable hard wood) as can bear transportation ; thus giving the largest amount of local employment, as well as tonnage to the railways, and delivering us from the position of 'hewers of wood' for other countries.

I quote these words of Mr. Keefer in order to show that even in 1889 he deems it important that we should possess the knowledge which this motion calls for. Up to the present, so far as I am aware, there has never been laid before parliament a complete statement as to this source of our natural wealth. Our manufacturers are increasing daily, the discoveries connected with electrical development are multiplying, and it is not improbable that even during our own lives electrical energy will be able to furnish all the light, heat, and manufacturing power we may require. What is our own position ? Take the city of Montreal, which is very fortunately situated as regards water powers. On referring to past legislation, I find that in 1873 we incorporated a company known as the Lachine Hydraulic Works and granted to it extremely valuable water powers in the Lachine rapids. These were given without any consideration and without any provision for any governmental control over the company as regards the manner in which it would deal with the electrical forces at its disposal. In one section of that Act, which was passed in 1873, there is a provision that the government may at any time expropriate the company, but that is the only provision destined to safeguard the public interest. And that provision can now scarcely be called operative. It could only

be carried into operation at very great cost, because that company has disappeared and its assets are in the hands of a much larger corporation—a corporation which controls the electrical power purchased from that company as well as the electrical power from other sites in the neighbourhood of Montreal. There was another statute passed by the Canadian parliament in 1890 granting to a company which had been incorporated by a provincial statute the right to utilize extremely valuable water powers at Chambly, and that right was given without any consideration, qualification or condition of any kind. The power developed by that company is now the property of a larger corporation which practically controls the supply of electricity in the city of Montreal. These grants, these arrangements, as well as others which have since been entered into not only by the past, but by the present government, are governed by no condition. The leases or terms of alienation will be found to differ in each case, and very seldom are conditions placed in these deeds of alienation which are calculated to protect the public interest. But we have in the vicinity of Montreal—which is our largest commercial centre and a very large manufacturing centre—still large undeveloped water powers in and around the Lachine rapids. These large powers are under the control of the Dominion government. Higher up in the River St. Lawrence, there are also very extensive water powers along the counties of Beauharnois and Soulanges. Some of these have been utilized, but there is still a very large quantity of water which could be utilized and their electrical energies transmitted, by means of modern electrical discoveries and improvements, to the city of Montreal. There are also in the Ottawa river, behind the Island of Montreal, very considerable water powers still undeveloped. The survey of the Georgian Bay canal covers a portion of these water powers at the back of the Island of Montreal in what is known as the Back river, and I believe that one of the results of that survey has been to create among the engineers the impression that the Georgian Bay canal could more properly be continued from the Lake of Two Mountains down the Back river to the lower end of the Island of Montreal, rather than through Lake St. Louis by an enlargement and improvement of the present Lachine canal. Whether that line of canal be adopted or not, these large water powers behind the Island of Montreal, as they will become developed by the canalization of that river, will constitute an extremely valuable asset for the government, and that great metropolis. There are other considerable water powers under control of the government within 75 or 100 miles of Montreal. There are water powers at Carillon and Grenville and along the Ottawa. Under these circumstances, I think it would be extremely interesting for us to know what is the extent and the nature of that national asset. It would lead no doubt to the introduction of legislation which would prevent the future alienation of that valuable asset except under conditions very carefully considered in the public interest. There is no doubt a growing sentiment in favour of the municipalization and nationalization of public utilities. In my opinion, it is only a matter of time when that doctrine will ultimately prevail ; but whether it prevails or not there can be no doubt that what we possess in the way of water powers requires to be carefully husbanded and should not be alienated except under conditions which would safeguard the public interest. The government will render great service to the country by giving to this motion every attention and furnishing all the details possible. Of course even a careful and correct return to this motion would not give us by any means all the water powers which are to be found in British and North America. These are being increased by discoveries every day. Nor do I expect that we will ascertain exactly what degree of power can be developed at each place ; but what we should get is all the information possessed by the department, so that we should know as nearly as possible what we have at present in the way of water power. Many of our water powers have been alienated. Some were alienated by previous governments and some have been parted with by the present government. In this way private individuals have acquired, by lease or otherwise, extremely valuable water powers subject to the obligation of a very general character of improving them. This the grantees have not done in many instances, but are waiting for the chance of making a fortunate speculation. I think all these leases, all these alienations, should be terminated as rapidly as possible and that alienations of our water powers in future, should only be made with extreme care and after a full study of the subject has enabled us to provide legislation under which these alienations will be so guarded that they cannot possibly be contrary to the public interest.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). Mr. Speaker, I am very glad that the hon. gentleman has brought this very important question to the attention of parliament. I may say that I have given special study to that question for some years past, more perhaps as regards provincial water powers, but certainly the principle is the same.

I think we are only at the beginning of a new era in the history of water power development. There is no doubt that water powers have been used for years and for centuries for industrial developments of a local character. But the importance of the national asset contained in the water power richness of a country is just beginning to be known, and I think, in preparing a work of

this kind, the government might well take into consideration the work that has been performed in Europe by several of the most civilized and most developed countries, so far as this question is concerned. I have given some attention to the enormous work that has been performed by the French government in that respect and I may say they have gone so far as already to load the credit of the country with enormous sums of money for the purpose of taking back from individuals water powers that were alienated years ago or even that pertain to personal properties, with the purpose of assuring to the large industries, to the public service, to electric traction, a source of richness which they themselves define as being, at the present time, incalculable. It seems to me that my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) could have enlarged the scope of this motion and could have given an opportunity to this government to render some of our local provinces a valuable service, perhaps more valuable than the amount of money which, one after the other, they have been begging from this government for some years past. Just as this government has under its control the geological survey of the whole of Canada, which affords to the various provincial governments the advantage of becoming better acquainted with their mining richness, thanks to the good service performed by the geological service, I think the same principle could be extended to this question and as thorough a valuation of our hydrographical richness could be performed by this government, because, although a large portion, in fact the greater portion, of these waters are possessed by the provincial government their development would be a source of richness to the people of Canada at large, a source of income for the government of Canada by the development of trade and industry, and at the same time it would be a great advantage to foreign capitalists, to foreign investors, to foreign engineers, to know the exact richness of Canada as far as water powers are concerned. The inventory which my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) asks from the government could be but a partial inventory, because it would cover only those waters powers which are possessed by the Dominion government, but I think if a thorough study were made by the Federal government of all the water powers which are in existence in Canada—that would take years of course to perform, but it could be performed in a methodical manner so as to indicate to those interested where those water powers are situated, those under provincial control and those under individual control—it would be possible for any people who were interested in the development of trade and industry in any part of the country to know where they could go in order to secure the water power necessary for the development of their industries. It seems to me that if the government would study this question, as I have no doubt they are prepared to do, they could enlarge the scope of this study and create a permanent hydrographical service for the Dominion of Canada. The Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and some of his colleagues, as well as the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), have given a great deal of encouragement to the forestry convention which was held in this city lately. I think they deserve credit for having done so, and this question of hydrographical surveys is intimately connected with the question of forestry. Everybody knows that the preservation of our forests, and especially the reforesting of the country, is closely connected with the preservation of our water-sheds, of our lakes, of our rivers and of our water powers, and it is perfectly useless to attempt a serious solving of the problem of the preservation of our water-sheds, if at the same time we do not take advantage of the surveys, of the explorations that are made, to ascertain the capacity of our water powers. I may add, further, that it would greatly reduce the cost of our surveys if at the same time a survey would be made of the capacity of these water powers, because as every body knows the preservation of water courses is connected with the construction of dams and dykes upon rapid portions of rivers, on falls, on rapids, so that both surveys could be performed at the same time and a double result would ensue from the work of the government. I entirely endorse the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) and I hope the government will give the question the serious consideration it deserves, so that we shall thoroughly arouse the interest of the people in that enormous wealth which we have in this country, a source of wealth which is at the same time so closely connected with numerous public services. As my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) says, there is no doubt that there is a tendency, whether right or wrong, towards a control of public services by the people, whether by parliament or municipalities, and as water powers are a source of energy for several of the public services in the large cities, and probably before many years will be the source of energy for a great many of our railways, it seems to me we should not commit the same mistake that we have committed in connection with the development of many industries, and especially the development of many public services; we should not let individuals or corporations take hold of such a source of richness from the people of Canada, but should take the means to keep it for the advantage of the people of Canada at large.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). I agree with the two speakers who have preceded me. I believe that the greatest source of wealth to-day are the water powers of this country, and that being the case, the time has certainly arrived when a national

policy in regard to these water powers ought to be adopted. In many portions of this country we have no coal; we have no hard coal, but in Ontario and in all the west as they have in Quebec, we have immense sources of water power and water power has been called the new white coal, as against the black power that comes from coal. As to the alienation of water powers that has taken place in the past, I believe that an attempt ought to be made to recover these water powers.

In Ontario, it has been found that the great bulk of the possible water power from Niagara Falls has been alienated without proper conservation of the rights of the people in that power. Take, for instance, the city of Hamilton. They have a street railway problem there. The present service is very bad. The companies say they are not able to give a better service, one reason alleged being that too high a price is demanded by the Cataract Power Company for the power to drive the cars. That power company derives its power, under a franchise given by this government, from Welland canal waters. Therefore, I agree with the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) when he says that no concession of water power should be given, especially to a company, without retaining in the government right to regulate the prices charged for energy. We have given away the right to generate power, in many cases, and have retained no control. It is true that the charters given by the province of Ontario in connection with Niagara Falls contain a stipulation for some sort of control. But the net result, so far as the people of Toronto are concerned, is that, while power can be generated at Niagara Falls and a profit made at $12 per horse power per year, the probability is that Toronto people will be asked to pay from $50 to $60 per horse power for the energy, merely because sufficient protection is not secured under the concessions granted. There is a great agitation in Ontario to recover these water powers, the province to own them and generate the power and distribute it to the municipalities, who will distribute it to users. If this were done, the great power of Niagara could be used all through Ontario at a price, I believe, below $20 per horse power per year. In fact, I believe that Niagara power could be distributed all over Ontario at less than $17 per horse power per year, for twenty-four hours a day. I also believe that electrical energy, will, in a short time, be the handmaid of agriculture. Nothing will do so much to improve agriculture in this country as an unlimited supply of power widely distributed. I believe that every farm in Ontario could be economically lighted by power distributed from Niagara Falls, from the Ottawa river, or from some of the streams flowing into Georgian bay. To attain this result, the work must be done on a large scale, it must be done by the state, and the distribution effected by the municipality. Therefore, it is incumbent upon the government to see to it that no more of these concessions are given, or, if they be given, that the terms of transfer shall be such as to enable the government at any time to recover complete control; and, meantime, to regulate the prices at which the power shall be distributed. Great corporations are now being organized to exploit these water powers. At Niagara one such concern is being capitalized at millions. Something less than $6,000,000 has been issued in bonds, the proceeds of which have been used to construct the works. But $6,000,000 of stock has been distributed by the promoters, among themselves, and, they propose that hereafter and for ever the public of Canada shall pay them 10 or 12 or 20 per cent on this great issue.

Another point is this. We have allowed these companies to get control of these franchises, and it is now their intention to use the power of Niagara Falls to move trains on the American side of the river. I believe that at least two of these great power developments at the Falls to-day intend that the power shall be used to handle the traffic on the New York Central and the Pennsylvania systems. Not one horse power of that energy should be allowed to go out of this country, if we can use it in Canada for our own traffic. If this is the traction power of the future—and I believe it is, and the great Vanderbilt and Pennsylvania systems are ready now to convert their roads from the steam system to the electrical system—the law should provide that none of that energy generated in Canada shall be used to drive the railroads of the United States if it can be used, as I believe it can, to drive the railroads of our country. To that end, I have already advocated in this House—and hon. gentlemen will find that the matter will come up again with renewed strength hereafter—that there should be an export duty on energy going out of this country to a foreign country until our people have had the chance to utilize it. All along the border, this question is being agitated. We hear about the despoiling of the Falls as a spectacle through the works of these concessionaries. I believe that that matter is worthy of attention also. But the great question is that of the generation of power. In connection with the generation of power on the Niagara river, it has been pointed out by the engineers who have most recently investigated the matter that probably as much power can be developed in the rapids below the falls as is developed by the falls themselves. I believe that that will be found to be the fact. That will mean that the scenic value of Niagara Falls can be retained and quite as much power generated as though the water now running over the falls were diverted into underground tunnels. This also is a question for the government. I hope the return that we are

to receive will be as complete as the hon. member for Jacques Cartier proposes and will even go as far as the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) suggests, so that we shall soon be in possession of an inventory of the water powers possessed by this country. I hope that hon. Mr. Whitney, who is now in charge of the affairs of the province of Ontario will find a way to recover the three great franchises that have been given out in connection with Niagara Falls; that he will be ready to give full value for the works that have been built, with a reasonable allowance for interest; that he will take over the water power and will distribute the energy to the municipalities who will distribute it at cost price to the people at large. If this be done, Ontario will find herself, as Quebec under a similar policy will find herself, possessed of a resource of greater value and usefulness than anything now enumerated among our assets. For, the wonderful thing about this energy is this—and there is nothing in the world like it—it delivers itself without cost at the end of a wire wherever you desire it to be. Coal must be mined; it must be raised from the bowels of the earth; it must be loaded on trains and transported bodily long distances; it must be elevated, carted to the place where it is to be used and fed into the furnace. And after that, the ashes must be carried away, involving still further work. But the electrical energy developed by water power will deliver itself, free of cost, hundreds of miles away at the end of a wire. That being the case, it is the greatest source of wealth any country can have, and the distribution of this wonderful power at the end of a wire at the least possible cost is one of the problems that is up to all governments in the world to-day. But especially does this problem confront the Dominion government and the various provincial governments. So I say the time has come for the government to declare that these water powers are for the use of all the people, and their service and distribution is one of the live problems of government. That being so, I hope the governments of Canada and of the provinces, irrespective of party, will appreciate the situation, and especially appreciate the fact that Canada, of all countries on the face of the globe, is the richest in its sources of water power. Therefore, I hope that the government will consider this question in a wide spirit, and that they will adopt a new national policy in regard to the developments and distribution of electrical energy.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). There is no objection whatever to the motion of my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean). All the information we have on this very important subject will be collected with all speed and communicated to the House. I do not know how far we can satisfy the very legitimate curiosity of the House upon this subject. We have a great number of water powers which have been developed, and we have a larger number which have been leased but not developed yet. Some time last spring the government instituted a communication with the object of collecting information about both these points, namely, what water powers have been developed, what have been leased, and any other data we may obtain preliminary to declaring a policy upon this subject. There is no doubt that Canada, as my hon. friend from East York has said, has greater resources in wealth of this kind than any other country in the world. There is more water probably on that portion of the earth's surface comprised between the St. Lawrence, Hudson Bay, the coast of Labrador, the Lake of the Woods and Lake Winnipeg, than on any other usual portion of the earth. Indeed our country is full of water powers. Water has always been a well known source of industrial energy, but we never knew its full value, and it is only since discoveries have been made in electricity that we have commenced to realize the enormous extent of the wealth we possess in that particular. Our fathers, when they ran their grist mills, sawmills and other mills by water power, never suspected what an amount of energy was passing over their wheels ; I think we hardly suspect it ourselves at this moment.

I do not know that I would endorse every thing that has been said by my hon. friend from East York. He is much more of a stalwart in these matters than I am. He wants to nationalize everything to water power. I do not know that he would leave us anything to drink; if he were to have his own way we would have to apply to the State in order to get a glass of water. But I agree with him in this, that whatever disposal is made of this subject—and I am not prepared to say now that it will be, but whatever policy may be adopted, whatever disposal may be made of the water power that the government controls, I think we should regulate the prices to the consumer. I think that ought to be done, and having done that, we should secure the public so far as they can be secured. But my hon. friend goes much futher. He wants the government to build all the railways, he wants the government to develop all the water powers and turn them over to the municipalities, then to be turned over to the consumer. I am not prepared to go that far. But I am prepared to agree with him in this respect, that the object which we should have in view is to protect the consumer and in all the laws made in future the government should retain in their own hands the power to regulate prices to the consumer, the price at which energy is to be sold to the consumer. All water powers have not the same value, and it is impossible to sell them at the same price. I noticed in the remarks of my hon. friend from Jac-

ques Cartier (Mr. Monk), he said that under the present system—if we have any system at all—in the disposal of these water powers, some are sold at certain prices and others at certain other prices. I think it must always continue to be so because there are some water powers more valuable than others. Geographical situation, for instance, is an immense consideration in a matter of this kind. A water power which is in the vicinity of the city of Montreal has already, and will have in the future, a far greater value than a water power two or three hundred miles away. My hon. friend from East York seems to have forgotten that it is not so easy to supply energy that is to be found at the end of a long wire. But everything depends upon the cost of development, everything depends on the geographical situation of the power so developed. A water power energy at the end of a wire a mile or so from its source, is a very different value from the energy which is conveyed several hundred miles. There is no similarity at all. All these things have to be considered. The matter is in its infancy and we have not given attention to it yet. Up to the present time I think we have disposed of these water powers altogether too freely, both the late government and this government, for the very obvious reason that we did not know the wealth that we were giving away. It is only in recent years that we have commenced to appreciate its value, and it is time that we should give the subject our best attention in order to evolve a policy which the government will submit to the country.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART. The subject engaging the attention of the House is certainly a very interesting one, but to my mind the question uppermost is : What jurisdiction have we over it ? Some time ago I pointed out to the House what would be the probable future of railway development in this country, and I prophesied that all railways in this section of the country would be run by electricity. About ten years ago when Mr. Booth started the Canada Atlantic Railway he intended to run it by electricty. I notice that the Ontario government propose to run their new line of road by electricity. There is no doubt that we have resources of water power in this country arising from the precipitation of moisture within our own territory greater than any other country. Those resources in this country are greater even than its immense coal fields. We have cheaper sources of power than any other country. We have the means of extracting metals from the ore, as seems to have been clearly established by the experiments made by the Geological Department at Sault Ste. Marie. They have proved that electricity can be used for the purpose of extracting ore from the raw material.

But the question arises: What jurisdiction have we over the matter ? What right have we to legislate over water power in Ontario or Quebec ? I do not know if we have jurisdiction over the water powers of the St. Lawrence. If I remember rightly, the Ontario government claims those which are situated within that province. We have no jurisdiction even over the Ottawa river which divides Ontario and Quebec, the jurisdiction is in the two adjoining provinces. Then what jurisdiction have we ? We have jurisdiction over certain water powers which we have developed ourselves in building canals in various parts of the country. But a very small moiety of the water of this country is under our jurisdiction, we have very little now upon the Welland canal. This entire question as to the preservation of our water power ; as to its municipalization, if you may call it that, the control over the water power, depends entirely upon the provincial governments, and we have no power to pass regulations and laws in reference to it. But still it is an interesting question. Even the discussion of the question is interesting and I am with the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) and the hon. member for Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) in the belief that we have sources of wealth greater than those of any other agricultural country of equal size in the water powers which we possess and that we have cheaper means, at least at the present moment, of producing power and light than any other country. I believe that such development will soon take place in electricity as electricity may be commercially converted into heat. If that is so, then we will have in the water powers of this country a greater source of wealth than that of any other country, as the Prime Minister has said, of equal extent, in any other part of the world.

Mr. SAM HUGHES (Victoria and Haliburton). In supporting the motion of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) I desire to ask the government what is the nature of the arrangement made with the province of Ontario in the recent taking over of the water tributary to the Trent canal in the county which I have the honour to represent. I understand that recently the waters tributary to the Trent canal in Victoria county have been taken over by this government from the province of Ontario and that it is the intention of this government to erect dams for the storage of water in reservoirs throughout that area and in the remote regions of the county. Does the government control the electrical power in connection with these water powers or does the Ontario government retain control of the water powers ?

Mr. HYMAN. This is not a matter within the Public Works Department. It is a matter within the Railway Department and whether arrangement to which the hon. gen-

tleman (Mr. Sam Hughes) has referred has been consummated or not I am not aware. There were negotiations proceeding for some time between the Ontario government and the Dominion government in reference to the taking over of certain dams on the Trent canal. These dams were erected originally for the purpose of assisting the lumber interests. Their use for this purpose has now practically ceased and in reference to a lot of these dams a proposal has been made to utilize them for furnishing and storing water for the Trent canal. I believe that the Ontario government asked that the Dominion government should take them over. I am not in a position to say whether the arrangement has been consummated but I am quite sure the government will be willing and desirous that the facts in connection with the matter should be laid upon the table.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, whether this parliament or the legislatures have jurisdiction I am sure that we are indebted to my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) for bringing the matter to the attention of the House. Speaking from the standpoint of the coal areas there was one remark to which I would take objection, namely, that there is any difference in the facility of transmitting power generated by coal and power generated by the action of water. You can transmit along a wire power generated by coal as easily as power generated by water and there is no distinction in that regard although I understand some such distinction to have been suggested by my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean).

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In connection with what has been observed by my right hon. friend the leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) I did not gather whether he said that there had been a commission appointed to investigate this subject.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, on the leases.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was the report ever laid before parliament ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It will be as soon as we have it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You have not the report ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We may have it for all I know.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is one observation to be made in respect to the use made of water powers, subject to the control of this government and it is this : whether or not the government is disposed to go as far as has been suggested and utilize these water powers so that the power shall be delivered to the municipalities and by municipalities to individuals. I think we all should agree that leases of water powers controlled by this government should be made for such terms and under such conditions as will prevent an undue share of the increment in value being taken up by private corporations. If you grant to a corporation for speculative purposes a long lease of a power controlled by this government one result is sure to follow. In the first place it is extremely likely that that water power will remain undeveloped for a long time. There will be no competition in regard to it. Then, if the term is long and the rental fixed at a low sum in the first instance, when that water power is developed and when it comes to be utilized through the corporation by the general public, the general public will get very much the worst of the arrangement. I would suggest that all these leases should be made either for short terms or else that periods of five or ten years should be fixed at the expiration of which the government should have the power to deal with the question of rental. That system has to some extent been carried into force by the government of Nova Scotia in connection with the leases of coal, and I am not sure whether the same idea has been carried out in connection with the leases of old areas or not. I think it has not. My hon. friend from Cape Breton suggests that it has. Very well, so much more apt is the illustration. Certainly it is carried out in so far as the leases of coal are concerned. The lease is for twenty years, renewable for four additional terms; at least that was the nature of the lease when I last examined it. The lease is for twenty years, renewable for four additional terms of twenty years, but at the expiration of each term the government has power to increase the rental or royalty. I would prefer a shorter term in leases of public utilities. It is essential that these utilities should either be granted for short terms, or if granted for comparatively long terms there should be shorter periods fixed at the expiration of which the government should have power to deal with the question of rental. The adoption of such a policy would tend to give to the people of this country, either through government control or through increased revenues from the use of the water power the benefit of any increase in the value of these water powers which arises from time to time by reason of commercial development, or by reason of greater opportunities for making use of these water powers. I repeat again that the thanks of the House are due to my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier for bringing this matter to our attention.

Hon. C. S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works). Mr. Speaker, as far as I am concerned I am in hearty sympathy with the motion which has been brought before the House by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). So little has been thought either by the provinces or by the Dominion government of the value of these water

powers that up to the present time, as my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart) has stated, we are very much at sea in reference to the whole question of jurisdiction over water powers. I will give as an illustration the question of the water powers at the Chaudière Falls within a very short distance of Ottawa. Upon this side of the Chaudière river, the Dominion government practically control owing to the Ontario government some years ago surrendering their rights to the Dominion government, but on the Quebec side the power is being operated through a sale having been made of the land by the Quebec government to the owners and it is being operated there under Quebec law. The question of the jurisdiction has been considered by the government, but it is a complicated question, and, as to just what steps the government intends to take in reference to it I am not prepared to say further than that the government fully appreciate its importance.

The question in its relation to the Niagara River is being dealt with by the International waterways commission and the House has full information with regard to the reasons why that commission was appointed, and as to the scope of its work. I have hopes that the International commission will be able to make such representations to this government and to the government of the United States as may lead to an agreement being made, followed by a treaty, which will meet the approval of both the people of this country and of the United States. Charters to develop power at Niagara Falls have been given not only by the Ontario Legislature but by the Dominion parliament as well. The charters granted by this government are as to powers which would be the outcome of Dominion government works, and it has always been conceded that this is under the control of the Dominion government. I think I may say that the right of the Ontario government to grant these charters for the utilization of the water at Niagara may fairly well be questioned.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Hear, hear.

Mr. HYMAN. I am not however prepared to say that the present moment is the proper time to take up that question. The hon. gentleman for York (Mr. Maclean) has referred to the export from Canada to the United States of the power which is generated, and I do not think it possible that there can be any question that the jurisdiction as to that is vested in the Dominion government.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. And the tariff law.

Mr. HYMAN. I will speak of that in a moment. I think it cannot be questioned but that this government has full and complete jurisdiction as to the export of that power. The situation is very difficult in this way: There has been authority already given for the development of a large quantity of horse power at Niagara Falls upon the Canadian side, and were the government to say now that not one single horse power of that should be exported to the United States, it might greatly interfere at the present time with the development of this power. Always providing however that we on this side of the water are not prepared to utilize that power, I think I may say that the government purposes laying down a policy in reference to the exportation of that power which for all time to come will give the Canadian government full and complete control; looking always to the fact that our development is such that that power will be required on the Canadian side. Applications have already been made for leave to place wires across Niagara for the purpose of exporting the power. For the reasons I have stated, I do not think it is wise that the government should say now: You shall not export. But, the gov ernment does purpose saying in the first place, that any permission given may be revoked by the government upon short notice; in the second place, that there shall be no claim of any possible kind against the Dominion government or any government because of the revocation of any permission which may be temporarily given to export power; and, in the third place, that any company asking for authority to export power shall conform to all rules and regulations which now or hereafter may be put in force in reference to the exportation of power. I think, Mr. Speaker, that with that permission carefully guarded, the only question the government would then have to consider would be as to whether from time to time that water power could be used upon the Canadian side, and in this way the government would have under its control the regulation of every single horse power that now or hereafter might be developed at Niagara Falls.

The hon. gentleman from York (Mr. Maclean) has also referred to the preservation of the scenic beauty of Niagara Falls. That is a question of the gravest importance. Apart altogether from sentiment, the scenic grandeur of the falls has a commercial value, and I feel quite sure that the people of all Canada are anxious that the beauties of this wonder of nature should be preserved. I think that a solution of this will be found. I know that the question is engaging the atttention of the International commission at the present time and I hope a solution will be arrived at under which the government of the United States and the government of Canada may arrange that no more horse power will be permitted to be developed from the Niagara river than is consistent with the preservation of its scenic grandeur. There is no report from the commission in reference to that

matter at the present time, but another meeting will be held shortly, and meanwhile this government has given instructions—or rather I should say they have notified the commission of their desire that the spoliation of Niagara by power companies should not be permitted. If there should come about a treaty, what the nature of that treaty may be the government have no exact information at the moment.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. When does the minister expect the report of the commission ?

Mr. HYMAN. An interim report will be laid on the table of the House possibly within a week or ten days.

Mr. HAGGART. If you have not jurisdiction how can you make any arrangement ?

Mr. HYMAN. As to the question of jurisdiction I have advised the commission that while at present it might not be advantageous to raise that question, they should enter into negociations with the Ontario government and place all the arrangements they propose to make before Mr. Whitney, and endeavour in conjunction with him (if his government has jurisdiction) or in conjunction with the federal government (if this government has jurisdiction) complete arrangements without at this stage entering into a discussion as to which government has jurisdiction. The matter is in good hands when the international waterways commission has charge of it ; they have given a great deal of attention to the question, and I trust that such conclusions may be arrived at as shall be satisfactory to this House and to the country.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT (Renfrew). As president of the Canadian Electrical Association I thank the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) for having brought this matter before the House and the government. It is high time that the Dominion government, as well as the government of Ontario and Quebec should take steps to guard and conserve these water powers which are becoming of such increasingly great value. It must be remembered however, that it is not very easy for any man to invest the amount of money necessary to develop a water power, and then, as one of the hon. gentlemen has suggested, that he should be put off with a lease of five years. Some people have no idea of what large capital it takes to prepare for the establishment of a plant, get a generator, and then put up a high tension wire to transmit the power to a distant point.

Who would ever dream of putting money into such a scheme and then have to give up his privilege at the end of five years ? It is high time the government should take these water powers into their consideration and see that none are sold or leased unless the party undertakes to develop them within reasonable time. Some basis should be established on which to compute prices to be charged for the sale of these powers. For a long time we did not realize the immense value we possessed in them. For a long time electricians were in doubt whether they would have single base or multiple generators to generate electricity, but all these problems have been thoroughly worked out and we can now have splendidly equipped lines through which we can send power almost an indefinite distance. The government should take this matter in hand and see that the water powers under their jurisdiction be sold in such a way that the public may get the full benefit.

Mr. MONK. Regarding the suggestion made by my hon. friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) it did occur to me that it would be a great advantage if we could cover by the return I asked for, the assets of the provinces. I did not see, however, how I could properly include that within the scope of my motion. But I quite agree that the government could not render better service, at any rate to the province of Quebec, than to institute an investigation which would cover the water powers belonging to that province. There are a great many ways other than paying out money to a province in which this government can assist, and that is one. I think perhaps that at present the best way would be to make such a return as is available in the department and the government might institute further inquiry after it has put the House in possession of the information at hand. Just one word as regards jurisdiction. I think my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart) is mistaken on that point. On most of these water powers we have jurisdiction. Our jurisdiction arises under the terms of section 91 of the British North America Act which gives the Dominion parliament exclusive control over navigation. That point arose in the case of the Chambly Electric Company. That company was incorporated by the Quebec Legislature, but when it came to develop power in the river Richelieu it found that dams and flumes and other constructions had to be erected in the river, which of course affected navigation. So the company had to come to Ottawa to obtain authority to make those structures. The same thing occurred in the case of the Lachine Hydraulic Works. That company had to come to this parliament to get authority to construct works in a navigable river. On that principle the Dominion government has granted leases for the exercise of water powers in the Ottawa. The moment you attempt to develop the power, you interfere with navigation, and come under the control of the Dominion parliament. Therefore on that point I think my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart)

is mistaken. We have large water powers in our canals. If hon. members will look at the last report of Railways and Canals, they will find that extensive water powers on our canals have been leased for the sum of $230,000 or $240,000, and yet last year a comparatively small portion of those rentals was collected. I am informend that were those water powers on our canals properly utilized, they would bring the government far greater revenue. But we have still greater water powers in our rivers and streams which, under the section of the Federal Act I have referred to, come within our legislative control.

Motion agreed to.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

VETERANS OF FENIAN RAIDS.

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

That it is desirable that the government of Canada should recognize in some substantial manner the services rendered during the Fenian raids of 1866 and 1870 by our Canadian volunteers.

He said : The object of this motion is to call the attention of the government to the advisability of settling now a matter that has been in abeyance for a considerable length of time and also if necessary, to test the opinion of the House as to the manner in which the matter should be settled. I may mention to the House that there are in Montreal and its immediate vicinity a considerable number of survivors of the volunteers who were in active service at the time of the Fenian raids of 1866 and 1870. How the claim which they now urge had its origin I do not exactly know nor do I think it is very important for the House to inquire into it. Within the last two or three years, being organized and having had occasion, I think upon invitation, several times to present their claims and make representations to the federal as well as to the provincial government, they are naturally anxious to see what solution is to be given to the matter, and I am sure members of this House who reside in Montreal, as well as myself, have on many occasions been interviewed by members of that very important and representative body of men who have sought for information as to what is going to be done. Three times, I believe, they have had occasion to interview the federal government since 1896. On one occasion they were referred to, or at any rate some doubt was expressed as to whether they should not make their representations to the local government. They did so ; they went in a deputation to Quebec and they were there referred to the government at Ottawa. I shall briefly state the nature of the steps they have taken at diverse times since 1896. In 1896 a large representation of the volunteer veterans of these two raids had occasion to come to Ottawa. They met, as representatives of the government, the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the hon. the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden). Speaking in answer to remarks that were made on that occasion by Major McMillan, Colonel Lyman, Major Harper and other members of the volunteer forces, among whom were Colonel Ibbottson and Senator Temple, the Prime Minister stated :

He would like to find a few facts about the subject under discussion so that he would have a basis to work upon. To begin with, he said, 'I would like to know about how many men were called out at that time, and if it is the desire of the present delegation that services of all the remaining veterans who took an active part and also in what way it is considered their services would best be recognized.'

In reply Major McMillan stated that at that time some 25,000 men were called out ; he considered fully a third are now dead (some of the members here stated that probably far more than that are now gone). Of course, the Major said, there were probably quite a number who would be satisfied simply with badges, but he understood the majority were strongly in favour of receiving a grant of land and a medal as volunteers who have taken part in more recent rebellions have been granted. It was also intended, he said, that all who signed for service should be remembered, as although they had not seen active service, it was only because they had not been called.

In making his reply Mr. Laurier stated that he fully appreciated the strength of the reason that all should be remembered and that nothing would give him greater pleasure than laying the claims of the veterans before his colleagues at the next parliament, as he regretted to say it was too late at present to bring it up at the present session.

A deputation, I think, interviewed the government since then but I have no account of what took place when their representations were laid before the government. I have been told that between 1896 and 1905 representations were made in a formal manner by duly authorized representatives of the corps of volunteers.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Just a year ago a deputation came here.

Mr. MONK. In May, 1905, a very large deputation, which members of the House will remember having seen here, a deputation representing the province of Quebec, the French speaking veterans, the Eastern Townships corps and some from the province of Ontario, were presented to the government by my friend from the St. Lawrence division of Montreal (Mr. Ames) and the member for Ottawa (Mr. Stewart) who also spoke upon that occasion. The Prime Minister is reported as follows :

Sir Wilfrid Laurier received much applause when he rose to reply. Two years ago he had

been approached by a smaller deputation on a similar errand, but as the session was far advanced he had been unable to give them a definite answer. He had told them then he hoped to be in a better position next time they came to him. The members had evidently remembered his words, for they had now returned in largely increased numbers.

He could hardly claim to be a veteran as they had called him, for he had only been a volunteer in 1870. When the regiment he belonged to had been mustered the trouble was over.

To the victors, he said, belonged the spoils. was an expression most of them were familiar with. While the veterans had turned back the invaders in 1866 and 1870 there had been no spoils left. Thirty years after they come to ask from the country some recognition for their services, and he thought some appreciation should be shown. Their services then had saved the country from much humiliation, if not worse.

Had the invaders not been repelled at the border much misery would have been caused, although, of course, the country would not have been conquered.

What the veterans asked was not much. He could not give a definite answer himself to their request, but he could assure them that he and the ministers with him would be very pleased to report their request to the Privy Council.

The meeting closed with three cheers and a 'tiger' for Sir Wilfrid, called for by some enthusiastic veteran.

Last session, I had occasion, towards the close of the session, to refer to this matter. And my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) spoke as follows on that occasion, as reported in 'Hansard' of 1905, volume 4, page 6047 :

I think it is obvious to any one, and my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) will agree with me, that if the veterans of 1866 and 1870 have a claim against anybody, it is the Dominion government, although I do not say that the veterans, from their point of view, have not done well to address themselves to the provincial government. Mr. Gouin, the provincial premier, I do not think went further in his answer than to say that they should first of all address themselves to the Dominion government. This they have done, and the matter is now under consideration. But I must say, and my hon. friend will not be surprised, that up to this moment the government has had no time to take the matter in hand and give it the attention which it will require before we can come to a conclusion. The matter is under consideration, and without making any pledge, I will say that I will give an answer during the present session. When the answer will be given, I am sorry to say that I can give no indication today to my hon. friend, but certainly it will be given during the present session.

Now, as to the number of veterans, so far as the province of Quebec is concerned, as well as I can judge from information that I have carefully gathered, the number now in a position to receive any acknowledgment that the government might be pleased to give is, at most, 1,700. In Ontario the number is larger, but not so large as was stated in a certain newspaper a few days ago, which said that there were 40,000 claims. There were never more than 25,000 men called out. And, I believe it will be found that not more than 12,000 are living to-day, or, adding the number from the province of Quebec a total of 14,000 veterans at present living. The applications were made to the government, I find, in 1896 then in 1903 and then during the session of 1905.

As to the kind of acknowledgment to be given, undoubtedly that which has been talked about during these interviews, and probbably on that account is most mentioned amongst the veterans, is a grant of land. We have a very large territory still in the hands of the government which we are endeavouring to settle. It is most desirable that that territory should be settled as soon as possible and with the best sort of people. I do not think it would be possible to find better men to undertake the settlement of our great Northwest than these men. Objection has been taken on the ground that there are not only the veterans whose claim I am now urging, but also other deserving classes. Reference is made to the volunteers, who, in 1885 went up to the Northwest to put down the rebellion there. There were also those who saw active service during the Boer war in South Africa. And certainly, whatever may be the opinions one may hold as to the justice of that war, it must be agreed that these men shed great credit upon their country. But each class of these men are in a different position. The veterans to whom I am referring took up arms at a time of danger and responded to the call to defend their country. Those of 1885 who went to active service in order to quell internal trouble. And, of course, the men who went out to South Africa went under special circumstances, volunteered and went into a foreign country there to defend the British flag. As far as I am concerned if the government came to the conclusion that the claim I am advocating, the claim of this class of veterans is one which can be reasonably entertained, I would have no objection whatever that a similar favour should be extended to all those who in these moments of peril, and at the call of the authorities responded and worked bravely for the defence of their country or in vindictation of Britain's cause. I find that there is one thing in common amongst all these men—they are honourable Canadian citizens who have deserved well of their country, who have shed great credit upon their country, they are men to whom might well be confided under special circumstances which the government could determine, the excellent task of settling a couple of million acres of waste land in the Northwest.

If we turn to the report of the Department of the Interior, which shows how our territory in the Northwest is being settled, we find that at this moment those who are availing themselves of the extremely fav-

ourable conditions as to settlement are mostly foreigners. Whether the propaganda, the advertisement of the extreme advantage in settling our Northwest has been carried on more actively outside the country than inside, or whether it is that the inhabitants of the older provinces are satisfied with their lot and care little for going up to settle in the Northwest, the fact remains that these lands which we are disposing of are falling largely into the hands of foreign immigrants. Let me give the figures for 1902, 1903, and 1904, the last years of which we have complete returns. These are the three last years of which we have record. In 1902 we had 14,672 immigrants taking up homestead entries in the Northwest. In 1903 the whole of the homestead entries in the Northwest amounted to 31,383. The last year of which we have record is 1904, in which there were 26,073 homestead entries. Now, out of these 26,073 homesteaders, representing, according to this report for 1903-4, 68,381 souls ; what proportion was Canadian ? The larger number were from the province of Ontario, from which there were 3,692 homesteaders ; from the province of Quebec, only 429 ; from the province of Nova Scotia, 131; from New Brunswick, 102; from Prince Edward Island, 87 ; from Manitoba, 753 ; from the Northwest Territories, 493 ; from British Columbia, 69. So that the immense majority of those homestead entries during the years to which I am now referring, the last of which we have record, were made by foreigners coming in and taking up those lands. In fact out of 26,000, there were probably 22,000 foreigners who availed themselves of the favourable conditions which we offer to immigrants coming in and taking up our lands, getting land for nothing in the Northwest.

Now let us see for a moment how we stand with respect to the large vacant territory we have in the Northwest. I am advocating, not an absolutely free grant of land, perhaps, to these men ; but on account of their merits we should acknowledge their services, the fidelity with which they have performed their duties, and at the same time encourage the volunteer movement, which I think should be encouraged in this country. We may not all share the same ideas as to what is called vaguely militarism, but there is no doubt whatever that we require a strong volunteer force well organized, ready at any moment to give a good account of itself ; and in order to have that we should encourage in every way possible the volunteer movement. Well, up to now we have done absolutely nothing in the way of granting our waste lands on favourable conditions in the direction to which I am referring. We have granted in the Northwest Territories and Manitoba to railway companies, 56,000,000 acres—I am giving the figures approximately but correctly. Out of that grant the railway companies have earned 30,000,000 acres. Out of the lands we have at the disposal of homesteaders, 25,000,000 have been taken up. We are often under the impression, and that impression is very often expressed in words, that we have a limitless area of land. I think in this House two or three sessions ago, in answer to a question put to the Minister of the Interior, we were told that there were 100,000,000 acres still open for homesteaders. According to careful calculations made recently by my hon. friend from St. Antoine Division, Montreal, (Mr. Ames), who has gone into this matter with great care and who has visited the Northwest, we still have, of even numbered sections open to homesteading, only 12,000,000 acres, which, as matters are now proceeding, would probably give to men coming from Europe, immigrants not Canadian born but coming into the country from the continent of Europe or from the United States, probably 10,000,000, if not more, out of this 12,000,000 of acres remaining to be homesteaded. It will take at the present rate of immigration and under present conditions, if they are continued, a comparatively short time for the rest of that domain of some 12,000,000 acres to be taken up. It is calculated that even within three years this 12,000,000 acres, as things are proceeding now, will be taken up. Opinions may naturally differ as to the propriety or wisdom of allowing, as we have done in the past, such a very large and to a certain extent indiscriminate immigration into Canada. The House is aware that the system which has been established here for years is directly opposed to what has invariably prevailed in the United States. The policies are totally different. We spend an immense amount of money in bringing immigrants into the country, we spend very large sums in advertising our country abroad. We certainly favour immigrants coming into the country by the treatment we extend them when they arrive here, more than we favour our own people. We pay bonuses to men who undertake to bring these immigrants into the country. In the United States an absolutely different policy prevails. A tax is charged to immigrants entering that country of $2 a head, which it is intended, I believe, probably to increase. We advertise in foreign countries. All printed advertisements in foreign countries to induce immigrants to come to the United States are strictly forbidden by law, and no bonus of any kind is paid for immigrants entering the United States. A far stricter surveillance than is exercised here is enforced there over immigrants entering the United States. In other words, their policy is to a certain extent to keep out immigrants, or at any rate, to scrutinize closely those who enter and to derive a revenue from them. Every year the United States derives from immigration an amount not only sufficient to cover the immense cost of

the inspection of immigrants arriving there, but an amount which leaves a large surplus. Now that is a policy I believe in. I think it is time for us to change our system with regard to immigration and not to encourage indiscriminate immigration to Canada. But in the meantime, and whilst this Northwest country is being settled by such a large number of people the immense majority of whom come from foreign countries—last year I think there were 47,000 Americans coming in—I think we should endeavour to place in the midst of that population a sprinkling of our own people whose presence there could not but do an immense amount of good. Here is an occasion where that can be done, whilst at the same time we acknowledge the services of these men who have as volunteers done their duty to their country.

Scrip might be given to them, quarter sections might be given to them without conditions and they would do with them what they saw fit, or conditions might be imposed upon them whilst granting them each a quarter section which would enable them if they would not ensure their own presence on the lands to be settled—because most of them have reached an age when it is to a certain extent impossible for them to go themselves and settle these lands—to delegate the execution of the restrictions upon them for the settlement and for the final patenting of these lots to members of their own families. They might in that way be benefited, the settlement of some million and a half or two milion acres of land by our own people would be assured and you would create what I think is necessary—a warm interest among our own people in the settlement of these lands, you would give them an idea what these lands are worth and at the same time fulfil the object which I had in view when I gave notice of this motion and which is to acknowledge the services rendered by this large and influential class of people who represent our veteran volunteers. I think under all the circumstances they are at any rate entitled to a definite answer from the government at an earlier date. My right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has delayed them for a considerable time. I think he will admit that. At the present moment we are anxious to know what the government has decided. These veterans have reached an age when expedition is necessary in the matter and on this account I trust the government will see fit to formulate as soon as possible its policy upon this important matter, and I trust also that the government will see fit upon the lines which I have briefly indicated to reward the services of these men who have done their duty to their country.

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia). Mr. Speaker, I am sure that every one in this House will agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) who has moved this motion in all that he has said in praise of the work done by those men who went to the front so readily to protect the soil of this country against the invader. Those who are old enough to remember the conditions, which existed at that time will remember what excitement existed throughout eastern Canada. The conditions during the war between the north and the south had been such as on more than one occasion to cause very great fear of some peril, some clash of arms between Great Britain and the United States, something occurring which might be greatly to our detriment. Fortunately nothing of that kind occurred, but at the close of the war a band of marauders was organized which threatened to overrun this country. I imagine that the excited condition of the public mind was such that the danger was always, to some extent, magnified. I do not, however, think that it should or that it does in any way diminish the great credit which is due to those veterans who went to the front at that time. It may, however, be desirable at this late date, so long after these events, to refer very briefly indeed to the occurrences which actually took place at that time, and first I would like to refer to the number of men actually called out. I have taken some trouble to collect these statistics, and I find that in 1866, between March and June, something like from 20,000 to 25,000 men in the old provinces of Ontario and Quebec were called out and were under arms. I might remind the House at this point that this particular occurrence, the raid of 1866, took place more than a year before confederation, and I might also remind the House that what was going on in Ontario and Quebec was also going on elsewhere, and that precisely the same conditions existed in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and that relatively to the population of these provinces quite as many of the militia were called out as in the great provinces of Ontario and Quebec. While 20,000 to 25,000 men were under arms in the provinces of old Canada, there were probably fully 10,000 under arms in the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. So I must remind my hon. friend at this point that whatever is to be done, if anything is to be done, for the volunteers of that time in Ontario and Quebec the same thing must be done for the volunteers who served similarly in the provinces of New Brunswich and Nova Scotia.

Mr. MONK. I was under the impression that there had not been any calling out of the militia in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There was.

Mr. MONK. In 1866?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. In 1866. It was feared that the Fenians would seize the steamer plying between Portland and St. John, N.B.; in fact we had very reliable in-

formation that arrangements had been made to seize the boat at or near Eastport in the state of Maine and that it was intended to bring a regiment of Fenian soldiers to some point at the head of the Bay of Fundy, presumably the town of Windsor in Nova Scotia, and the whole of western Nova Scotia was under arms and ready for the attack. Similarly, on the border line between New Brunswick and the state of Maine, there were threatenings of invasion and all along that line the volunteers in New Brunswick were under arms. Now, I will refer to what took place in 1870. In 1870, 6,000 men were called out in April, and at the beginning of June 13,500 were under arms in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec; there being no alarm in the lower provinces the militia were not called out there. Now, as to what actually took place—these men were ready for action, but how many of them went to the front?

Mr. BERGERON. In what year ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. In both years; I will take 1866 first and 1870 afterwards. In 1866, at Ridgeway on the Niagara frontier on the 2nd of June there were: The Queens Own Rifles, 11 companies, the 13th Battalion, 6 companies, and two independent companies of rifles (the York and the Caledonia), making a total of 840 of all ranks. These were under the command of Lt.-Col. Booker the commanding officer of the 13th. The casualties of that force were 9 killed and 22 wounded.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The 10th Royals were there.

Mr. BARKER. Is the minister speaking of Ridgeway ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. And you say there were only 840 men.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Actually at the front. That is my information.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Where were the 10th Royals and the G. G. B. G. ?

Mr. BARKER. The minister says he is speaking of the men actually at the front; there were thousands besides these. I was there myself, within a few miles.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I say there were 20,000 called out in 1866 in Ontario and Quebec, and that actually at the front and engaged, there were at Ridgeway a total of 840 of all ranks under Lt.-Col. Booker, and the casualties of that force were 9 killed and 22 wounded. At Fort Erie, on the same day, there were a detachment of the Welland Field Battery acting as infantry, and the Dunnville Naval Brigade totalling 75 of all ranks. They met the retiring Fenians and they had six men wounded besides losing 54 captured by the enemy. Besides the above mentioned, Col. Peacock had a column at New Germany not far off, consisting of 55 men of a battery of the Royal Artillery. 550 Regular Infantry and 765 militia infantry; and Col. Lowery had a column at Clifton consisting of a battery of the Royal Artillery, 340 Regular Infantry and 752 militia infantry. Neither of these bodies ever met the enemy. In 1870, on the 25th of May at Eccles Hill, in the county of Mississquoi, an invading force of 200 Fenians was driven back by 40 men of the 60th militia battalion and some 40 farmers; no casualties. On the 27th of the same month about 250 Fenians crossed the frontier in Huntingdon county and were met by a brigade under the command of Lt.-Col. Bagot of the 69th Regular regiment. consisting of 450 men of that regiment, 380 of the Montreal Garrison Artillery and Engineers, and 300 of the 50th Militia Battalion. The enemy was driven off without any loss to us. It will be observed that in all but one of these engagements the regular army which was then stationed in different parts of Canada, took part, and that the command in every case but one was held by an imperial officer.

Mr. BARKER. I do not think that is so.

Mr. BERGERON. Is the minister speaking of 1866 all the time ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No. I particularize 1866 and 1870. I will send my hon. friend over this paper which I am quoting from. Now, I find that in all these engagements there were 21 wounded and 9 or 10 killed.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. For the two years ?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, and 49 were pensioned including widows and orphans. The wounded who survived were pensioned, and all those dependent on the men killed were pensioned and if living they are still receiving pensions. Therefore, the wounded and the families of those who were killed seem to have been fully provided for. Shortly after the present government came into office a deputation of the veterans of the Fenian Raid waited upon the government asking for some recognition of their services. I remember distinctly the wording of the many letters and petitions I received, and the whole tenor of the contention then was that no recognition whatever had been given for the services which had been rendered. or which these gentlemen were prepared to render had they been called upon to go to the front. They felt that having made sacrifices, or having been prepared to make sacrifices for their country, it was only fair that some recognition should be given—not a substantial recognition for they told me over and over again that was not what they asked for. What they wanted was something to show their countrymen that the country recognized they had done service which was

worthy the presentation of a medal or a badge of some kind. It was one of my first official duties to obtain the sanction of Her late Majesty to the granting of a medal to these men and I understood for many years they were absolutely satisfied with that. It now seems they take a different view. If we are to agree that some further recognition should be given, I understand from my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) that he would be satisfied if these veterans were given homesteads in the Northwest, and I infer from the whole line of his argument that they would actually transfer themselves from the east and settle in the west.

Mr. MONK. I said that I thought that was an impossible condition on account of the age of these men and the fact that their lives were irrevocably fixed in the east. But, I suggested the placing of a condition on the grant by which it would not be made the subject of speculation as so many of these grants have been.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The argument of my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) was that the present policy of settling the Northwest was erroneous and contrasted unfavourably with the policy of the United States, and he pointed out that we were seeking by advertisement and bonus to induce settlers from the four corners of the earth, that it would be much better to get settlers within our own country, and that it would be a good thing to leaven the lump so to speak by sending some of these men out there. So, I think it was fair for me to assume that if his proposal meant anything, it meant that these men should actually go there and settle or you might amend that by allowing members of their families to settle in their place. But I question the policy of issuing scrip to these men and allowing them the privilege of selling it to some of these foreigners or undesirable settlers which hon. gentlemen opposite occasionally wax so indignant over. It seems to me we must guard very carefully the condition on which we would grant homesteads. The only point of view from which the proposition could be favourably considered would be that these men might be given a special advantage over others in the selection of homesteads, but only on condition that they became actual settlers. Admitting for a moment that that view could be accepted would my hon. friend limit the granting of homesteads to the 2,000 or less who remain in his own province. I understood one of his arguments to be that after all this will not be such a serious matter because there were less than 2,000 of these men living in the province of Quebec and some 10,000 or 12,000 in Ontario. Well, what about the other 15,000 or 20,000 who answered the call to arms and were ready to go to the front and who have since passed away? Are their children not to be recognized? Are we to limit this recognition entirely to the men now living and restrict it to the provinces of Ontario and Quebec? Why not include Nova Scotia and New Brunswick? It seems to me that the question is surrounded with some difficulties and that when our friends, the veterans of that time, come to reflect upon the whole situation, they will be inclined to withdraw this claim. Surely we are not to establish a precedent that whenever this country is threatened by invasion, such as that of 1866, or whenever a rebellion has to be quelled, our volunteers shall demand payment in land or money. That does not accord with my ideas of true patriotism and genuine loyalty, and I do not think that the veterans, upon second thoughts, will feel at all grateful to any one who presents that view. But since my hon. friend has presented his argument and suggested that homesteads bona fide should be offered to these men who might be willing to go to the Northwest as actual settlers, I am inclined to the opinion that the government would be ready to take that matter into consideration.

Mr. MONK. They have that privilege now.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is what my hon. friend suggested and I am merely giving him all he asks. I said a moment ago that some advantages might be given in the way of offering them special privileges to settle in certain communities or in certain favoured quarters. I have no right however to speak for the Minister of the Interior, but I would be disposed to go that far and to see whether anything could be done to meet their views in that respect. But to admit for a moment that every time the militia is called out, they should be entitled to extraordinary privileges and grants of land, I do not think it is in accord with our ideas of British loyalty at all. I would ask my hon. friend whether, having presented his case, he would not withdraw his motion.

Mr. SAM. BARKER (Hamilton). I did not intend or expect to say a word on this occasion, any more than I have done on other occasions when this matter was before the House; but when an hon. gentleman tells this House that he does not think it is in accord with British loyalty that the men who were out in 1866 or 1870 should expect any recognition from the government, I differ from him. I was out in 1866 and 1870 and have never yet asked the slightest recognition from the government, either of the province in which I live, or this government. I have never even asked for a medal; but for years past, the members of the old regiment to which I belonged, the 7th of London, have corresponded with me, and I can tell the hon. gentleman that these men whether they live in Toronto or Quebec or Michigan or Illinois, have a warm heart for their old friends and the old times and do feel a little

sore that they have not met with the recognition they think they deserve. The hon. gentleman speaks of the conditions in those days. I do not think he knows what the conditions of the volunteers then were. I was an officer of the 7th regiment in 1866, and I recollect being called out in March of that year and drilling daily until June, and I can recollect the last day, I think it was of May, after our evening meal, when we went down to the drill shed and the whole regiment was there drilling, Col Hawley, commander of the 60th rifles, came in and without a word of warning told us that we were to go to the front that night. I recollect well that when he, a few minutes later, said he would send only one-half the regiment and when the officers went to their companies and said only one-half would go, there was almost a riot because no man would stay behind. And when Col. Hawley was told what the trouble was, he laughingly, like a soldier, said I will take the responsibility of sending you all. We were there that night in our ordinary summer uniform, with our rifles and accoutrements, without an overcoat or knapsack, without the most ordinary equipment of a soldier, and within an hour after that we were on board freight box cars on the way to meet the Fenians who were then reported to have crossed Niagara river. That was the condition of things in those days. We had not then all the fine equipment which our militia have to-day. Those men from Friday night until Monday night had not a particle of food, except an early breakfast at Paris on Saturday morning, and from that time until they got home again on Monday evening, no food was served to them.

The only regiments at Ridgeway that got any food, so far as I could see, were those who relied on a carload of food sent by their own fellow citizens. Had it not been for that they would have starved like the rest of us. That, Sir, was the condition of things in those days. The 7th Regiment left London in the evening of Friday. Not a man was able to go to his home to tell his family, his relations or his friends that he had been ordered to the front. The only man I knew of who was able to get away was my fellow officer who got a minute or two to go down to tell the girl to whom he was about to be married that he was ordered to the frontier. I do not think there was another man in the regiment who got even that much. I was an officer, and I, with the men of my company, had to get into a freight car that had been loaded with lime; in that box car we travelled to Paris and you can imagine the condition we were in when we arrived there. We arrived in Port Colborne in the evening, just in time to see the 13th and the other men who had fought at Ridgeway returning. We lay on the ground all night and at 2 o'clock we saw the dead bodies to which you referred, brought in in farm wagons. At 4 o'clock we started for Ridgeway and about 11 o'clock we walked over the ground where the battle had been fought and over the bodies of dead Fenians. On Sunday evening we arrived at the village of Ridgeway and we slept there that night. The next morning the men got up still without food. The regulars who were there, the battery of artillery and Col. Lowrie's regiment had obtained food; they had it with them, but we got none. I saw volunteers get the bone of a ham bake it over a fire and attempt to gnaw a bit of food off the bone to prevent themselves from starving. We returned on Monday and at Hamilton I recollect buying one sandwich which was the first food I had had since we left home. We got back to Hamilton black with mud from walking through swamps in Welland.

That is what those men did, they did not consider whether they were to get medals or land in the west or in Ontario. They went out to do their duty to their country and that, I think, is loyalty. These men were loyal and as I say for years back I have received letters from old men in the company in which I was an officer reminding me of those old days. Only recently I have had letters from Westmount, near Montreal, from an old sergeant of the company, recalling the old circumstances and wondering whether any recognition would be given by the country for what was done in those days. I have received letters from Canadians in Michigan to the same effect. Not long since, I received a letter from a fellow-officer on his death bed, asking me for a certificate recognizing what he had done when he was out. That is what those men think and feel and that is what the hon. gentleman tells us he does not think is loyalty. I say those men were loyal, they thought of nothing but loyalty, they sought nothing. Not a man of them would give a snap of his fingers for the sordid recognition; their hearts are warm towards their country, not only from the province in which they live but from the whole Dominion.

I do not want to speak warmly on this; I speak myself as one who was out, but I have never asked for a medal; I suppose I was entitled to one; I have certainly never asked one for myself. I am not seeking any land in the west, but I know I have the same feeling as these men have, and I tell you there are hundreds and hundreds of men in the States to-day who would gladly receive the slightest recognition, the slightest acknowledgement by Canada, that what they did in Canada is remembered.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Let me remind my hon. friend that 5,250 medals have been issued to the militia of that time.

Mr. BARKER. Possibly. I think the gentleman said that some 25,000 men turned out from the upper provinces and 10,000 from the lower provinces; that would mean that about one in seven received some recognition. I know that a great many of

these men did not receive any recognition. As I say, I never asked for it, I did not ask for it for the simple reason that I was not actually under fire. I arrived a few hours too late and therefore, as far as I was concerned, I did not want a medal and did not ask for it, but when an hon. gentleman says there were 5,000 who received medals there must be over 5,000 more who have received none. It is not a question now whether a man has already received something; it is the simple question, as I understand, whether there is anybody whatever who ought to receive some recognition or further recognition. I do not suppose any of these men would like to measure it in dollars or cents or acres, but I do think it is a mistake for any government, for any people, for any country, to try and measure with golden scales the recognition of patriotism. Surely such things ought to be generously done, surely we should not be stingy about our recognition. The late government of Ontario granted to a lot of these men acres and acres away up in New Ontario where there may be minerals but where they say they sow the wheat with shot-guns and I am told that the present government have to say they have not the land, even, to give them and are actually asking these men to take $50 as a recompense instead. Well, that is a noble thing for this Canada of ours to do. It is all very well to say: Shall we do this every time there is a rebellion, or a disturbance? There will probably never be such an occasion again as that of 1866. These men, if they did not fight, went out expecting to fight and were ready to fight. The men of the Queen's Own and of the 13th were under fire; some of them were killed and others wounded. Men of other regiments were equally ready to fight; but what they feel is that it is not whether they were hurt, it is not whether they suffered, but whether this country is willing to acknowledge that they were ready and willing to do their duty. That is the question and I do think it would be a grateful thing and a courteous thing for this country not to draw the line too narrowly but just to say to every one of these men: We are grateful to you, we acknowledge that you were good and loyal Canadians at the time you were called upon to do your duty and we desire to show we have not forgotten.

I shall give another instance. After Ridgeway there was another threat of invasion, and when the O'Neil party were threatening to cross the frontier, the very men who turned out in 1866, most of whom had been obliged to leave the ranks and go on with their ordinary employment, again volunteered. A brother officer and I had been obliged to leave our regiment; we could not retain our commissions and attend to the duties we were called upon to perform, but when the men were again called out that officer and myself again joined, this time, as privates, and went to the front and I recollect we were both promoted to be sergeants. I mention that as an example of what the men were doing in those days. It was not a question of philandering about in uniform; the men were willing to go out and do their duty and I think that should not be forgotten. An hon. gentleman says the danger was magnified. I do not know to what he refers, whether he thinks that the Fenian invasion across the Niagara River was magnified. If he does he was very much mistaken. It is quite true that the opposition to it was not very well handled. Mistakes were made undoubtedly, but undoubtedly the resistance that was shown the invaders stopped a very much larger invasion and if the volunteers had not turned out on that occasion as they did, no man can measure what the invasion might have been. I was on the spot, I could see across the Niagara River, and the hon. gentleman is very much mistaken if he thinks those who were prepared to take part in that invasion were confined to the few thousand men who actually crossed.

There were many, many thousands ready to follow them if they saw the slightest chance of success. The whole matter depended upon the prompt turning out of the Canadian volunteers. The fact that they were out so quickly, however unready they really were, was what stopped the invasion. I positively deny that there is any reason for saying that the invasion or the danger of it was magnified.

Mr. ARTHUR N. WORTHINGTON (Sherbrooke). After the complete and effective speech of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) there seems little left to say on the subject of the Fenian Raid veterans. However, representing as I do a constituency in which there are many Fenian Raid veterans—probably as many in proportion to the population as in any other county of the Dominion, I desire to unite with others in urging upon the government the consideration of these claims. The eastern townships of the province of Quebec, which are populated with descendants of United Empire Loyalists, and which border on the United States, naturally furnished many volunteers in 1886 and 1870, who turned out, at great inconvenience, loss of time and discomfort, to go to the front and repel these invasions. It is true, as the Minister of Militia has said that very few came in contact with the enemy, but all were willing and anxious to do so. Although not a member of the militia force at that time, I well remember when several regiments marched into Sherbrooke. I doubt that the Minister of Militia to-day could transport his regiments with greater celerity. The 58th battalion largely Scotch and coming from Megantic and Compton marched into Sherbrooke, a distance of from 60 to

80 miles, forty-eight hours after they had received the order to turn out. These regiments were quartered for several weeks in the drill shed, or patrolled the frontier and garrisoned Stanstead and other places along the border. And now, after almost forty years, these men are simply asking, as a reward for their loyalty, the same recognition that the province of Ontario gave its citizen soldiers of 1886 and 1870, and also those who returned from South Africa. In both of these cases scrip was given by the Ontario government. The citizen soldiers of Quebec, one might infer by the treatment meeted out to them, had a discount placed upon their loyalty.

We have free lands for Galicians, Doukhobors and every other class of immigrant that can be laid down here from Europe. Surely we should have something for our citizen soldiers. We have thousands of acres of land per mile to be given as subsidies to railways. Take the number of Fenian Raid veterans in the district of St. Francis, say about 600 and take two small railroads that are under construction in the eastern townships that have about 20 miles of construction, and the subsidy given to either of these roads 2,000 to 4,000 acres per mile, would more than furnish the land grants for all the Fenian Raid veterans in the Eastern Townships. These veterans have visited the capital several times in large delegations. I understand from correspondence I have had, that the District of St. Francis Fenian Raid Veteran's Association purpose, during this session, to make another pilgrimage to the capital. I think it would be wise to anticipate their wishes and give them this grant ; otherwise these deputations will become annual pilgrimages. If anything is to be done for these veterans it ought to be done now. After about twenty or thirty years it was decided by the war office to grant a medal for the services of these veterans, and now, almost forty years afterwards we are considering the question of giving them a land grant. If there is anything coming to the militiaman in Canada it should come, not in forty years after the services he has rendered, but it should come while he is militant here on earth.

Mr. J. W. DANIEL (St. John). I wish to endorse as strongly as I can the resolution of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). Before leaving home for the present session of parliament, my colleague (Mr. Stockton) in the representation of St. John constituency and I were waited upon by the representatives of this veterans' association and asked to promote, so far as we could, the application being made to this government for some recognition of their services. The Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) is perfectly correct, of course, in his statement that the men who were called out at the time of the Fenian Invasion were not confined to the provinces of Upper and Lower Canada. In my own constituency, the infantry corps were ordered down to the border as near as they could go, to Eastport where the Fenians were collected. They were sent down to St. Andrews, but how long they remained there I do not know. In addition to these the artillery were called out and probably other corps whose designation I am not familiar with. I hold, with others who have spoken, that we cannot treat our volunteers too well. We never know when we may want their services, and it appears to me that if they get the idea that after they have done what is wanted of them, that the country is niggardly and will not take a favourable view of what they have done, I think it can hardly have a good effect upon the young men of the country so far as volunteering is concerned. I am sorry that my colleague is absent. The deputation to which I referred placed in his hands certain documents in connection with the claim they are to make on the government. As my colleague is unfortunately absent, these papers are not available for me to-night, and therefore I am not in a position to place the claims of these veterans of New Brunswick before the House in such a manner as I should like to do. At the same time I must endorse in every particular the resolution of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), and I am sure we are all pleased at the able manner in which he has brought to the attention of the House the claims of these veterans. It may be true that some of these veterans did not lose much. But that was not their fault. They did their duty well and bravely, and, had they been under fire, I am sure they would have done the same.

Mr. R. N. WALSH (Huntingdon). I desire to say just a word in favour of the resolution. I represent a county which took an active part in resisting the Fenian invasion, and I can say that the men who volunteered at that time did so with no other object than the defence of their country, without any idea whatever that they might get a grant in the future. They suffered hardships, and I think I can say without fear of contradiction that it was owing to their services the invasion was so speedily and successfully resisted. These men were amongst the very best citizens of our county. Not only did they give their time on that occasion, but I would draw the attention of the minister to this fact, that in that county I do not think the government were at any expense in billeting the soldiers, because they were billeted and fed by the families of the men who had volunteered to go to the front, and that without any remuneration. I can say that the same spirit still exists there, and if a similar trouble were to arise to-morrow, they would be as ready to volunteer as they were then, and without looking for any pay.

Mr. SAMUEL HUGHES (Victoria). I was in hopes that the First Minister or the Minister of War from the Eastern Townships would have had a few words to say on this matter. But they both keep silence. Attention has been drawn to the fact that one of these invasions took place in 1866 prior to confederation. If the Minister of Militia will turn to the Auditor General's Report, G-17, he will find there military pensions for Upper Canada, 4 pensioners still on the list, who are in receipt of pay from this government for services in the militia of old Upper Canada anterior to confederation. Therefore there is a precedent for this government paying them. The minister is correct in stating that the militia were called out from New Brunswick and Nova Scotia as well as from the old provinces of Upper and Lower Canada in 1866; and undoubtedly the men who turned out in defence of their country at that time were equally deserving whether they went to the frontier, or whether they were defending the frontier under fire, or whether they were working on the lines of communication and sending forward ammunition and supplies to the troops at the front. The men who were under fire were under fire possibly once in a year, but the men who are working on railway lines, and working 24 hours a day perhaps, are just as deserving as the men who were at the front. So the minister's point about those who were under fire at Ridgeway I think was hardly well taken. There is no question however but in 1870, and that is the time to which the motion of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier applies, for days along the Quebec frontier men were in active service in resisting the invasion. Permit me again to correct the minister in his statement placing the number at only 200 at Eccles Hill, and only 250 who crossed the border at Missisquoi. I think his figures are entirely inaccurate. It may be something like the reports we frequently heard after an engagement in South Africa of the proverbial two Boers that were killed and four wounded. At Eccles Hill there were several thousand men across the border in the United States, and had it not been for the prompt action of our young Canadian militia on that occasion, the whole country would have been overrun by these renegades from the United States. On that occasion these boys turned out, not for the love of money, not with desire to shoot down the invader, but for the defence of their country. They had no desire to shed blood unless it was necessary for the purpose of ridding the country of the invaders. The response was the same in 1866 as in 1870. Small boys in 1866 turned out and small boys in 1870 turned out with the old men in order to do their share in driving out the enemy. The minister referred to the fact that the danger was magnified, and that only a few of the enemy crossed the border. Well, we remember that Great Britain waged a war in Abysinnia in order to release one man who had been taken captive. Great Britain sent a whole army over the mountains into that country to vindicate the honour of her empire. These men received recognition, received medals, and those who were injured received pensions. I do not think the minister was justified in stating that the danger was magnified in 1866 or 1870. Had the spirit that was generally understood in the United States prevailed in Canada, that we were ready to receive these gentry with open arms when they came into this country, and to haul down the flag of England and hoist the Stars and Stripes with the Fenian flag, had that spirit been dominant in Canada there is no doubt the invasion would have attained much greater proportions. But when they found so many loyal men on the border ready to meet them, each armed with a rifle, and fairly good shots, it had an effective tendency to cool the ardour of these renegades from across the line. Reference has been made to the men who were living in the United States at that time and who volunteered for service in defence of Canada. From Chicago alone upwards of 5,000 Canadian boys volunteered to return to Canada if necessary to serve their Queen and country.

I do not know what line the government propose taking in recognizing the services of the volunteers. But I will take an opportunity of making a suggestion, and I do it in all kindness, it is this: In 1866 and 1870 the men who turned out had no desire whatever to get their pay, although they looked to getting some recognition. Many served at that time without pay. I know that for a positive fact. I had the honour to serve a couple of weeks myself, and I do not think a man of that company ever sent in an account for pay. Now I suggest this to the First Minister and to the Minister of Militia as a solution of the matter. There are millions of acres of land in the Northwest, so we are told. The Minister of the Interior has told us before the Agricultural Committee again and again about the vast areas of magnificent farming lands in the Peace River Valley. I believe the colonization companies are going in there. Now, without desiring to use any opprobrious term, I must say that we have many settlers coming from Europe that are not as desirable as our own boys from Quebec, Ontario, and the maritime provinces. I therefore suggest that the government set apart in the Peace River valley a tract of land for the use of these men, and that scrip be issued in lieu thereof; or if the man goes up and settles on it he will get 320 acres, but if he does not settle on it, he will only get 160 acres. Some system of that kind should be adopted in order to encourage these men to go there and settle. There is another point. When our boys returned

from South Africa the question was mooted of giving scrip to them ; and on one occasion when it was proposed to give scrip to the boys who had gone to the front and volunteered their services to fight in the two Fenian raids, the First Minister met the suggestion with the argument that the land in the Northwest would possibly belong to the provinces, that the time was drawing near when these two provinces would have to be set up, and that then the people there would probably get control of the land. The First Minister cannot make that argument to-day. He has taken particular pains, or somebody who has engineered him, that the two provinces should have no land to give to any one in the Northwest, but it is all under the control of the Federal government. Therefore the First Minister can no longer argue that these men will have to look to the provinces the same as they did in Ontario. He has it in his power to-day to set apart an area of that land in the Northwest, in the Peace River valley. Let it be limited in some way to settlement in that locality ; and I am satisfied that he will find some of those men who served years ago, and their sons, who would be glad to go up there and become good citizens in our great Northwest instead of possibly drifting away to some other land. I have great pleasure in supporting the motion of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier.

Rt. Hon. SIR WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). There can be but one sentiment as to the gratitude of this country to those who, at the call of duty, turned out and left their homes to repel invasion, both in 1866 and 1870. But, Sir, if the arguments which were heard here to-day upon this motion and in support of it, from the initial speech of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, are well founded, it is a sad commentary upon the previous governments of Canada. We cannot forget that nearly forty years have elapsed since these men were called upon for the first time to serve their country and to repel invasion. The first call was in 1866, the second call was in 1870 and up to the year 1896 I am not aware —I speak under correction—that any effort was made on behalf of the volunteers of that day to have any more recognition than the recognition which was given to them immediately after these unfortunate events.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Efforts were made. I would draw my right hon. friend's attention to the fact that Col. McLennan of Glengarry, long anterior to 1896, took a very active interest in this matter.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What was the result ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The Conservative party went out of power and the Liberals came in; we never had an opportunity of doing anything.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think the Conservative party had an opportunity of doing everything they wanted to do. The first time I was approached on this question as the head of the government was in 1896 and it was repeated to me on that occasion that the volunteers had received no recognition whatever. Well, we looked into the matter and we found that immediately after the invasion in 1870 the government and parliament of that day unanimously did what is done generally under such circumstances by all civilized nations; they took upon themselves the support of the widows and orphans of those who had lost their lives and they gave a pension to those who had been maimed and wounded in the discharge of their duty. The government of that time did not think it advisable to do more than recognize, as is generally done, the services of those who had lost their lives or who had been maimed or lost their limbs. Now, we are asked to give more, we are asked to go beyond that and to give recognition to these men. My hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) says that these men do not ask for a substantial recognition but that all they ask is that they simply be told that their country has not forgotten their services. But these are not the words of the motion. The words of the motion are not at all what my hon. friend from Hamilton has in his mind. My hon. friend from Hamilton says that these men want to know that their country has not forgotten them, that even at this late day the country is prepared to do something for them in the way of recognition. I thought we had discharged that duty when in 1898 they got that medal which the soldier generally covets, the medal or badge which he can carry on his breast and which shows to every one of his fellow citizens that he has suffered for his country. But, if I understand the motion of my hon. friend from Jaques Cartier, what he wants is not simply the cross, the medal, the honor but what he wants is to have substantial recognition. Here are the words of the motion :

> It is desirable that the government of Canada should recognize in some substantial manner the services rendered during the Fenian raids of 1866 and 1870, by our Canadian volunteers.

It has been my privilege on two or three different occasions to receive a deputation from the veterans and upon every one of these occasions I have asked : What is it you want, gentlemen ? What is the particular thing you have in your mind ? Generally the answer is : We want to have a lot of land in the Northwest Territories. Well, sir, the policy of this government has been that the land should be given to the tiller of the soil, that every acre of land, every quarter section, should go to him who is prepared to make upon it a home for himself. That has been the policy of the gov-

ernment invariably for the last ten years. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier, with great ingenuity, sometimes dances on one foot and then on another. He says: Why are you not doing for these veterans what you do for strangers, what you do for foreigners? Why, if you give a lot of land to foreigners should you not give it to these veterans? There is no objection in so far as I am concerned. But, my hon. friend anticipates the answer and he says that these men are too old to settle upon this land. I can imagine that they are as forty years have elapsed since that time. I dare say that the men who fought at Ridgeway and Pigeon Hill are not prepared to go out and become settlers. But, while I say that, I do not say it by way of disparagement or by way of demurrer to the claim presented on behalf of these men. If these veterans of 1866 want a lot of land they are welcome to it and the government will take care that our officers show them the best tracts of land and that they have the pick of the country to select from. But, I dare say these veterans will say to us: We could fight in 1866, we could fight in 1870, but you cannot expect that we can take up a pick and shovel and perform the arduous duties of a settler to-day. I can appreciate that answer and I will say this that if there is a man who cannot take his homestead we are ready to give it to him. If he has a son who is ready to fulfil the conditions of settlement the government will be only too glad to give him that recognition. But, if it is intended that these lands should be given to the veterans simply for the purpose of selling them to the foreigner—to the despised foreigner who has been mentioned by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier, that is a thing, which, I think, would deserve a little consideration. Whenever we have been approached upon this subject I have asked the veterans: Can you give us some substantial scheme whereby we can meet your wishes consistently with our policy that the land should be given to the tiller of the soil? Like my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier I prefer that we should have settlers from our own country rather than from foreign countries, but if our policy has been—and I think it is good policy—to have settlers from wherever they may come, the only thing we want is that they should be honest, that they should have strong arms and that they should be prepared to become citizens of Canada and not only to become citizens but to become owners and tillers of the soil, to raise crops and to contribute to the revenue and general prosperity of the country. My hon. friend says that we should leaven this mass with our own blood. I quite agree with him and if he can suggest any way in which that can be accomplished the government is quite prepared to meet him in any substantial plan in that direction. But, I deprecate the spirit in which the thing has been brought up.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

My hon. friend referred in the early part of his speech—I was not present, but I came in as he concluded—to a word of mine in which I had promised to give him an answer during last session and he said that I did not give him an answer, because, perhaps, the matter had not again been brought up. If it had been brought to my attention I would have been only too glad to have spoken of it again. The government has no wish to repel this idea. This motion comes very late after a lapse of 40 years. but yet it is not too late and if a plan can be devised by which we can leaven the mass with our own blood and find homesteads for our veterans or their descendants and children, the government would be prepared to consider the question and do its share towards recognizing the men who risked their lives for the defence of the country upon that very important occasion. Time moves and evidently the ideas we have in 1906 are not the same as they were in 1866 or in 1870, the government of the day thought they were discharging their full duty to the veterans and the volunteers, to those who had risked their lives, by simply providing for the widow and the orphans of him who was no more and providing as well a pension to him who had been disabled. But, we have moved since that time and now we are told that we should recognize in some substantial manner the services of these men. As I have said the government will be prepared to consider any resolution of that kind. But, if it be insisted that the veterans should receive land simply to speculate in it, that is a thing that requires further consideration from the government before we agree to it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The right hon. gentleman referred to the alleged inaction of a previous government, but he began by telling us that the men who served in 1866 and 1870 had not made any claim up to the time his government came into power. I do not know how that may be, but according to his own statement, and the statement of the Minister of Militia, the matter has been under the consideration of the government for the past ten years, since 1896, when a delegation waited on the government at Ottawa. I refer the right hon. gentleman to his own words during last session.

> The matter is under consideration and without making any pledge I will say that I will give an answer during the present session.

The right hon. gentleman used exactly the same words with regard to the consideration of the tariff in the coming November session, and I trust we shall have a better fulfilment of his pledge in that respect than of his pledge which I have just read, for I do not recollect that any answer has ever been given.

It is a little difficult to appreciate the attitude either of the Minister of Militia or

of the Prime Minister. The Minister of Militia deprecated very much that these men should make any claim ; he was inclined to reflect upon their loyalty, but in the end he was disposed to consider that the government might give them recognition of some kind ; at least to the extent of making a change in the conditions under which they might acquire homesteads in the Northwest. He tells us that there are too many of them to recognize. The suggestion is that there are 14,000 or 15,000, or perhaps 20,000, who might still make claims under this resolution, and yet he tells us that only 5,250 medals were distributed.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. 15,250.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman said as plainly as could be that 5,000 medals were distributed.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. 15,250.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the minister said 15,000 the words became transmogrified in some way so that when they reached us they were 5,000. I understood 5,000 as distinctly as I ever understood anything, and my attention was so attracted to it that I took the figures down. Of course if it should be 15,000, that is much more in accordance with the figures to which the hon. gentleman has just referred. It is no discredit to these men that they are now asking consideration of their claims. As has been stated by my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker), they did not go out with the idea of receiving any reward in the future ; they went to the front in no sordid spirit ; they went out in a loyal and generous spirit to do their duty to their country. Surely that does not prevent us from giving consideration to the very great services they rendered to their country at that time.

The right hon. the Prime Minister has referred to the great difficulty of giving these men any substantial recognition by means of a grant of land in the Northwest, and he professes a very earnest desire that these lands should be reserved for the tillers of the soil. It is a pity the same fervent desire to that end was not present in the mind of the government when they gave 250,000 acres to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Co. at $1 an acre, which have since been disposed of at about $8 an acre. It also seems strange that the government did not have that same fervent desire that there should be no speculation in these lands, and that they should go to the tillers of the soil when they have from time to time made these issues of scrip which notoriously have been used for purposes of speculation and for no other purpose. It seems to me a remarkable thing that the government should be paying £1 a head for immigrants from the continent of Europe to settle on these lands in the Northwest, and should not feel themselves able to make the slightest relaxation in the conditions of settlement in favour of the men who forty years ago were willing to lay down their lives for the safety of the country.

My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) brought forward this motion in a very commendable spirit. I listened attentively to his remarks and there was not one partisan or offensive word uttered by him. He urged the claims of the veterans moderately and fairly, and if the Prime Minister can do no better than to base an argument on the spirit in which my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) put forward his motion, then the Prime Minister has a very weak case indeed. If the number of claimants be as great as suggested by the Minister of Militia, then the government should consider how large a recognition it would be proper for this country to give under the circumstances. Some substantial recognition would seem to be not out of place. I venture to say that during the last ten years lands in the Northwest have been exploited in the interest of friends of this administration which would suffice ten times over to give to each one of these claimants more than he at any time has asked for or desired. The language of the Prime Minister and of the Minister of Militia in answer to the motion of my hon. friend (Mr. Monk), is, I believe, not such as to commend itself to the good sense and generous spirit of this House. My hon friend (Mr. Monk) does not seek to dictate to the government what form the recognition of the services of these veterans shall take. The Minister of Militia has in effect said that there should be some substantial recognition, and the Prime Minister himself has virtually, although vaguely, made the same admission. Under these circumstances it would be very proper for the government to accept the motion and at the earliest possible moment see that the claims of these men should receive substantial recognition, although that recognition may in the end prove to be of a very moderate character.

Mr. MONK. I would point out to the Minister of Militia that my motion is broad enough to cover the volunteers from the maritime provinces as well as the volunteers from Ontario and Quebec. Naturally, my attention has not been directed to the events of 1866 and 1870 in the maritime provinces, but my motion of course includes the volunteers from those provinces. The Minister of Militia did me the justice to say that I brought the subject to the attention of the House in a fair spirit. I do not think the Prime Minister was justified from anything I had said in deprecating the manner in which this motion has been brought forward. I introduced nothing whatever connected with politics, and in moving the motion I simply had the desire that the question should be fairly discussed and submit-

ted to the House apart altogether from any political consideration. Both the Minister of Militia and the Prime Minister have admitted that if it were possible to modify the conditions of settlement which are applicable to immigrants coming from foreign countries in favour of the Fenian raid veterans, then if a plan were not before the government the government would accept anything reasonable.

That is in fact admitting that this motion is well founded. The desirability and justice of recognizing the services of our volunteers was admitted by the province of Ontario as far back as 1901. I have just been shown by my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) a statute of the provincial legislature of Ontario, chapter six of I Edward VII, in which provision is made, not only for the volunteers of 1866 and 1870, but other classes of our militiamen to whom allusion has been made in this discussion. Something on the lines of this statute might very well be adopted by this parliament. I am tempted to test the feeling of the House upon this point. It is not a party matter and if the government is well disposed—as it seems to be from the remarks which fell from the Minister of Militia and the First Minister—to meet these men—not by establishing a charge upon our revenue, not in making any sacrifice to any extent—but by giving them certain facilities with regard to grants of land in the Northwest which are not extended to the first comer, why not frankly say so by acceding to this motion and then let the government debate with those veterans what the conditions should be. I would suggest to my hon. friend the Minister of Militia that he would do well to allow the motion to pass.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I would suggest to my hon. friend that he should accede to my request and withdraw his motion. Then if some action be not taken, he will have an opportunity of bringing it up later on. He admits that he has received satisfactory assurances from the First Minister and myself, and it seems to me that it would be better that he should withdraw his motion, for the present at any rate, and give the government an opportunity to see what can be done.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON (Beauharnois). I would urge my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) not to agree to the suggestion of the hon. the Minister of Militia. My hon. friend deserves our congratulations for having brought this question before the House and for presenting it in so forcible and conclusive a manner. It is rather difficult to understand why the right hon. the First Minister should have seen fit to cavil at the manner in which my hon. friend submitted his motion. It is all the more difficult to understand when the government practically admit the justice of my hon. friend's claim. It seems to me that, under the circumstances, the reply of the government is simply adding insult to injury. Since 1896 these veterans have waited on my right hon. friend on three different occasions and tried to obtain from him an answer favourable to their demand. Yet, all my right hon. friend could urge today as a reason why he should not consent to this motion was that he had never heard before 1896 of any such demand on the part of the veterans. Well, the reason is not difficult to find. When hon. gentlemen opposite were in opposition, they were urging these men to elect them to office by promising that once in power they would see that their services were duly recognized. Only elect us, they said, and we will give you all you can expect. But when these men, relying on these assurances, came to the right hon. gentleman in 1896, he put them off with soft words and sunny ways and led them to believe that although something could not be done then, it would surely be done later. In 1903 they came back but again they were put off by a somewhat similar plea, but were assured that the government had their interests well in mind and would certainly do something. Again in 1905 they returned and were given the same treatment. And as nothing has yet been done, my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) took the proper course of bringing the whole subject before parliament. If the government will not take the proper course of action with regard to these men, it is time for the House of Commons to speak its mind, and that is why I hope my hon. friend will not withdraw his motion. Let parliament speak. It is now a long time since those men went to the front—in 1866 and 1870. I regret that something has not yet been done for them, and if any blame attaches to the late government I am not going to make any apology in its behalf. What I say is that something should be done. As has been said this evening, we must have a militia force, and that being the case our young men who join that force should be made to feel that the Canadian people appreciate their services. I was surprised to hear the Minister of Militia draw distinctions between those who really went to the front and faced the fire and those who were awaiting orders to go. That is the first time I have heard such a distinction made. I have always been under the impression that whenever a regiment is called under arms, the moment the men leave their barracks, they are on active service. But if the dilatory policy of the government is to be continued, all the men who answered the roll call in those days and shouldered the rifle to meet the enemy will be in their graves before we think fit to offer any reward for their services. A good deal has been said about the pensions paid by the United States government to the soldiers who fought in the civil war. Well, in my opinion there was nothing which made the United States so favourably known

throughout the world as those pensions. They showed that the American people recognized and appreciated the services of the men who fought for what they considered the best interests of their country. It must be very gratifying to our patriotism to know that those men who went to the front in 1866 and 1870 were not animated by any hope of reward. We have had some of them speaking in this House to-day and they all say that any such idea was absent from the minds of the militiamen of those days. Well, we are proud of their patriotism, and we have no doubt that if our country required the services of its militia and volunteers to-morrow, we would have a repetition of what occurred in those days. But we, the representatives of the people, will not be doing our duty if we do not take this opportunity of showing our appreciation of the services of those men. My hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence did not expect this discussion to take the turn it has done. At first he said, in the reply to the motion of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) that he would not do anything. But when he and his friends saw what was going to happen, the right hon. gentleman said that they might do something but would not because the request came from the opposition. Then the Minister of Militia asked my hon. friend to withdraw his motion and promised that he would then do something. I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is trifling with the common sense of the House. If I understood well to-night, it was shown that in 1866 our men where under arms for about three months. Well, many of us know what dangers are run in camp life. I have here a letter written in 1866 regarding a mutiny among the troops who were stationed at Cornwall. It shows the dangers to which are exposed those who join the militia or who are ready to go to the front. It is dated Montreal, August 4, 1866, and is addressed to Capt. Wall, and signed, John S. McDougall. It reads :

> I am happy to be able to inform you that the Major General in his remarks on the late Court of Inquiry at Cornwall mentioned your conduct on the evening of the fray, with special commendation.
>
> Believe me,
> Yours very truly,
> J. S. McDOUGALL.
>
> Capt. Wall,
> Hochelaga Regiment.

Sir, there might have been loss of life, we cannot appreciate what might have happened if this man had not exposed his life to quell that trouble. What inducement is there to-day to any man in the same position, whether captain or private, to do anything of the sort in view of the manner in which parliament or the government of the country was willing to treat them.

My hon. friend said a moment ago that the land in the west was to be given only to those who were willing to till it immediately. Why could not the government give these men, no matter whether they are prepared to go on it or not, say, 50 acres of land, if they are not prepared to give 160 acres, anything at all in the way of recognizing their services. I do not wish to detain the House any longer ; I simply wish to say I am sorry my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has come to this conclusion after promising these men, for the last ten years, that something would be done.

Mr. H. J. LOGAN (Cumberland). I wish to say only a word to congratulate the member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron), after sitting in this House for 18 years under the Conservative rule on at last awakening from that Rip Van Winkle sleep and coming to realize the dangers of camp life and the great necessity of giving substantial recognition to the men who fought in 1866 and 1870. My hon. friend makes some kind of an argument, which I can scarcely understand, as to why there was not something done in all those 18 years for those veterans of 1866 and 1870. But, Mr. Speaker, I think it would occur to any one, after what we have seen here to-night, that the motion at this time is a political dodge. I feel very much in sympathy with the idea of giving substantial recognition to the men who live and to the heirs of those who have died who fought at this time or who went to the front ; and I might have been inclined to have voted in favour of the motion as put before the House if we had not had the assurance given by the Minister of Militia and the Prime Minister, in reference to considering certain substantial recognition of what these men have done for their country. But it does seem to me that that should have been accepted by the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) and I only hope he may accept it yet as a promise from this government. The Minister of Militia has gone further and said : Accept this from us now and if we do not do something bring it up later on. Now, I am prepared, if this matter comes to a vote, to vote against the motion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. LOGAN. It is hard for hon. gentlemen opposite to understand a man having any independence in this House. It is difficult for gentlemen who sat on this side for 18 years, including the man whose patriotism bubbles over, the member for Victoria, to think that a man may be independent in this House ; but I want to say that in the discussion of this motion I have had the greatest sympathy with the subject under consideration, and I am bound to say that up to the time the assurance was given by the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) that my intention was to vote for the motion. But, when

I find that the motion is simply here as a political dodge I propose, myself, to vote against it if it goes to a vote. We believe the government will do its duty, with this promise which has been given by the Prime Minister and the Minister of Militia. There is not a man in this House or in the country who does not desire to recognize the patriotism of the men who fought to defend the soil of Canada in 1866 and 1870. They are just as much entitled to recognition as the men who have gone forth in times of excitement to fight the battles of the empire. These men who stood up to fight for the soil of Canada were prepared to do, and I believe, did their duty.

We have had the experiences of some of them related to-night by the senior member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) showing the harrowing circumstances under which they laboured. We sympathize with them and I believe that some recognition should be given them. The Prime Minister and the Minister of Militia have promised that some recognition will be given, and under these circumstances I think it is our duty on this side of the House to vote against the motion made by the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) which seems to be—I do not know if he intended it to be such—but it has been so juggled around the House that it is now merely a political dodge to try and catch votes.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). I would like to interpose a question for the purpose of acquiring information. There we have one of the stalwarts of the House, a man noted for his independence, scarcely a session has passed but he has shown that——

Mr. LOGAN. I have never swallowed any principles.

Mr. FOSTER. Never had any to swallow—shown that independence by tamely supporting the government in every one of its projects, no matter what it was. Now such a stalwart as that gets up and declares in the face of the Speaker that up to five or ten minutes ago he had vowed in his heart that he would vote for the motion of the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk); he believed in it, he sympathized with the men of 1866 and the men of 1870. His soul rose to their sacrifices and breathed the very spirit of their loyal devotion. He would vote for this motion. He looked at the Prime Minister and he looked at the martial figure of the Minister of Militia. He said, I will fight them both, I will vote for this resolution against them. Then up rose the First Minister and he made a pledge which satisfied the member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan). He made a pledge for substantial recognition that satisfied the member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan). Now, in the name of common sense what was the pledge that the Prime Minister gave? You all heard him on that side of the House; we all listened to him with strained ears on this side. Will any man get up and translate into English just the pledge the Prime Minister made? Can you, Mr. Speaker? Can any one? I cannot, and I am a pretty good interpreter of English, spoken as nicely as my right hon. friend always speaks it, and if I can make anything of that noble pledge of his, so definite, so substantial, that it satisfied the martial soul of the member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) it was this, that he would not mind giving these men just about as good a chance of getting 160 acres as he gave to the Buckowinian, the Galician, and the man from Syria or Mesopotamia. The lands there are free, any man can get them to-day for his $10 application fee. Did the Prime Minister offer anything more in the case of these veterans? Will any one rise and say that he did? If he did I did not hear him; I doubt if any one on either side heard him. What then was the pledge which satisfied the burning ardour for the old-time veterans in the soul of the member for Cumberland?

The independent member for Cumberland, who, for ten or twelve years has satisfied the yearnings of a stern, sturdy independence by voting for everything that these gentlemen ever asked him to vote for. And the Minister of Militia too—what did he promise of a substantial kind? He said to the hon. member for Jacques-Cartier (Mr. Monk): 'If you will please withdraw this, I think you can rest assured that we will—give something? No he did not say that but—'we will consider the question.' And he said: 'If we do not act as you think we ought to, you can bring it up again.' Thank you for nothing. I suppose it is open to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) to bring it up at any time he chooses to do so. But where were those definite pledges which so suddenly cooled the ardour of the hon. member for Cumberland, and transformed him from a fighting major who was going to stand by the veterans of 1866 and 1870 for substantial recognition, to an interpreter of all sorts of political partisanship as furnishing the motives of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier. Strange things we see in parliament at times This is one of them.

Mr. W. P. TELFORD (North Grey). As a veteran of 1866 and a representative of that class, I rise to thank most heartily the hon. members of the opposition for the beautiful things they have said about us, our courage, devotion to country, loyalty and all that sort of things. But, I have my doubts, as to the sincerity of it all. After waiting for eighteen years to receive something from hon. gentlemen opposite when in power and receiving nothing, I would rather trust to the somewhat indefinite promises of my hon. friend the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) and

the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) then to the belated good intentions of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. ROBERT STEWART (Ottawa). I am not surprised to hear the expression of opinion of the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Telford) as to the sincerity of members of the opposition on this particular question. For my part I might perhaps have preferred to give a silent vote on this question but for the remarks of the hon. member for Beauharnois (Mr. Bergeron). What particularly attracted my attention and what I wish to protest against was the picture drawn of the veterans of 1866 and 1870 coming to the government almost cap in hand in 1902, 1903, 1904 and again in 1905. And when I protest against this picture of these veterans of 1866 and 1870, I do it as one of those veterans. Rather than take such a position, I would much sooner take the position of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker). He has told us that he made no claim for special recognition for his services to the country for having turned out in its defence in 1866 and 1870. He has even gone so far as to say he never applied for a medal. I think that the veterans of 1866 and 1870 are not such as were pictured by the hon. member for Beauharnois. They are grateful to the present government for the recognition thus far given to them, so much greater than that afforded to them under the regime of the hon. gentlemen opposite. These veterans came to the government when they assumed office in 1896 but the picture of their coming given by the hon. member for Beauharnois——

Mr. BERGERON. I think the hon. gentleman is making some mistake. I never spoke about the veterans of 1866 and 1870 coming here as beggars, coming hat in hand. I did not say anything of that kind.

Mr. STEWART. It is true that the hon. gentleman did not use that language. But I think that the picture in the mind of every hon. member, as impressed by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bergeron) was much like that which I have described. So far as the veterans of 1870 are concerned, they have no such spirit. They came to the present government and received recognition that had been refused to them by the previous administration. I think that the veterans of 1866 and 1870 are more like the hon. ber for Hamilton, and they do not care so much about the recognition in the way of something substantial as they want a recognition from the government of the services that they rendered.

House divided on the motion of Mr. Monk:

YEAS:

Messieurs.

Alcorn,	Lancaster,
Ames,	Lefurgey,
Avery,	Lennox,
Barker,	Léonard,
Bergeron,	McLean (Queen's, P.E.I),
Blain,	Martin (Queen's, P.E.I),
Borden (Carleton),	Monk,
Brabazon,	Morin,
Broder,	Paquet,
Chisholm (Huron),	Reid (Grenville),
Christie,	Roche (Marquette),
Clements,	Schaffner,
Crocket,	Staples,
Daniel,	Taylor,
Elson,	Walsh,
Foster,	Wilson (Lennox & Addington)
Henderson,	Worthington,
Herron,	Wright (Muskoka)—40.
Hughes (Victoria),	
Ingram,	
Jackson (Elgin),	
Lake,	

NAYS:

Messieurs.

Archambault,	Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Aylesworth,	Lavergne,
Beauparlant,	(Drum. & Arth.),
Black,	Lavergne
Borden (Sir Frederick),	(Montmagny),
Bourassa,	LeBlanc,
Bourbonnais,	Logan,
Brodeur,	Loggie,
Bruneau,	Lovell,
Bureau,	Macdonald,
Burrows,	Maclean (Lunenburg),
Caldwell,	Macpherson,
Calvert,	McColl,
Campbell,	McCraney,
Carney,	McIntyre,
Carrier,	McKenzie,
Carvell,	McLennan,
Cash,	Marcile (Bagot),
Chisholm (Antigonish),	Marcil (Bonaventure),
Clarke,	Martin (Wellington),
Copp,	Mayrand,
Cyr,	Meigs,
Delisle,	Oliver,
Demers,	Parmelee,
Derbyshire,	Paterson,
Devlin,	Parent,
Dubeau,	Pickup,
Ethier,	Proulx,
Finlay,	Ratz,
Finlayson,	Reid (Restigouche),
Fisher,	Rivet,
Fortier,	Roche (Halifax),
Galliher,	Ross (Rimouski),
Gauvreau,	Ross (Yale-Cariboo),
Geoffrion,	Sinclair,
Girard,	Smith (Nanaimo),
Gladu,	Smith (Oxford),
Greenway,	Stewart,
Hall,	Talbot (Bellechasse),
Harty,	Telford,
Hughes, (King's, P.E.I.),	Templeman,
Jackson (Selkirk),	Tobin,
Johnston,	Turgeon,
Kennedy,	Verville,
Lapointe,	Watson,
	Wright (Renfrew),
	Zimmerman.—90.

Messieurs.

PAIRS :

Ministerial :	Opposition :
Beland,	Perley,
Belcourt,	MacLaren,
Bickerdike,	Seagram,
Bole,	McCarthy (Calgary),
Boyer,	Ganong,
Brown,	Lewis,
Conmee,	Armstrong,
Costigan,	Haggart,
Crawford,	Clare,
Dugas,	Maclean (York, S),
Dyment,	Boyce,
Emmerson,	Pringle,
Fielding,	White,
Fitzpatrick,	Sproule,
German,	Wilmot,
Gordon,	Ward,
Grant,	Bennett,
Guthrie,	Cochrane,
Hyman,	Osler,
Knowles,	Bland,
Laurence,	Stockton,
Laurier (L'Assomption);	Kemp,
Law,	Barr,
Lemieux,	Tisdale,
McCarthy (Simcoe),	Northrup,
McCool,	Porter,
Miller,	Fowler,
Pardee,	Bristol,
Schell (Glengarry),	Smith (Wentworth),
Schell (Oxford),	Gunn,
Sifton,	Forget,
Sloan,	Lalor,
Turriff,	Cockshutt,
Wilson (Russell),	Macdonell,
Jackson (Selkirk),	Jackson (Elgin),

Motion negatived.

HOG PLAGUE IN KENT COUNTY, ONT.

Mr. HERBERT H. CLEMENTS (West Kent) moved :

For copies of all correspondence pertaining to complaints received by the government protesting against quarantine from hog plague in Kent County, Ont.

He said : I desire, in making this motion, to protest in the interest of the farmers of the county of Kent against the unjust, unfair and unreasonable quarantine regulations which exist in that riding at the present time. The farmers of that county are always ready to assist the Minister of Agriculture in doing what is right and proper, but I think they are justified in protesting against the unjust regulations that have been carried out there the last few years. Four or five years ago the swine plague broke out in that riding, and ever since then we have had in that riding a horde of government officials feeding on the fat of the land. I object to that state of things on my own behalf, and on behalf of the breeders in that county. Under the present regulations our swine breeders who have gone to great expense in bringing their herds to that state of perfection which they have now reached are unnecessarily harassed. In answer to questions put upon the order paper the other day, the Minister of Agriculture said there was only one township in that county in which there had been any swine plague for the last year or two. Now, we complain that these inspectors, or veterinary surgeons, are getting salaries from the government to inspect the swine in that county and in townships where there has been none of this disease for the last two or three years. If there is no disease, it seems to me that the breeders who have gone to such large expense in perfecting their herds should be allowed the privilege of showing their herds at the different agricultural fairs that are held throughout the province of Ontario during the last year. I know that requests were made to the minister to allow them to do so which were refused. At this time there are hundreds and thousands of hogs being shipped from that county to different pork packing establishments throughout the province and throughout the Dominion. If I did not fear to take up too much time of the House, I could cite many cases of farmers who have suffered injustice under the present regulations. A great many government officials have been sent up to that riding and have been living off the government, and getting splendid salaries, and their expenses paid for looking after a swine plague that does not exist. I say it is wrong from start to finish. I want to congratulate Mr. Rutherford, the veterinary surgeon of the Dominion, who, I think is a very efficient officer, but I say that the Minister of Agriculture has not been properly informed, or if he has, then he is greatly to blame for allowing the regulations to be enacted and enforced that prevail in that county for the last two years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I contend in the first place that we have had no hog cholera to any extent. I doubt if we have ever had one case of genuine hog cholera. There has been a swine plague which I think could have been cured if the expert veterinary surgeons sent there by the government had done their duty. As I stated in the House last year when speaking on this question, the only remedy ever offered was a shot gun, and the regulations were carried out to such a nonsensical point that the farmers in that district were greatly irritated. They were compelled almost by force to submit to restrictions enforced by the officials who had charge in that district. When this swine plague broke out in several places in that district, it was only right and proper that the government should take some action to investigate it and to prevent the disease spreading. Now, Sir, I claim that there ought to have been some remedy applied, or some precaution used, to save the immense number of hogs that were slaughtered unnecessarily in that riding, and if some action had been taken or

some remedy adopted to cure the disease, then no very serious complaint could have been made. But these men were sent there at princely salaries, and it seemed their only object was to slaughter every hog they possibly could without offering any reasonable remedy for curing the disease. Let me tell you how they proceeded. For instance, a farmer might have say 50 hogs upon his farm, 25 hogs upon the front of his farm and the balance in the middle at one of his other barns, and these hogs were allowed to run side by side with his neighbours' hogs. If one of the flock happened to die the farmers were always ready to carry out the law as laid down by the government. I want to say that our farmers in the district of Kent reported the disease promptly to the inspectors, who went out and inspected their herds, and the result was that they had every hog slaughtered upon their farms, both the well and the sick.

What I claim is that there should have been some precaution taken to save the immense herds of hogs slaughtered unnecessarily. When these hogs were killed the farmers were compelled to burry them 9 feet deep according to the regulations laid down by the government, they were compelled to cover them with lime and they were compelled to whitewash practically all buildings near which these swine had been running. They were compelled to go out of the raising of hogs for one year and at the end of the year, under the restrictions, they were allowed to go back to that industry again. Fifty per cent of the farmers throughout my district had suffered from the iniquitous regulations which were laid down by the department. The result was that when a farmer, after having had the first dose, got back into the raising of hogs again, if one of the hogs was taken sick, he was not so honest in running to notify the inspector to come out and kill the second herd without any reason whatever. I want to say that in hundreds of cases throughout that riding farmers who had experienced the first dose did not report their sick hogs a second time and in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred they possibly lost one or two hogs out of their herds. The balance got well, and were good marketable swine and the raisers were able to realize the profit on them which they had expected. On the other hand, in the first case, their hogs were slaughtered. The owners were compelled to wait a year for about half the value of these hogs that were slaughtered. I believe that the compensation has since been increased to some extent. There was a horde of officials in that riding last year and the season before. I want to congratulate the hon. Minister of Agriculture on having got rid of a few of them, this information having been given to me in answer to a question this session, but I notice that some of the high salaried officials are still in the riding. I contend that the local veterinary surgeons in my district are the most capable men to attend the wants of the government and of the farmers in that district and I object to these high salaried men who have been there and who, I believe, have been killing these hogs more with the idea of saving their own positions, of keeping them in the positions which they have occupied for a number of years and in which they have been living in a princely way than to prevent the spread of disease. After these farmers had been treated in the way they had, in some cases, they did not report cases of sickness amongst their herds and the result was that there was nothing for these fellows to do. The inspectors were there to look after the disease called hog plague or hog cholera. When the cholera was not existing there and when there were no cases reported these gentlemen were appointed as hog inspectors. Their duties, as I understand it, were to inspect each and every carload of hogs shipped from that district to the different factories in the effort to prevent the disease from spreading. At least, I presume that was the object of the Minister of Agriculture. I contended in this House last session that this procedure was wrong, that there should have been a heavy fine imposed upon these factories for reselling any light weight hogs shipped to them. It would have saved the government the princely salaries they are paying to these gentlemen and it would have allowed the farmers in this district to have sold their hogs either thin or fat to any buyer if they desired to do so. But, when these regulations were put into force the farmer was placed in this position: Suppose that he had twenty nice, fat swine for sale and eight or ten swine that weighed from 120 to 140 pounds that were not as heavy or as good as the other; if a buyer went into his yard he would be totally innocent of the fact and he would sell to the buyer all the hogs he had for a stated sum taking the thin and the fat together. The result was that when the farmer took these hogs to the place for shipment he was confronted by these men who were appointed as hog inspectors and he was allowed to ship his good hogs while he was compelled to take back home the thin hogs. It was a very great detriment to the farmer, whereas, if a fine had been imposed upon the factories the same result would have been accomplished as that which the government were trying to attain and the farmer would not have been put in an unfavourable position. Now, I want to read a letter which I received from a very prominent swine breeder of my district, from the Woodburn stock farm. I think I can mention this farm as being one of the most prominent breeding firms in my riding. I do not know what the politics of the writer of this letter are, but I can voice his sentiments because I have heard them so frequently expressed by the principal breeders of my riding. He says:

Dear sir, I write you regarding the hog cholera regulations which are very improperly in force in the township of Howard at the present time.

There was supposed to be swine plague in only two places in this township in November, 1904. The inspectors at the time deemed it unnecessary to quarantine the township as the cases were light ones and they did not spread any. For some reason they put this quarantine on in May, 1902. If it was going to be put on at all it should have most certainly been on in November, 1904. Six months had elapsed after the last case before the iniquitous regulations were forced on us. That in itself is expressly against the law. The truth of the whole matter is that the local inspectors and the district inspector are making a nice fat living out of it and there will always be hog cholera here if the inspectors have their way. There never was one single case in this township. The regulations in this township were put on to please some shippers here and for that purpose only and I know whereof I speak. A firm of hog dealers, of Ridgetown, were buying hogs west of here and also at Ridgetown. They frequently finished or completed their carloads here ; that is, bringing a part of car from a quarantine district to be finished here, and unless this township was quarantined also they could not do so. The quarantine followed. We have lost $500 or $600 already by these regulations. It has taken many years and also a great amount of money to get our business to its present status and we do not want to be forced out of it, and we will soon if these regulations are imposed. We, as breeders, would be the last ones to object to proper regulations to prevent swine disease when needed, but when they are put on to make a few dollars for the local vets. and to please the whim of some shipper. it is then we object.

In conclusion, I voice the opinion of the farmers and breeders of this township when I say these obnoxious regulations should be removed at once.

Far too much is left to these local inspectors. There should be some way of inquiring into their methods.

That is the sentiment of one swine breeder in that district. If time would permit I could cite hundreds of just such cases as that. This is not the first time this matter has been called to the attention of the Minister of Agriculture, because on several occasions since last session the breeders of that district have asked him to remove this iniquitous quarantine system. I trust that the hon. gentleman will now give his attention to the matter. I understand that a great many of those who wanted to show their swine at the Guelph fair were not permitted to send the animals to Guelph, so that the owners have suffered great hardship in this respect. I can tell the minister that these herds have never had any disease, and if the inspectors have any knowledge of their profession, they should have been able to reject any hogs that were diseased, if there were any to be found, and allow the sound animals to be exhibited. In reply to a question put by me the other day, the minister stated that only in Chatham township was there any disease during the past year. In the county of Kent our farmers depend largely on the raising of hogs for a means of livelihood, and these iniquitous regulations have tended to greatly injure their industry. There is not a farmer in my district who would not readily assent to any fair regulation for the public good if there was a necessity for it, but they do object to the present regulations and to the manner in which they have been inforced. I have always contended that the disease came from the American side, and I have on many occasions protested against American hogs being allowed into the Canadian market. I congratulate the minister for having abolished the bonding privileges and preserving for the Canadian raiser of hogs the Canadian market, as the American farmers have always had their market preserved for them. At a convention held in my riding a short time ago, at which the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman) was present, a resolution was passed eulogizing the Minister of Agriculture for the splendid act he accomplished in putting a stop to the bonding privilege. I am willing to give credit to the minister in that regard, but it is a question whether he deserves a great deal of credit after all, inasmuch as it took him ten years to find out what would benefit the farmers of this country. And if the abolition of the bonding privilege was a benefit to the farmers of Canada who are engaged in the production of hogs, the minister should remember that there are still a great number of other agricultural products which might be benefited if a similar policy were adopted in respect to them. I have never seen the Minister of Agriculture do any farming myself, but I understand he is a practical farmer, and, if that be so, and if his farming is not done altogether by pencil and paper, he must realize the embarassing position in which the hog raisers of the county of Kent are placed by these restrictions and quarantine regulations, especially in view of the fact that the disease has greatly abated and that in a great many townships of the riding there has not been any disease for the past two years. It seems to me that the minister should withdraw the high salaried officials he has in that riding and leave it to the veterinary surgeons of the district who are more competent to carry out the quarantine laws then the men who are sent there merely to get large salaries.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). I shall be very glad to adopt the motion of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clements) and to give him all the information he asks for with regard to this subject. I do not know that my hon. friend (Mr. Clements) need complain very much of the gathering in his county which congratulated me, because he himself has congratulated me just now, and therefore he is in accord

with the convention in endorsing the action of the government in shutting off the importation of American hogs for slaughter in our packing houses. With reference to the officers of the department who are dealing with the hog cholera in Kent county, I was sorry to hear my hon. friend (Mr. Clements) allude to these gentlemen as officials who live on the fat of the land and on princely salaries, as if they were not earning their salaries and as if they were not doing beneficial work. If the hon. gentleman will refer to Hansard he will find that in reply to his question a few days ago I stated that these princely salaries amount to from $250 to $300 a year, and for veterinary surgeons, scientifically trained professional men who do good work for the country that is not very high pay.

Mr. CLEMENTS. These are not the gentlemen I referred to at all.

Mr. FISHER. There is only one gentleman, Dr. Perdue who has a salary of $1,400 a year, and to Dr. Perdue more than to any man in that country is due the fact, that while four or five years ago we were paying $25,000 and $30,000 a year compensation for hogs slaughtered in consequence of disease, for the last fiscal year we have spent less than $1,000. The disease is practically stamped out, and if we have attained that end it is due to Dr. Perdue and those associated with him who have a thorough grasp of the situation and know how to deal with it. The salary paid this man of $1,400 a year is money as well spent as any that is spent in the interests of the country. My hon. friend spoke of Dr. Rutherford as a highly skilled professional man and complimented him on his work. No man deserves praise more. But what has been done with regard to the hog cholera in Kent county has been done wholly on the advice of Dr. Rutherford. He did not think it wise in the interests of the farmers of Kent county themselves and the hog owners of the rest of Canada to raise that quarantine which my hon. friend is complaining of. A few years ago when Dr. Rutherford took hold of this matter, there were thousands of hogs slaughtered all through Ontario and thousands died on the farmers' hands for which the farmers got no compensation. In one year we paid as much as $30,000 compensation for hogs slaughtered, and then we were only paying one-quarter and one-third the value whereas now we are paying two-thirds. Yet this year up to the present we have spent less than a thousand dollars. This surely ought to show that the manner we have been dealing with this subject has been evidently successful. My hon. friend complained that certain individual breeders in that county were not allowed to send their hogs to exhibition. Well, the very last place in whose favour I would allow the quarantine to be broken would be an exhibition. At these exhibitions the best animals are collected for show purposes, and to allow for a moment the slightest danger of contagion among these animals would be nothing short of criminal. My hon. friend spoke of the fat stock show at Guelph. He knows that at that show the very best hogs from all over Canada are brought together—animals for breeding purposes, as well as for showing, fat animals which are going to be slaughtered as well as those which are. If we were to allow any suspicion of taint or contagious disease to be introduced into the building at Guelph, we would be open to the gravest censure. My hon. friend has also spoken about a cure for hog cholera. I regret to say that we have not got a cure. A number of quack nostrums are talked about and some are advertised in the agricultural journals, but so far the veterinary profession have declared there is no cure. That is why animals, when affected with the disease, are slaughtered. Even animals which have come in contact with them, have to be slaughtered. My hon. friend says that the disease is not hog cholera but swine plague or something else. I cannot give an opinion of my own on that point. I only know that the best veterinary authorities say it is hog cholera. If my hon. friend wants to set his opinion against the best professional advice and knowledge, I cannot help it.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The greatest objection I have is that they have been slaughtering unnecessarily in the riding and the disease is not hog cholera. One-tenth of those slaughtered had not the complaint.

Mr. FISHER. No hog has been slaughtered by the order of any of my officials unless he declared positively it was affected with hog cholera. And no animal has been slaughtered in consequence of contact, unless it has been in direct contact with the animal slaughtered or which dies of hog cholera. Lots of hogs have been slaughtered which did not show symptoms of the disease but they were slaughtered because they had come in contact with other animals which had the disease. Until we slaughtered the animal that came in contact with those affected, we were never able to succeed in reducing the disease. But since we are slaughtering, not only the animals which show the disease but those which have come in contact with them, we have been able to stamp the disease out. If today there is but little disease, it is because we have been strictly carrying out the policy inaugurated by Dr. Rutherford, and the results show the value of that policy.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I would like to ask the hon. minister what excuse he has to offer for quarantining the township of Howard, where the disease never existed. Yet that township has been quarantined for the ben-

efit of the individual inspector there. Personally speaking I think the minister could raise the quarantine in that whole county without any danger whatever. So far as the inspectors are concerned they have never offered any excuse at all or any remedy. There have been hundreds of cases in that county where the animals had the disease the second time and the farmers knew that if the inspector was aware of these second cases he would have the herds killed. But the farmers would simply kill the hog affected and the balance got all right.

ADJOURNMENT—INQUIRY FOR REPORTS, &c.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to remind the Prime Minister that he was to have laid upon the table of the House, from day to day, a report of the evidence taken before the insurance commission. I do not know whether that has been overlooked or not.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I will call the attention of the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) to it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like also to ask the Prime Minister whether or not tenders have been awarded for the two sections of the National Transcontinental Railway that were advertised some time ago ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The time for submitting tenders expired about two weeks ago.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. On the 12th ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. On the 12th, the tenders have not yet been awarded ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.20 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, March 27, 1906.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 49) respecting La Banque Provinciale du Canada.—Mr. Bergeron.

Bill (No 51) respecting a patent of Henry Luther Houk.—Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 52) to incorporate the United Empire Bank of Canada.—Mr. Belcourt.

Bill (No. 53) respecting the Crawford Bay and St. Mary's Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 54) to incorporate the Pacific Marine Underwriters (Limited).—Mr. Macpherson.

PACIFIC BANK OF CANADA.

Hon. N. A. BELCOURT (Ottawa) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 50) respecting the Pacific Bank of Canada.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). I would like to ask the hon. member how many times this charter has been renewed already ?

Mr. BELCOURT. I am not in a position to say. I am not aware of its having been introduced before.

Mr. HENDERSON. It is a hardy annual.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSION—STATUE OF HON. JOHN YOUNG.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 55) respecting the powers of the harbour commission of Montreal. He said : The purpose of this Bill is to empower the harbour commissioners of Montreal to contribute to the erection of a statue of Hon. John Young within the limits of the city of Montreal. Last year a Bill was introduced authorizing the harbour commissioners to expend the sum of $6,000 for the erection of this statue, but providing that the statue should be erected within the limits of the harbour of Montreal. It has since been found that no suitable place for such a statue was available within the harbour and the object of the present Bill is to provide that a statue may be erected within the limits of the city of Montreal.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton). I would like to ask the minister whether or not the goverment have in contemplation the abolition of the Montreal Harbour Commission and the substitution of some other authority. I would also inquire whether or not it is true as alleged in the press, that the government or the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is responsible for the recent decision of the board to exclude the representatives of the public press from their deliberations. I understand that this step has recently been taken ; and it is alleged—with what truth I do not know—that it has been taken either at the instance or with the authority of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries or of the government.

Mr. BRODEUR. As to the first question, with regard to the reorganization of the harbour commission of Montreal, I may say that the matter is now engaging the attention of the government. As to the second question it is a matter entirely within the power of the harbour commission, and consequently the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had nothing to do with the decision of the board.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is not quite an answer to my question. Was this step taken at the instance of the minister or with his approval ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I was never officially consulted with regard to it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. 'Officially.'

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

McLAREN'S CREEK, VICTORIA COUNTY, ONTARIO.

On the Orders of the Day being called :

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria and Haliburton). Mr. Speaker, I desire to draw the attention of the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to a statement contained at page 617 of yesterday's Hansard in answer to a question relating to the construction of the roadway across McLaren's creek. The right hon. first minister stated that :

> An amount of $2,500 'contribution towards construction of a road across McLaren's Creek' was voted in the fiscal year 1905-6, and as the municipality has not done any work, no expenditure has been made.

The point I want to lay before the government is in reference to the statement, 'as the municipality has not done any work.' Let me point out what the circumstances in connection with this roadway are. Formerly, the creek had solid banks. In connection with the development of navigation in that district a dam was constructed across the river at Bobcaygeon which raised the water and flooded a considerable tract of country, so that the municipality, in constructing a roadway across this country would have been put to a great deal more expense by the action of the government than if the dam had never been erected. The matter was laid before the government some years ago and a sum was placed in the estimates to construct this roadway, or in other words, to place the municipality in about the same position as it would have been if the water had not been raised by the action of the government. It may be said that the provincial government constructed the dam. That is true but the Dominion government took over the dam and assumed all liability in connection with it.

Mr. FOSTER. What did the government do ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. They took over the dam. The Tory government took over the dam and assumed all liabilities in connection with the matter. The municipality agreed to do all that a municipality could be expected to do when the roadway was placed in a position similar to that in which it had been previously to the raising of the water, that is when the approaches to the creek were completed on each side the municipality would construct the bridge. If the government would construct an embankment leading from each shore up to the old bank of the creek the municipality would put in the bridge. I merely wish to bring this to the attention of the government so that there will be no delay in going on with this very necessary work.

Hon. CHAS. S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works). I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the explanation given by my right hon. friend the leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was that which was handed to him by the Department of Railways and Canals in whose charge this matter is. I have no information nor do I think any member of the government has any information, but I promise that I will have the remarks of my hon. friend the member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Sam. Hughes) brought to the attention of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) and he will be prepared to give him an answer.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

House concurred in certain resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

WAYS AND MEANS—INTERIM SUPPLY BILL.

House went into committee of ways and means.

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs) moved :

> Resolved, that towards making good the supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending 30th June, 1906, the sum of $161,000 be granted out of the consolidated revenue fund of Canada.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER. I think we ought to have a little explanation of this before it goes through. What is it proposed to do with this $18,000 for the Imperial Institute? We have had certain policies in regard to it, if they may be dignified as policies. Here is a substantial amount being voted. What is the new policy in reference to this thing ? What is going to be done ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). In reply to my hon. friend

(Mr. Foster) I would say that for several years back we have had small votes for the Imperial Institute in London. In consequence of the pressure of our exhibition work we have not been able to really deal with this question effectively. During the Liège exhibition I took occasion of the opportunity when Mr. Hutchison, the Exhibition Commissioner, was within reach of London, to ask him to go to London and thoroughly investigate the condition of the Canadian exhibit in the Imperial Institute and prepare a scheme which he considered would be commensurate with the interests of Canada for that exhibition. He did this and communicated with Lord Strathcona, our commissioner, who was also one, of the commissioners in charge of the Imperial Institute. They went into the matter with the officers of the Imperial Institute and eventually submitted a scheme to me that was going to involve an expenditure of something over $20,000. I hesitated a little about going into such an expenditure, but after carefully examining the scheme, communicating directly with Lord Strathcona, and getting from him his views and opinions in regard to the matter I felt that if we were going to do anything with the Imperial Institute at all, if we were going to have a Canadian exhibit there, it was necessary that we should adopt some such scheme as Mr. Hutchison had outlined. We have had for a considerable time various provincial exhibits in the Imperial Institute. Certain space has been allotted to Canada. These exhibits, in many instances, are old, they have not been renewed for many years, they do not contain much that we would like to see exhibited in any Canadian exhibit and they have not been arranged under any general scheme which might be said to be Canadian or national in its character. Mr. Hutchison's scheme was one to reorganize completely that exhibit, to make it a national exhibit, to take advantage of any exhibits that were there which would be useful in arranging and making up a new exhibit and to provide for that exhibit specimens that would really and properly represent Canadian production and Canadian industry. He gave full details of the scheme, made up an estimate which was submitted in considerable detail and he reported that it would be necessary to expend something over $20,000. We have a certain amount in the ordinary annual vote. Last year most of the vote lapsed because we had not been able to take hold of the question thoroughly and elaborate a scheme. We had this year about $8,000, but a portion of that vote is devoted to the annual payments to the authorities of the Imperial Institute and a portion to the salary and office expenses of the curator. We have between $2,000 and $3,000, speaking from memory available in the current year's vote for the Imperial Institute and we estimate that if we had a vote of $18,000 we would be able to carry out the scheme.

Lord Strathcona agreed that the carrying out of the plans as arranged by Mr. Hutchison will to a very considerable extent add to the appearance and to the success of the Imperial Institute, and when this scheme in carried out the Canadian exhibits will not only be the best in the Institute but will tend to make the whole project much more successful than ever before.

Mr. FOSTER. Has that scheme ever been laid before parliament ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. When?

Mr. FISHER. It was discussed on the vote two or three years ago, and again last year I explained to parliament that the intention was to make the Canadian exhibit of a national and not a provincial character. I have already obtained two votes, but unfortunately the scheme has been delayed because the exhibitions in Europe have succeeded each other so rapidly that we were not able to carry it out hitherto. The expenditure is larger than we had anticipated, but after getting Lord Strathcona's advice and the opinion of the administrator of the institute, we thought it well worth while to make this expenditure in view of the fact that parliament had endorsed our plans.

Mr. FOSTER. Have we ever had laid before us the report of Mr. Hutchison which seems to be the foundation of the scheme ?

Mr. FISHER. That particular report came in since last session of parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. What in the wide world is this parliament for if it is not to obtain the information from our officers upon which is predicated the expenditure of large sums of money, and to be consulted before the money is actually expended ? The minister tells us he knows the scheme, and Lord Strathcona knows the scheme. I do not care tu-pence ha'penny if Lord Strathcona or if the minister knows the scheme; this parliament is here to know that scheme and this parliament will not do its duty unless it keeps this vote just where it is until it has that scheme before it. The minister seems to think there is nothing for him to do but to get a sub-officer's opinion and straight way go to work and lay out $20,000, $40,000 or $50,000 of the public money. That is not treating parliament with courtesy. The minister knew the session was approaching, and what was the extreme necessity which compelled him to undertake the expenditure of $20,000 on a scheme that parliament knew nothing about. Would anything have broken if the had simply waited until he had advised parliament of

what this scheme was, or, has the minister come to the conclusion that parliament does not amount to anything; is he going to treat with utter contempt not only this side of the House but his own side? Has he come to the conclusion that there is not a spark of independence, or of judgment, or of reason in the 215 members of this House? It is time that parliament should utter its protest against that sort of thing, and I utter my protest most determinedly against it.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. gentleman is heated in his language, The question has been before parliament—

Mr. FOSTER. Have we ever had Hutchison's report?

Mr. FISHER. Not this particular report. The scheme was laid before parliament two years ago and was endorsed by parliament, and last year the general principle of the scheme, though not the exact amount of expenditure, was also endorsed by parliament.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have no recollection of that scheme ever having been laid before parliament.

Mr. LENNOX. Nor anybody else.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In what way was the scheme laid before parliament on these occasions.

Mr. FISHER. I cannot remember the exact language, but in general terms it was stated that the vote was asked for the purpose of making the Canadian exhibit in the imperial institute a Canadian exhibit instead of a provincial exhibit. Speaking from memory I think the first vote for that was $6,000.

Mr. FOSTER. When?

Mr. FISHER. Two years ago, and I am not sure but that there was a smaller vote taken three years ago.

Mr. BERGERON. It grew.

Mr. FISHER. It grew as the demands were shown to be greater. The inperial institute was re-organized I think two years ago and that also delayed the putting through of the proposition to change the nature of the Canadian exhibit. They asked us to contribute a certain amount annually for certain specific purposes, and speaking again from memory, there was first of all a certain sum for the general maintenance of the institute, a certain other sum towards the rental of certain offices in the city, a certain other sum for the salary of the curator of the Canadian exhibit and the office expenses connected therewith. Speaking again from memory, that amounted to between $4,000 and $5,000 a year.

Mr. BERGERON. Where can we find a report of that?

Mr. FISHER. The information was given to parliament when the votes were asked.

Mr. BERGERON. Did you give the names of the curators and all that information?

Mr. FISHER. The curator is the same since the imperial institute was established. I gave his name when the votes were taken, every bit of the information I am giving now has been placed before parliament twice and parliament accepted it and passed the vote. The only question here to-day is the difference in the amount. The scheme—or the proposition, if you prefer that word—has been before parliament certainly twice, and has been explained to parliament just as I am explaining it to-day; and parliament, having had that explanation, deliberately voted the money for this purpose.

Mr. FOSTER. How much of a vote?

Mr. FISHER. The vote for the current year is $8,000; last year it was $6,000, I think. These votes have lapsed in consequence of the delays which I have explained with the exception of sufficient of last year's vote to pay the costs of the general purposes of the institute, the salary of the curator and such things. But when we came to examine the situation, I took the advice of the exhibition commissioner, who has been remarkably successful in the way he has put Canadian products and Canadian industries on exhibition before the world, and I also discussed the matter with Lord Strathcona, who is on the spot, and who knows thoroughly the nature and scope of the institution and whose judgment may fairly be considered good in the matter. I am simply pointing out that I took the best means within my power to see what could be done to make the Canadian exhibit a satisfactory and creditable one, which parliament had given me authority and had practically asked me to do. I discussed the question of this increased expenditure with my colleagues, who approved of it, and who authorized me to ask parliament for this amount which is necessary to carry the thing through.

Mr. FOSTER. How much money has been spent up to the present time?

Mr. FISHER. We have spent nothing up to the present time beyond what is contained in the current year's vote. Preparations have been made for spending this whole amount.

Mr. BERGERON. Do I understand that it is a permanent exhibition in the city of London?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. Since when?

Mr. FISHER. About twenty years, I think.

Mr. BERGERON. How much does it cost every year?

Mr. FISHER. Until about four years ago it was maintained nominally by the provinces which had exhibits there. Then I asked this House to give a vote for the purpose of trying to make it a creditable national exhibit. That was agreed to, but for one reason and another we were delayed in carrying out the project, and it was only when the Liège exhibition was closed last fall that I was able to get the advantage of a comprehensive and accurate report as to what could be done, and for that purpose I applied to my exhibition commissioner, who had a short time at his disposal between the end of the closing of the Liège exhibition and the opening of the Milan exhibition. That report was presented to me in the early part of this winter, and it is in consequence of that report that this vote is asked.

Mr. FOSTER. We would like to see that report.

Mr. FISHER. I shall be glad to lay it before the House.

Mr. SPROULE. According to my recollection, it was contemplated to reorganize the institute and as soon as that reorganization took place it was to be submitted to parliament and a vote asked from parliament in connection with it, but the government have never carried out their promise to parliament in that respect.

Mr. FISHER. Oh, yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Now we are asked to vote a large sum for an organization that was never submitted to parliament and that parliament never sanctioned.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend is mistaken. Last year I explained the whole organization, and the year before, when it was in formation, I explained it also.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman says it was only this winter that he received the report from his commissioner as to what the scheme of the organization should be.

Mr. FISHER. No. The scheme of the organziation was a matter for the imperial government. My commissioner had nothing to do with that at all. He simply stepped in after that was completed and examined the space allotted to Canada, and pointed out wherein that space could be best utilized for an exhibit that would be creditable to Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. That has not been explained to the House, and that is what we want.

Mr. FISHER. I have not the plans here; they are in the office, but I can lay them on the table of the House if hon. gentlemen want them.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman cannot get his vote until he gives us his plans.

Mr. BERGERON.

Mr. FISHER. If the hon. gentleman wants to hold up the Supply Bill until he gets them, well and good.

Mr. FOSTER. The time has come when we must insist on fair treatment. The time has come when we must insist on knowing what is in the minister's noddle, if we can possibly draw it out, before we give him the $20,000 to carry out his vagaries or his good plans, if his plans be good. When I said I did not care a button what Lord Strathcona said about this matter, everybody knows what I meant. What I meant was simply that it was no argument to say we must vote the money because Lord Strathcona says the scheme is a good one. The minister is not exempt from ordinary rules and has been too great a sinner to be entitled to any indulgence. Spending the people's money without proper authority is an offence to which he is very much inclined. He has put us to thousands of dollars expense in this destruction of animals business without any warrant from parliament at all. Yesterday I was astonished to hear, in answer to a question, that the number of cheese curing establishments which he has started have already cost the cool outlay of some $117,000 to this country. I do not think there was a man in this House who had any idea that, under the cover of a general vote, the minister was going to spend $117,000 on half a dozen cheese curing establishments. What else he is going to do the Lord only knows. I do not believe that even his colleagues do. Well, before he gets this vote through, he must take us into his confidence. He took half an hour to tell us that there was some plan, but what it was he did not know and what has been accomplished he does not know. If we want to find out, we shall have to read the commissioners report. Yet he wants $20,000 to carry out this plan. The plan may be a good one, but we want to know what it is. Mr. Hutchison is a practical man and has done good service, but that does not dispense the minister from informing us what the plan is, so that we may judge, before we vote the money, whether it is worth while to spend $20,000 or $25,000 on it. The institute exhibit has never been a success up to the present, but what we require to know is whether it is likely to be a success if the plan in view be carried out. Surely that is only reasonable.

Mr. FISHER. I have no desire to deny or withhold any information. As my hon. friend says, Mr. Hutchison has been remarkably successful in any plans he has hitherto recommended and carried out, and I am confident that his present scheme will be equally successful. I am quite willing to lay on the table every detail that can possibly be required. But I never imagined that I should ask Mr. Hutchison how

many pounds of grain or sheaves of oats he was going to put into this exhibit.

Mr. FOSTER. That was a great lapse on your part.

Mr. FISHER. I do not think so. I do not think parliament has any interest in learning such insignificant details; and when my hon. friend insists on having such microscopic information, that only shows the smallness of his view in such matters, and it is not what one would expect from a man who has been Finance minister. I do not believe my hon. friend is serious. If I were to lay on the table the details he asks for, he would not look at them. Every information that can possibly be required is in the hands of the department and can be furnished, but it never occurred to me that such details as the hon. gentleman asks for would be required by anybody. Of course the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has a perfect right to insist on being given those details and I have no objection to furnish them, and of course he can hold up the vote until he gets those things if he wants them, but he will have to take the responsibility, and I do not think that conduct of that kind will commend itself to parliament. My hon. friend rather misrepresents the facts when he says that the Minister of Agriculture wants parliament to do something on which it is not properly informed. In this particular instance, that is certainly not the case, because parliament has been informed already of the general scheme and has been asked whether it endorsed the scheme and wished it to be carried out. And parliament has given that endorsation. The officer of the department who has been charged with this particular work and who, my hon. friend admits, has hitherto been remarkably successful, has put his programme and plans before us.

Mr. FOSTER. Before whom ?

Mr. FISHER. Before the department and the government.

Mr. FOSTER. I think parliament has something to say in the matter.

Mr. FISHER. No doubt, and if parliament wants all the details, parliament shall have them all. If possible, I shall give the exact number of pounds of every individual kind of grain which is to go into that exhibit. But I do not believe that parliament wants such minute details. If I did furnish them, I do not believe parliament would read them, because hon. members have something more important to do. This matter has been before the House at least two years and the House authorized the Minister of Agriculture to go ahead with this work and voted money for it at least twice. It is only to-day, after the officers of the department have been able to go into the matter thoroughly and minutely and find out just what money is required, and have reported to that effect, that I have been able to state to the House what the thing will cost. If parliament says that the money shall not be spent, of course it will not.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How much is the annual expenditure going to be ?

Mr. FISHER. In the first place we are committed to an expenditure of between $4,000 and $5,000 a year for the current regular expenses of the institute. That is all we shall be committed to if this vote passes, but I think it likely that a small amount of from $1,000 to $2,000 a year will be required to keep up the exhibit from year to year by making additions to it as required.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. minister says that my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) must take the responsibility of the position he has assumed. Well, the position taken by the hon. member for North Toronto is that parliament is entitled to reasonable information as to why the money is required before voting it. But the minister must take the responsibility of the position he assumes. He comes down without being able to give us any information without being able to give us any assurance except his own word—and a great many of his words are to very little purpose—and on this he asks us to vote this money. For three-quarters of an hour the minister has been talking without giving parliament any definite information. All he has been able to tell us is that the scheme was outlined to this committee last year. Well, his explanations last year were not more lucid than they are this year. While the hon. gentleman was busy taking up the various departments of war and our relations with the mother country and cognate subjects and neglecting the interests of agriculture, I have been endeavouring to follow what the hon. minister has been asking the House to do in the interests of our farmers from year to year, and I take the responsibility of saying to the minister—and I hope I will have his attention because I want to make it a distinct challenge—that he cannot find in 'Hansard' of last session or the session before any such scheme as he intimates Mr. Hutchison has laid before him, and which he proposes to act upon at the present time. Two years ago some gentleman on this side asked a question, and what did the minister tell us ? He said, well, the Imperial Institute is not in a very satisfactory condition, it is not as we would like to have it. Some one asked him : Under what department is it ? Well, he said, I think it is under the Department of the Board of Trade in England, but he said, that is a kind of omnibus department in which they pitch everything which has no other place, and so, he said, it is something like the Department of Agriculture in this country. He

said it is not in a satisfactory condition and he said : We will do better, I hope; I hope we will devise some plan by which we will have it on a better basis and if you put through the vote I will endeavour to get it on a better footing if I possibly can. And so on the strength of that we gave him a vote two years ago of $8,000. But last year the matter was in no better condition and on page 1,836 of 'Hansard' he asked a vote

For renewing and improving Canadian exhibits at Imperial Institute, London, and assisting in the maintenance thereof, $8,000.

Then follow some particulars. Mr. Ingram asked :

What changes have taken place in this office ?

and the minister replied :

We pay £450 a year as a contribution towards the general maintenance of the Institute, &c.,

And the minister will not find in the three columns of the ensuing discussion one word to indicate that he contemplated at that time that we should launch out upon a broader basis, or that we should have a scheme submitted to the Minister of Agriculture, whether in his capacity as Minister of Agriculture or Minister of War, I know not, and that he should decide without submitting to parliament what should be done in that regard. We want some information as to how this money is to be expended. I wish to say that the expenditure of that money in the last ten years in the institute has not been productive of an advantage equal to the cost involved, and we have had feeble promises from the minister that better things would be done but we have had feebler results from those promises and I think it is the duty of members on this side of the House and on that side to say : We will have adequate and sufficient information from the various ministers of the Crown, whether we are supporting them or not, so that the people shall have an opportunity of judging of the expenditure of money from time to time, as it is submitted to the House.

Mr. PATERSON. I may say a word or two on this subject. This is one of five or six items that passed in Committee of Supply and in which the House concurred a short time ago which form a supplementary estimate of sums required up to June 30 of this year. When they were under discussion the House was thin; I think my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was absent. I feel sure that my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) was present. A few remarks were made by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) when speaking on the $75,000 vote, which is another vote. He said, speaking of this vote for exhibitions :

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I saw a remarkable specimen of the resources of this country in the Imperial Institute in London about ten years ago. It consisted of a very few samples of a very few of the products of the different provinces. The province of which I have the honour to be a native, the province of Nova Scotia, was represented by about half a bushel of coal piled up in one corner of the room. It was a most exhilarating spectacle to any one from that province. I trust that if we exhibit at Milan, we shall make an exhibit worthy of the country.

Mr. LENNOX. That is this year's 'Hansard.'

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, it was the other night. The item under discussion has passed two stages, the Committee of Supply and Concurrence, and of course I do not take the ground by any means that the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) is not within his rights in bringing it up for discussion now, but it has been before us. It so happened that the Minister of Agriculture was not here that night; there was a desire on the part of the First Minister that these items might go through and a Supply Bill be introduced before the other branch of the legislature had adjourned. I said myself on that occasion :

The item No. 260, which we have allowed to stand, is intended to remedy the condition of affairs in London to which my hon. friend alludes. It will be taken up when the Minister of Agriculture is present and he will explain what is to be done in that connection.

I understand and quite agree that the member for Toronto (Mr. Foster) is within his rights and that the House is within its rights in asking for the explanation. I quite recognize the fact that a promise was given that the minister would explain it, but I would ask the hon. gentleman opposite in all fairness has he not done that ?

Mr. FOSTER. He has not given a word of explanation, he does not know a word about it himself.

Mr. PATERSON. He has explained if I understand him aright, that there was that condition of affairs in the Imperial Institute, and that a plan was devised whereby, by the expenditure of a sum of money we would make a national exhibition that would be some credit to us.

Mr. FOSTER. Where is the plan.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman has not laid the plan on the table of the House, but he has said he will.

Mr. FOSTER. He will get his money and give the explanation afterwards.

Mr. PATERSON. He has meanwhile given an explanation to the House that he has endeavoured to improve the condition of our exhibit in the Imperial Institute, which the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) has characterized so strongly, and in my judgment correctly, for not only is that exhibit not creditable but it is positively something that every Canadian visitor would be ashamed of. Last year as I under-

stand the minister he took a vote of $8,000 to obtain exhibits. It had not then been decided that we would make an exhibit at Milan; it was thought we would take some of the exhibits from Belgium and utilize them in the Imperial Institute, but when it was thought wise—and parliament is to-day asked to give sanction to that proposal—that an exhibit should be made in Milan, then the minister felt he did not want to take away from that which had brought such very, very great credit on Canada in connection with our exhibit in Belgium, he wanted to send the complete exhibit to Milan, and so he has to get additional exhibits for the Imperial Institute and he has entrusted to Mr. Hutchison the duty of procuring these exhibits, and in order to carry out this extra work he requires this extra vote. Now, that is an explanation to which this House is perfectly entitled; all I would ask hon. gentlemen opposite to consider is that, if we have failed in the proper respect that is due to the House, they would overlook it for this time and we will try to be better in future. It was not anticipated, or, I suppose, it would have been laid on the table. But, I do not think the House ought to take such a strong stand—and I feel sure that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) will agree with me—after the explanations given by the minister.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know whether I can be as cheerful about this matter as my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson). What I would suggest to him, in the first place, is that this ought to impress the hon. minister, as I know it would impress the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) if he were here, with the very great importance of what we have urged before, namely, that ministers of the Crown from whom explanations of estimates are expected should be in their places when estimates are going through. This whole difficulty is owing to the fact that the Minister of Agriculture absented himself from his place at a time when he should have been here.

Mr. PATERSON. And the hon. member for North Toronto.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No, it was the Minister of Agriculture. We asked explanations; and, as the Minister of Customs has said, the explanation was not given, but was to be given when the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) was here. When the hon. Minister of Agriculture came to-day he should have brought the report with him ; he might reasonably have expected that it would be asked for. But the difficulty antedates that—he should have been here at the time when the estimate was under discussion.

I notice—and I wish to impress this upon the Minister of Customs—an increasing tendency on the part of ministers to absent themselves more and more from the House. Day after day the public business has been obstructed through the absence of the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) during ten days or two weeks. Day after day a Bill introduced by my hon. friend from Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) and another Bill introduced by my hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) have stood over because the Minister of Railways and Canals was not here to attend to his duties. Why is he not in his place to-day ? Why has he not been in his place day after day for two weeks ? Look at the Treasury bench at this moment. How many ministers are present ? Only four of the ministerial places are filled.

Mr. FOSTER. And badly filled at that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is true that we have, at the moment, a new occupant of the Treasury benches in the person of my hon. friend from North Lanark (Mr. Caldwell), who, I must say fills the place as creditably as any other gentleman on the other side of the House could. Four of these gentlemen, besides the Solicitor General (Mr. Lemieux) are present at this moment. I do not allude, of course, to the absence of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) whose illness we all regret, nor to the absence of the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who, I understand, is indisposed to-day. But I allude to the absence of ministers of the Crown from their seats when these gentlemen have no public reason for absenting themselves from the performance of their duties in this House. As I say I desire to impress this very much upon the Minister of Customs. Suppose that a record had been kept by any gentleman in the press gallery, or by any hon. member on this side of the House, of the continued absence since this session opened of gentlemen who have places on the Treasury benches, what would it disclose ? Some reason may be given for occasional absence, of course. These gentlemen have important public duties that may call them out of the House at times. I am willing to make every possible and every just allowance for them, but, after making every possible and every just allowance, we find what seems to be nothing less than grave neglect of duty by ministers of the Crown. I urged upon the government last session that their estimates would proceed better, and public business would suffer less, if ministers from whom explanations were desired were in their places attending to the business of the country when their estimates were going through. It is not alone the minister of the department whose estimates are under consideration from whom an explanation may be desired. Over and over again information is necessary from the head of some other department than that to which the estimate strictly relates. And we are asked, we are solemnly and seriously asked, to

let the item go through because that minister does not see fit to attend to his public duty. I think this had better stop.

Nor would I limit my remarks altogether to ministers of the Crown. I have sometimes spoken in confidence to my friends on this side of the House and asked them to give a better attendance than they sometimes do. And I take this opportunity to say that whatever I have said with regard to the duties of a minister of the Crown is, to a very great extent, applicable to members of this House, and particularly to members of this opposition. There are a good many here to-day—the attendance is better than usual. But I do not at all desire that my remarks should be limited to ministers of the Crown, because we on this side of the House have certain duties and functions to perform, and I am bound to say, that, sometimes, we have not the attendance of hon. gentlemen sitting to your left, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to see.

But this is apart from the subject now under consideration, which is whether or not the Minister of Customs can, with any show of reason, when this difficulty has been brought about by the default of one of his colleagues, ask us to pass these estimates without the explanations asked for by the hon. member for North Toronto. I would suggest that due importance should be given to the question—and I do not think it is a matter for jesting about or a matter for minimizing in any way—due importance should be given to this matter by letting this proceeding stand over until to-morrow, and placing on the table of the House, if possible to-day, or at least, giving to us early to-morrow morning, the report which we should have had in the first instance, when this vote first came up for consideration. I make that suggestion to my hon. friend the Minister of Customs. I am very anxious to forward the work of the session, but, at the same we must insist a little on matters of this kind. My hon. friend (Mr. Paterson) from his long experience of eighteen years of opposition in this House, knows that sometimes it is necessary to impress these things a little upon a government. Otherwise the government are apt to become altogether too negligent in the way they put through their estimates. I think probably there would be no difficulty in putting the item through with a little discussion to-morrow. I trust the Minister of Customs will agree that it is due to the members of the House and hon. gentlemen on this side, under the circumstances, that we should have this information.

Mr. PATERSON. I have been long enough in this House to know that when a minister wants to get his estimates through it is well to be as conciliatory as he can. I have every desire to act upon that idea. But I think the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) should not insist upon this to-day. Nor do I want to enter into a controversy as to how ministers attend in their places——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) is very wise in that.

Mr. PATERSON. I agree that when the estimates are going through the minister whose estimates are directly under discussion should be present to give any explanation that may be desired. Of course, I recognize the right of the House as to that. But it is not imperative for ministers who are not concerned in the Supply that may be under consideration to be in their places at the same time, if the minister primarily concerned is present—as I think the House will admit is practically always the case under this government. It was as I grant, through the forbearance, or, as I prefer to say, the confidence in the goverment, of the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) that this vote was allowed to pass when we were in Supply though the Minister of Agriculture who, I think the House will agree is very often in his place—happened to be absent. The item came up for consideration late and the Minister of Agriculture did not happen to be here. Some of the hon. members of the opposition have been in office, and they know how ministers are called out of the House on matters not relating to their own business but to the public business, and wishing to show the courtesy to their constituents and others who wish to see them, they leave this Chamber for a time. It is impossible sometimes, because of these interviews, that you can get at your correspondence or even to see it in the morning and ministers have, perforce at times, to say to those who want to come and see them : Well, I have to go to council now ; the House meets at three o'clock ; I will try to slip out of the House and hear what you have to say and discuss the matter with you if I can be spared from the House. That is the position. I do not want to say more. In reference to this one item, it passed in Committee of Supply. I grant you it passed through the willingness of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition and those hon. gentlemen who were present in the House that night to let it go through. I recognize the fact that it was promised that an explanation should be given but it passed in Committee of Supply and it passed in concurrence. The House agreed to this and there was not a word about it. I do not, however, insist upon that point.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That illustrates the difficulty of the situation. We are promised certain information—and hon. gentlemen on this side of the House cannot have every one of these matters in their minds all the time—but the government does not redeem

its promises, it does not bring down the information and the item passes through concurrence. That is held up to us as if we were estopped from offering any objection. It is true that we did not happen to remember when the matter came up for concurrence that the information had been promised and not furnished, but that illustrates the danger of being irregular in the first instance.

Mr. BERGERON. Nobody expected this matter to come up this afternoon.

Mr. FISHER. If I had had the slightest idea that this particular plan would have been asked for, I would have been only too glad to have laid it on the table. There is no desire whatever to conceal the plan. I thought that a general explanation in regard to the question was all that was expected. My right hon. friend the leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) told me that an explanation would be required I said that I had the information which I have been in the habit of giving, and that I was quite ready to give it. I thought I had given it to-day to a fuller extent than before. But, if I had thought that the plan would be required I could have had it with me. I am perfectly ready to lay it on the table of the House. I do not think I will be able to get it at this hour, but I will be able to get it to-morrow.

Mr. INGRAM. I think it is high time that this vote should come to an end. Several years ago the hon. gentleman's attention was drawn to the fact that the exhibit at the Imperial Institute was a disgrace to Canada. The hon. gentleman has been giving great credit to himself for looking sharply after the agricultural interests of Canada. In asking for a vote for the improvement of the exhibit at the Imperial Institute in London, he made a very short statement as to the object of the vote. That statement was very unsatisfactory. I will give you an instance that I have here before me.

Mr. FISHER. What year ?

Mr. INGRAM. 1904. This has been going on for years, but when the first vote was proposed an explanation was asked for and none was given. In 1904 a vote of $8,000 was asked for at half past eleven o'clock at night. The hon. minister was very eager to pass this vote through the House. The opposition took the ground, it being late, that they had no objection to allowing the item to pass, if it were understood that at a later period we could have the explanation of the minister, and then discuss the item, but hon. gentlemen objected to that, and it is just in that way that several of these items pass through the House. They pass through without very much explanation being given. I want to point out in respect to the Imperial Institute that several gentlemen have visited it and they have complained bitterly of the style of the exhibit made there by the authorities of Canada. The hon. minister pledged himself in this House that he would look into the matter carefully and that he would improve the exhibit and make it such as would be a credit to the Dominion of Canada. We have his word for it. In the following year there was an item placed in the estimates and we asked the hon. minister what had been done with respect to the Imperial Institute. Nothing had been done. That was the answer and that is what we complain of. I want to say to-day that while the hon. minister has stated that he had submitted a plan to the House in respect to the improvement of the Imperial Institute, the hon. gentleman cannot put his finger on a single line of the plan that has been submitted to this House. We have had an office in London for which we were paying £100 a year. That lease has been cancelled and now we are paying £200 for a changed arrangement. This was the explanation that the hon. gentleman made to the House. Other than this the hon. gentleman was asked what he was going to exhibit in the Imperial Institute and he said on one occasion, probably canned goods, dressed poultry, butter, cheese, hams and bacon. He was asked what these exhibits were now, and he said they were mineral and forest exhibits. These are all the exhibits that are there. Then, his attention was drawn to the out of the way place it was located in at that time, it being pointed out that it was of no great service to Canada unless there was a change made in the location of the office. These things were all drawn to the hon. gentleman's attention and on different occasions members of the opposition pointed out to the government the importance of making an improvement in the exhibit at the Imperial Institute at London, because it would tend to encourage immigration to this country if intending emigrants could see the kind of products that the Canadian people produce, and we all felt, as I feel now, that the minister has been more than careless in the arrangement of that exhibit in London. I see that while he asked for $3,000 in 1903, $8,000 in 1904, and $8,000 in 1905, he comes down now and asks for $18,000 for 1906 without submitting a single plan to this House to justify him in asking for an increase from $8,000 to $18,000. So, I say my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Foster) is quite correct when he says that an explanation should be given. It is time we should call a halt to this delaying from year to year in the making of proper explanations of the expenditure of public money.

Mr. FISHER. I quite agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) that we ought to call

a halt to delay. I suppose that I must plead guilty to a certain portion of the responsibility for these delays. The delays were due to two things. In the first place when the attempted reorganization was started, I did not feel justified in going on with any work in connection with the institute, because I did not know what the future of the institute was going to be. Eventually, that cause of delay was overcome. The reorganization included certain payments from us which I explained to the House fully last year in detail. At the time I asked for the votes mentioned by Mr. Ingram I had expected, as I think I explained too at the time, to utilize the exhibits from other temporary exhibitions on the continent of Europe. But these exhibitions have succeeded one another so rapidly that I have not been able to do that without seriously interfering with the success of greater exhibitions. As my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) said a few moments ago when the investigation was going on last spring in London in regard to the Imperial Institute, I had hoped to utilize the exhibits from Liège. It was decided a little while ago that we should exhibit at Milan and in discussing what should be for the best we believe that it would be best to transfer the whole of the Liège exhibition to Milan supplementing it and adding to it certain agricultural exhibits to make it fresh and up to date. That prevented me from being able to do what I anticipated doing, that is utilizing these exhibits for the Imperial Institute involving a small expenditure, and it is in consequence of that fact that we have been obliged to ask for this large sum. If, instead of asking for this sum I had said : We will take the exhibits from Milan and utilize them in the Imperial Institute, I would have to wait again for another year until after the Milan exhibition was over, thus incurring another delay for which my hon. friend censures me. I came to the conclusion when this scheme of Mr. Hutchison's was put before me that we had better adopt it and carry it out without regard to the other exhibitions. That is the reason I am asking for this amount to-day. I grant that no plan in detail has been submitted ; I have never suggested that I put a plan in absolute detail before the House. If a detailed plan is required I am now in a position to give it, but I was not before. If hon. gentlemen opposite wish to hold the vote up until the plan is laid on the table, I cannot object. I promise that the plan will be brought down and a full opportunity given for discussion when the main estimate for next year is brought up.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister has come right down off his high horse. He told us that on two or three different occasions he had made a full explanation of the plan, but it turns out that such is not the case.

I have great difficulty in voting money for that Imperial Institute. Every one knows that it is situated out of the general current of travel, and the question with me is whether that money would not be far more productive to Canada if we spent it on an exhibit in the centre of population in the city of London. Parliament should have had an opportunity of passing an opinion upon that question. If the Minister of Agriculture will persist in obstructing his own estimates it is not our fault, and nothing that has been said by my kind hearted and smiling friend the Minister of Customs, who excuses the Minister of Agriculture from his dereliction of duty, although the words of the Minister of Customs nearly melted my own heart.

Mr. PATERSON. Please keep it melted.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister of Agriculture seems to think it is not necessary to give any information and that any vote of his will go through as a matter of course. We must teach him a lesson. The older heads in the ministry should have taught him, but as they do not seem to have undertaken the duty we must see to it. I am not altogether obdurate ; I do not want to hold up anything that is necessary. But this vote is not necessary ; you can drop it and get the rest of your supplies through and then bring down a supplementary estimate when you have the information here and inside of a week we can discuss the matter and pass the vote. I submit that as a solution.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) has submitted two points ; one that I did not give enough information, and the other as to the wisdom of an expenditure on the Imperial Institute. The latter point was settled by parliament two years ago. I confess that like the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) I had a little doubt as to the advisability of Canada having a national exhibit in the Imperial Institute. I considered the question, I consulted my colleagues, and we eventually submitted the proposal to parliament in general terms and parliament endorsed it. I would remind the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) that the expenditure of $20,000 on an exhibit outside of the Imperial Institute would be but as a drop in the bucket. We could not make any kind of an exhibit at all worthy of Canada, outside of the Imperial Institute without spending perhaps $100,000. It is because the Imperial Institute is practically free and has a full organization of officers, and is understood to be a place of colonial exhibits that we are able to make a presentable exhibit for $20,000. I will take my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) into my confidence and tell him that when an independent exhibit was suggested the estimate given me was from $125,000 to $150,000, and it frightened me. In view of the fact that we have an emigration agency in London, and that the

Canadian Pacific Railway is making an exhibit there for its own purposes, I did not think it advisable to start another exhibition when we had the Imperial Institute organized in all its branches. We considered it was wise for us to make a creditable exhibit in the Imperial Institute and with that object the vote is taken.

Mr. FOSTER. We will judge of the wisdom of that when you bring the plan down.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. During my visit to Glasgow last winter I noticed an exhibit in a store, labelled Canadian exhibit; there was also a similar one in London. I tried to gain access to these stores but they were closed, and when I inquired in the adjoining store they told me they were seldom open.

Mr. FISHER. I have nothing to do with these exhibits I do not know what their character is.

Mr. KEMP. There is an office in the city of London called the City Office?

Mr. FISHER. There is a city branch of the Imperial Institute.

Mr. KEMP. Are the expenses in connection with that office included in this vote?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. When this vote came before the House and it was stated that explanations would be given on concurrence, I did not suppose that any hon. member understood that concurrence would come to-day. I want to ask my hon. friend one or two questions. I understand that the provinces formerly exhibited at the Imperial Institute. Can my hon. friend tell us what it cost each province, and also whether the Dominion government, in taking over these exhibits, will come into conflict with the provinces which exhibited there before, and whether, if we exhibit along with the provinces, they will share in the expense?

Mr. FISHER. When the Imperial Institute was first established the provinces were asked to exhibit, and I think most if not all of them agreed to do so. They sent over some exhibits and continued to do so for several years and paid something towards the maintenance of the institute.

Mr. BERGERON. How much?

Mr. FISHER. I could not give the details now. I think altogether about $3,000 from all the provinces. Out of that Mr. Harrison Watson, the curator, was paid. At the time that we were asked to take up the matter several of the provinces had ceased to contribute anything. I cannot say whether to-day any contribution comes from any of the provinces. I rather think not; but I was informed by Lord Strathcona and by Mr. Harrison Watson that any exhibits of the province that were there would be available for us, if they were suitable, and we propose to use them to the greatest extent possible.

Mr. BERGERON. Is Mr. Harrison Watson a Canadian?

Mr. FISHER. He is a Canadian by birth and he lived in Montreal until he was grown up, and has been there, I think, once or twice since. He has been the curator of the exhibit ever since the exhibition was established.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the minister state whether it is proposed to change the location of the exhibit in the Imperial Institute or not?

Mr. FISHER. Our exhibit was in two different places, and it is to be brought all together.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the total space to be given?

Mr. FISHER. I could not give the square feet of space. It is slightly larger than before.

Mr. BLAIN. I would ask the minister if he will be good enough when brining down Mr. Hutchison's report to bring down two other reports to which he made reference last year when discussing this matter. At page 1,836 of last year's Hansard, in discussing this item he said:

> Last fall, when the gentleman whom I sent in connection with other exhibitions were in London, I asked Mr. Brodie and Mr. Hay to report what ought to be done to make the exhibit in the Imperial Institute a thoroughly effective one. I have that report.

The minister last year stated that he had the report of two men who were specially directed by himself to make a report in connection with this matter, and without bringing down that report he asked and obtained from the House a vote of $8,000; and now he comes and asks for $18,000 more, and has absolutely neglected to bring down the report of Mr. Hutchison or the report of Messrs. Brodie and Hay. If the work of my hon. friend is not attended to better in the future than it has been in the past, I suppose we may expect the exhibit to continue for all time in its present condition. I hope the minister will bear in mind that we as a committee expect that these reports will be submitted to the House, and that he will refresh his own memory by a perusal of them, because he seems to be rather dull on the all-important question of how much space we shall have there. I suppose the hon. minister has not paid very much attention to this matter. Perhaps he is rather in doubt whether it is a good expenditure of money at all or not. One would have thought that the very first statement he would have been able to

make to the committee would have been that a certain space would be allotted to the Canadian exhibit; and yet, with three reports in his possession, he is not able to answer that simple question. I hope he will devote a little attention to the matter before the next meeting of the committee and will be able to give these explanations as to the way in which he is going to make the exhibit such a great success in the future.

Mr. FISHER. I will.

Mr. LENNOX. I understood the minister to say that at one time he entertained doubts as to the advisability of continuing this exhibit. Was that correct?

Mr. FISHER. I said so.

Mr. LENNOX. Will the minister tell the committee when he entertained those doubts?

Mr. FISHER. Before we decided to take it up.

Mr. LENNOX. That is hardly the point. About what date does the minister mean?

Mr. FISHER. Before we asked a vote for it.

Mr. LENNOX. Does he mean about two years ago?

Mr. FISHER. No, we asked for a vote before that.

Mr. LENNOX. Does he mean that he entertained doubts before any money had been expended at all? Did he ever express those doubts to the committee or the House?

Mr. FISHER. I do not remember.

Mr. LENNOX. Does the minister not think it would be his duty, if he entertained doubts as to the advisability of expending money, to express these to the House?

Mr. FISHER. When I asked the vote I showed that at that time I had no doubt about it.

Mr. LENNOX. One other question I wish to ask. When does the minister say that the House adopted the policy of expending this money?

Mr. FISHER. When it gave the vote for it.

Mr. LENNOX. That was at the time these doubts were in the minister's mind?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. LENNOX. Immediately after it?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. That will do.

Mr. TAYLOR. I wish to ask the hon. minister whether he is prepared to revise the answer he gave this House yesterday? Comparing that answer with the Auditor General's Reports, it shows conclusively what little reliance this House can place on statements of the hon. gentleman. Yesterday I put this question:

What has been the total expenditure in connection with the Brockville cheese curing room, and what has been the total revenue from the same?

To this question the hon. minister replied:

Expenditure, $18,661.34 to March 1, 1906; revenue, $6,568.33 to March 1, 1906.

I have no figures for the expenditure prior to the 1st July, 1905, because the minister, in his reply, gives us the expenditure up to the 1st March, 1906, but I know that the expenditure must have been several thousand dollars. Comparing this answer with the three Auditor General's Reports for the fiscal year ending 1st July, 1905, 1904, and 1903, I find that the expenditure was as follows in each of these years:

1903, page	'D' 67..	$ 7,190 00
1904 "	'D' 100..	9,056 10
1905 "	'D' 66..	5,929 00
Total..		$22,000 00

This is the total for the last three years, not including the expenditure between the dates for which we have no figures. Yet, the minister, in his reply, yesterday, told us the expenditure was $18,000. This shows what little reliance can be placed on his statements. He tells us, on his honour as a minister that the total expenditure in connection with the Brockville cheese curing room was $18,000, yet the Auditor General's Reports for the last three years show that they amount to $22,000, and if I were to go back one or two years more, the figures would no doubt be very much enlarged. The hon. minister makes a statement in which there is evidently not a semblance of truth, and yet he expects us to vote his estimates without protest.

Mr. PATERSON. I trust my hon. friend will let the minister explain some other time and let us get on with this vote.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not think the Minister of Customs should interrupt the Minister of Agriculture in this unseemly way.

Mr. FISHER. I gave the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) the figures put in my hands by the officers of my department. He has made a statement which calls for investigation, and I shall see that it is investigated.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I find that the situation with regard to explanations promised by the government is worse than I imagined. I asked for information—as will be seen on page 331 of 'Hansard'—with regard to the exhibit in the Imperial In-

stitute and I got this reply from the First Minister :

I know that an arrangement has been made by Lord Strathcona to put an end to the disgrace in connection with our exhibit which my hon. friend has just spoken of. That arrangement requires this appropriation, but I do not know the particulars at this moment. I shall bring down the particulars next time we go into Committee of Supply.

That was on the 16th March and this is the 27th. During the eleven days that have intervened, we have not had one syllable of information placed before this House although the item went through on that promise. Not only that but without any notice, except a private intimation last evening that some items would be taken up in concurrence, this item is taken up and not one syllable given of the information which was promised on the occasion I have mentioned. I should think the Minister of Customs would insist that the item should be withdrawn.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. If the hon. minister were in doubt some few years ago as to the advisability of this exhibit, he ought to be able to tell us now whether the various appropriations which have been made since have had the results he anticipated or whether they have been of little or no value. For some years we have been giving annual votes to keep up this exhibition about whose utility the minister had doubts at one time. Now apparently he has overcome those doubts, but he is exceedingly reticent as to the reasons which have caused this change of mind. In my opinion, if the exhibit is not considerably improved on what it was when I last saw it—some two or three years ago—it certainly is no credit to the country and not at all calculated to encourage emigration. I should say it would have exactly the opposite effect. If any intending settler should visit that exhibit, I should think that any favourable impressions he may have had regarding Canada when he went in would be removed and he would be induced to give up altogether the idea of establishing himself in this new country. The exhibition certainly cannot, by any stretch of imagination, be considered as representative of the products of this country. Despite what the minister has said, I have grave doubts as to the wisdom of this expenditure. Either we must go in more heavily and spend $100,000 instead of $20,000 or abandon the idea altogether. I do not believe that this exhibit can be made a success on these small votes. One of the first essentials is that it should be up to date. There is no earthly use in exhibiting goods ten or twenty years out of date, yet that is what is being done now. Of course our natural woods and other natural products do not come under this class, but in the case of manufactured goods—take an agricultural implement or a piece of cloth or a garment—after it is on exhibit over a year it becomes shabby and out of date and is no credit to the country. There needs to be a constant change if our exhibits are to be kept up to date. Goods under glass of course will be seen, but take canned goods, they cannot be seen on the outside, and in a few years the labels will look very shabby. It is also a question whether this exhibition is in the right place. True it is in a magnificent building, but it may be planted in the wrong quarter where it is not likely to do any good. These matters should be carefully considered, and if we decide to go on with the exhibition, we should make it one worthy of the country. Otherwise it will do us harm and instead of being an encouragement to emigration will prevent settlers from coming to our shores. If that is the case it is desirable that we should have either one or two things, either an exhibition that is up to date, and of an entirely different character to what we have had in the past, or else abandonment of this vote. We should not go into an exhibition at all if we are not prepared to do it on a basis that will be creditable to this country and to the manufacturers and producers of Canadian goods.

Are these exhibits the property of the government or the property of the exhibitors ?

Mr. FISHER. That depends on the arrangement with the individual exhibitor. Sometimes we buy the exhibits and sometimes the makers send then over and renew them from time to time.

Mr. KEMP. I suspect that the office in London which has been spoken of as being closed was the branch of the Imperial Institute. We pay £250 a year rent, but nothing is provided for taking charge of it.

Mr. FISHER. That is taken charge of by Mr. Watson and his assistant. One or the other is supposed to be there.

Mr. KEMP. Supposing the Imperial Institute did not exist and we were going to exhibit in London, what would be the best place for an exhibition ? Of course we have, in the Imperial Institute, exhibits from all parts of the British empire, no part of that empire is as aggressive and as go-ahead, as the Dominion of Canada but we are on a par in the Imperial Institute with all the smaller colonies of Great Britain. I would like to satisfy myself as to whether the exhibit is in the right place or whether we are going to this expense out of courtesy to the organization. Is this exhibit bringing any returns that are worth while, and if we are going to locate a first-class exhibit in London to-day, to attract immigrants or to interest capital, where would we locate it if the Imperial Institute was not in existence ?

Mr. FISHER. That would depend on the amount of money we are to spend. If money were no obpect we would not locate it at the Imperial Institute but at some place passed more frequently by crowds of people than the Imperial Institute is. The Imperial Institute is a well known establishment which, in addition to this work, has other work to perform; it has a very large establishment for scientific investigation and a great many people who want to invest money in Canada who want to discuss industrial matter, send to the Imperial Institute for information and a great many men who are asked to make reports by proposed companies go to the institute to get the material for their reports, not only in the scientific branches of the institute but also by examining the exhibits there. For instance if in England a mining company or a pulp company or anything of that kind was to be suggested, the probability is that the people interested would have some expert go to the Imperial Institute and get all the information they could get there in regard to Canadian products in those lines and make them a report. The Imperial Institute was started with that intention, and not with the idea of establishing popular exhibits such as my hon. friends speak of when they talk of the immigration department, &c., and I quite agree that if the exhibit was for the purpose of immigration and just attracting population, we would not spend money in the Imperial Institute, but if we are going to support an exhibition of that kind in England, instead of spending $20,000 to start one, we would have to spend $100,000 at the very least to begin with and probably $200,000 before it was thoroughly established, and if we are going to maintain it for any time, we will have to pay heavy rentals and maintenance expenses, all of which work is done for us by the management of the Imperial Institute.

Mr. FOWLER. If the Imperial Institute is not for the purpose of attracting immigration what is it for ?

Mr. FISHER. The purpose is to give information in regard to Canadian production and industries.

Mr. FOWLER. What good is that if it does not induce emigration to Canada ?

Mr. FISHER. There may be other things besides immigration.

Mr. FOWLER. If it does not have the effect of bringing people to Canada I fail to see why we spend the $20,000 at all. Is it in connection with the flotation of bonds, the business of the country ? It is not, it is not like a trade bureau, what is it for then ? Only as my hon. friend beside me says, to spend money. What tangible and material results have ever come from this expenditure. I do not speak in a spirit of captiousness I really want to know.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend will understand that until we put a creditable exhibit of Canadian products there, we cannot expect results. I tried to explain to the member for Toronto (Mr. Kemp) that in addition to the ordinary purpose of exploiting Canadian products, natural and industrial, there is also a scientific aspect of the Imperial Institute. I do not think myself that any great number of people likely to immigrate to Canada are apt to go to the Imperial Institute, but I quite understand that people who are promoting immigration to Canada from Great Britain may go there and obtain valuable information by which they may be able to promote that immigration.

Mr. FOWLER. Then it seems the great object of this, after all, is to provide information for those who are promoting immigration to Canada. If that is the case would it not be better to unite this with the immigration office and have an exhibition of your own, handled by the immigration officers ? It seems to me that would be much more desirable and effective.

Mr. BERGERON. The member for King's (Mr. Fowler) should understand that this is only the thin end of the wedge. Later on we will come to a higher expenditure. As this is only one resolution I would like to ask about some other items in it. How is it that we have to spend $75,000 more than was expended last year when the items for estimates for exhibitions were prepared. What about the report we have been promised the last four or five days of the insurance commission ? I see we are called upon to pay $20,000 in connection with the Royal Commission on Insurance. We have been promised a daily report of the proceedings before the commission and we have not had that yet. We do not know anything about it except what we see in the newspapers. We are called upon to pay $25,000 to relieve the famine sufferers in Japan. I do not see why we should be called upon to pay money right and left. What have we to do with paying money to Japan ? I always understood that Japan was a very rich country. I do not see that the people in Canada owe anything to Japan. There might be some justification for this in England, but I have not seen anything of the Imperial government in England voting anything for the famine sufferers in Japan and why should we do so. And we are doing that in a hurry. We are throwing money away. I would like to get some information on the subject before this is passed.

Mr. PATERSON. I understand that the report of the Insurance Commission is being printed and will be laid on the table.

Mr. BERGERON. We were promised it four or five days ago.

Mr. FISHER. This expenditure in relation to the Imperial Institute is due to the fact that we are exhibiting at Milan. When the estimate for the current year was before the House we had not decided to exhibit at Milan. It was then expected to take for the Imperial Institute some of the articles that formed part of our exhibit at Liège.

Mr. BERGERON. How much did our exhibit at Liège cost the country ?

Mr. FISHER. I can only speak from memory and in round figures. I believe it cost about $140,000.

Mr. BERGERON. And this $75,000 is for Milan ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, to pay up to July 1 this year.

Mr. BERGERON. And more will be required ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, it will probably cost about as much as Liège.

Mr. BERGERON. And this $25,000 for Japan—how do we come to pay that ?

Mr. FISHER. Great suffering through famine has, unfortunately, and quite unexpectedly, come upon the Japanese people. We have recently concluded a treaty of commerce with Japan ; and because of this, and believing that the relations between the two countries are to become much more intimate, we feel that an expression of sympathy of this kind to the empire of Japan, which is now undoubtedly suffering a very great national calamity, will tend to make still more friendly the relations between the two countries. The Japanese are the allies of the empire, and they are our next neighbours across the Pacific. For all these reasons, we believe that the people of Canada would like to extend their sympathy in a substantial manner to the people of Japan. Therefore the government decided to ask parliament to vote $25,000 for that purpose. I am glad to say that there are many evidences that the people of Canada sympathize with this movement. Individual subscriptions have been raised to the amount of $5,000 or $6,000, besides this sum, which the government propose to send to Japan. I notice in the press also general concurrence and appreciation on the part of the people of the act of the government in this matter.

Mr. SPROULE. Unless I am mistaken, there is a much stronger reason than any yet given why the minister should furnish the information asked for. He has been telling us what he has been going to do with this $18,000 for the Imperial Institute. But, the money is already spent is it not ? It is voted as part of the supplementary estimates for the year ending June 30 next.

Mr. FISHER. No, it has not been spent yet.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. It would appear that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) is not much in touch with the work being carried on in Great Britain with reference to this exhibit in the Imperial Institute. He frankly admits that our present exhibit there is anything but satisfactory, and I am sure that he will find on investigation that this is the case. I asked the hon. minister a question the other day, as I was anxious to find out what discriminatory duties were imposed by the German government upon our apples. The hon. gentleman in his reply gave me to understand that green apples were admitted into Germany free. I am sure that he will not say that now, after having heard the subject discussed in the fruit convention held here last week, where it was stated that, while we exported last year, 150,000 barrels of green apples had been sent to Germany practically free, there is now a duty on green apples going into that country of $1.50 a barrel. Perhaps the hon. minister will explain that.

Mr. PATERSON. I fancy the hon. gentleman (Mr. Armstrong) is alluding to a question I answered. I can only say that the answer I gave had been prepared by the Department of Trade and Commerce and handed to me. If there is any question as to its accuracy, I will call the department's attention to it. It may be that there is a new schedule of duties, I believe that on March 1 a new German tariff came into effect. Whether that has any bearing upon the subject or not I do not know.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. On March 19, I asked the following question :

What are the rates of discriminatory duties imposed by the German government on the following goods imported from Canada : wheat, flour, oats, bacon, hams, butter, cheese and apples ?

The answer given was as follows :

Notice was given in the 'Reichsanzeiger' of June 14, 1898, fixing the date on which Canada ceased to receive most favoured treatment as the 31st July, 1898.

The provisions of the German general tariff on the articles referred to are as follows :

Wheat, 54 cents per 100 pounds ; flour of wheat, $1.14 per 100 pounds ; oats, 43·2 cents per 100 pounds ; bacon, $2.17 per 100 pounds : hams, $2.17 per 100 pounds ; butter, $2.17 per 100 pounds ; cheese, $2.17 per 100 pounds ; apples, dried, 43·1 cents per 100 pounds ; apples, green, free.

I am sure that the hon. minister will not agree with that statement.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong) may know more about it than the minister who gave the answer to the question, but I confess that I do not. I do not know whether the answer given was correct or not ; but as the minister answered it, I take it that his answer is correct.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Was it not stated at the fruit convention last week that our apple industry faced a very serious situation so far as export to Germany was considered because of the duty of $1.50 a barrel ?

Mr. FISHER. I heard it so stated, but I do not know whether it is correct or not. I have not looked into the matter ; but I should be disposed to accept the statement of the minister.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it would be better if the minister would accept the promise we have made. It does not bear with it any hardship at all.

Mr. PATERSON. I certainly recognize the fact that all reasonable explanations with regard to the estimates should be given. But I appeal to the House whether the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) has not given the fullest details that could be expected. As to laying the report on the table, he says he will do that to-morrow. Surely the House will not stop a Supply Bill on acount of such a matter. If the minister had not given, or could not give—even if he had showed any reluctance in giving—full information on the subject, there might be some reason for delay. My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) is the last member of the government to be suspected of withholding information when asked for. The House knows that his explanations are always full——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, they are always full and satisfactory. And his explanations to-day are full and they ought to be satisfactory to hon. gentlemen opposite. This amount is $18,000. The hon. leader of the opposition has stated, and other hon. members agree with him, that the exhibit that Canada now has in the Imperial Institute in comparison with those of other colonies and of India, should make Canadians blush. We ask for this $18,000 to improve that exhibit. The money was not asked for before, because the Minister of Agriculture intended to take from the samples that were exhibited in Belgium. But when it was decided to have an exhibit at Milan, and it was thought wise not to withdraw any of the articles that had been exhibited at Liège, it was decided that money must be provided for a new exhibit for the Imperial Institute, such an exhibit as will do Canada credit. Of course, if hon. gentlemen opposite do not want to make an exhibit in the Imperial Institute, there is no reason why they should not say so. But the House has already declared that it wants such an exhibit provided. The leader of the opposition says that if there is to be an exhibit he wants a good one. And so say I. The Minister of Agriculture cannot reasonably be asked for any further explanation. He has even repeated his statement in a courteous way, half a dozen times, in answer to questions. All that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) asks is to have the report of Mr. Hutchison brought down. The hon. Minister of Agriculture says he will bring it down to-morrow. Now, I do hold that the promise that was made to the leader of the opposition has been fulfilled. The minister is in his place and he has given the explanation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I trust my hon. friend will not be under a misapprehension about that. There seems to be in his mind some misconception. I read it in his hearing a moment ago that the Prime Minister asked this item to be passed upon the promise that the first time the House went into Committee of Supply thereafter the information would be brought down. The House went into concurrence upon this item and even then no information has been brought down. I do not desire to protract the discussion but I cannot sit silent and listen to any such statements as those to which the hon Minister of Customs has just given utterance. The promise has not been fulfilled in any respect whatever. Let there be no misconception about that. There has been an absolute neglect to fulfil it in any respect. The duty of the government was to bring down that information the very next time the House went into Committee of Supply. They did not do it then, nor did they do it on any subsequent occasion. Nor did they do it when this item came up in concurrence. That is what we complain of. It is idle to make any such assertions as those which have just fallen from the lips of the Minister of Customs.

Mr. PATERSON. The leader of the opposition is not fair in that. He said that the Prime Minister promised that he would give this information subsequently. What is the general understanding when a promise of that kind is made ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That it will be fulfilled.

Mr. PATERSON. That when the matter comes under consideration again, or when the information is asked for it will be fulfilled. The hon. gentleman surely does not mean to say that the Prime Minister would make a promise that he deliberately meant to break or that he would withhold any information because he did not want to bring it down. Is not the whole context of the Prime Minister's statement that when the Minister of Agriculture was in his place and the information was asked for he would give it.

Mr. FOSTER. And he has not.

Mr. PATERSON. He has done it to-day. I heard the hon. gentleman read the lan-

guage but does not that carry with it the meaning that the explanation that is to be given will be given on another occasion and is it not implied that hon. gentlemen opposite will bring it back to the recollection of the House when it is taken up again ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Absolutely, utterly and completely impossible that it should have any such meaning. I will tell the hon. gentleman why. The item is passed. It never will come up again in Committee of Supply. The item passed upon that understanding.

Mr. PATERSON. It is up now.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Not in Committee of Supply.

Mr. PATERSON. No, but explanations are being given now, apparently.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman said that this promise had been fulfilled.

The promise was :

I shall bring down the particulars next time we go into Committee of Supply.

That was the promise. The hon. Minister of Customs does not seem to be anxious to get the item through without difficulty when he suggests that the promise has been fulfilled in any respect whatever. It has been absolutely violated and treated with contempt. It may have been through inadvertence but promises should not be made unless the ministry are capable of keeping them in mind. It is not the first time that this has occurred. I recollect letting an item go through about three sessions ago upon the distinct and definite pledge that explanations should be given by one of the ministers of the Crown before the session ended and when I asked for the explanation a few days afterwards, the session being about to conclude, that minister of the Crown had left Ottawa and gone to his home and the explanation was never given. We have had enough of this. Let these items either stand, or if they are passed upon the promise that information will be brought down at a particular time let that information be brought down or there will be difficulty in getting on with an item in concurrence or on occasions of this kind. I do not wish to be obstructive. I did not desire to be obstructive on that occasion. The hour was somewhat late, the Prime Minister said the information would be given and I let the item pass relying upon that promise. The promise has been treated with the utmost contempt by the government from that time to this.

Mr. PATERSON. It will be more in accord with hon. gentleman's usual language to use that word which he did and get the credit for it, that if there has been any neglect on the part of the Prime Minister it was through an inadvertence.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have always said that I do not accuse the Prime Minister of doing it wilfully, but I do say that the Prime Minister or any other minister of the Crown should not make these promises unless he finds himself capable of bearing these things in his mind and carrying them out.

Mr. PATERSON. I prefer that expression inadvertence ' in referring to the Prime Minister.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I say that.

Mr. PATERSON. Well, I think the hon. gentleman does not usually go to the length of saying that he would treat a promise with contempt. I do not think the Prime Minister would treat any promise he made with contempt.

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Chairman, I have been listening to this lengthy discussion and I have been wondering why this undue haste in rushing this item through concurrence at this early date of the session. It is a long time yet to the first of July and I understand the minister is not in immediate need of this money. Surely he can wait until to-morrow; yet, he wants to rush the item through to-day before the information is laid on the table of the House. I think the request coming from this side of the House is an extremely reasonable one. All we ask is to see the grounds upon which this money should be paid, that we should be reasonably satisfied that this is a proper expenditure of public money and one day in the month of the session is all that is necessary, the minister tells us, to furnish the information which is required to satisfy this side of the House if he is in possession of such information. I ask him again : Why not accept the proposition, coming from this side of the House and let the matter stand over ? Why rush it unduly? It creates in the mind a very deep suspicion that there is something wrong, that the minister has some motive in thus pressing a vote of this kind upon the House in such a hasty way without the information which he says he can lay on the table. He told us repeatedly that he could lay the information on the table. What signifies it to us that he can do it if it is hidden away in the archives of his department where none of us can have the privilege of looking at it ? I appeal to the minister to just meet the wishes of the opposition and let this matter at least stand until he has fulfilled what he says he can do and then let him press for a vote after having given us the reasonable information which we think we on this side of the House are entitled to. I ask him again why press this vote at this time ?

Mr. PATERSON. It is not pressing it unduly. The vote was passed on the 6th of the month, eleven days ago. There has been no undue pressure.

Mr. HENDERSON. I know that it was passed in supply as the hon. minister states in consequence of a distinct understanding. Now let the conditions upon which it was passed be fulfilled. Let all the conditions that were then laid down, upon which we on this side of the House assented to the passing of that item, be fully complied with and I think the minister will then have some excuse for pressing for a vote. But, what is the real motive? What is the object? There is something behind all this, I am quite sure, because, to my mind one day should make little or no difference in the passing of this vote. Surely the government is not so terribly run or hard up for funds that it cannot wait for twenty-four hours in order to get this money. There seems to be some extreme need for it. I think the minister should take us into his confidence and tell us just why he must have this money to-day and why he cannot wait twenty-four hours for it.

Mr. BENNETT. The bailiff is coming in.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think the country is not so far gone as that. I do not think the department is so terribly poor. Over and over again hundreds of thousands of dollars have been spent by this government long before they even asked for a vote. Time and again we were told by the Minister of the Interior that an item of thousands of dollars which we were asked to vote has been already spent and without the consent of parliament. I admit that the Minister of Agriculture seems to desire to adhere more closely to the proper rule, but I cannot see why it is so urgent that he should have this money to-day. Unless he waits until he gives us the information necessary, then the House and the country will believe that there is something rotten in the state of Denmark.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Is the resolution carried?

Mr. HENDERSON. No; I want an answer to my question.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no use for the minister to sit and say nothing because that will not work. We made a fair proposition: that this vote shall be dropped for the present as a standing reminder of the wilful neglect of the minister to do what he ought to do, and that he takes the rest of his money if he wants it. It may be well to inform the minister that if he is not reasonable he may find difficulties in his path that he knows not of.

Mr. FISHER. If the work is to go on this year this money must be voted within the next few days. Of course, if this item does not go through with the rest of these supplementary estimates it will not be reached until probably near the end of the fiscal year, and the work with regard to the Imperial Institute will be stopped to-morrow.

Mr. FOSTER. It should have been stopped before.

Mr. FISHER.—That is a matter of opinion.

Mr. FOSTER. Because you had no money.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend is incorrect. I had the money until to-day, and if this vote is not passed I will have to cable Mr. Hutchison to stop all preparations with regard to the Imperial Institute.

Mr. FOSTER. All right; cable away.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. gentleman says 'all right,' but I am satisfied that parliament wants this work to go on, and I judge from the opinions of gentlemen opposite that they also want it to go on. I point out what the postponement of this vote will involve, and I do not think parliament wants that to happen.

Mr. FOSTER. The man who gets into a difficulty has always to take a little trouble to get out of it. There are many ways and means that are open to the ministry. They can bring down an estimate and incorporate it in a Supply Bill almost any week, provided parliament is agreeable. It is not our fault this difficulty has arisen but the matter has been made an open challenge by the Minister of Customs, who after admitting that we had no information now says that every bit of information that could be asked for has been given by the Minister of Agriculture. But the Minister of Agriculture could not tell what space we had, what plan Mr. Hutchison has proposed so that we on this side of the House know nothing about it. As to the threat that the Minister of Agriculture will cable to-morrow and burst up the whole machine, let him carry it out if he likes. If he cannot find any way of getting money when it is not voted, all he has to do is to apply to some of the deputy ministers and he will find out how it is done.

Mr. J. D. REID. It is strange that the Minister of Agriculture always gets wrathy when we ask him for information about his estimates. He is always ready with a long speech, but he keeps away from the item and gives no information. I for one feel that there is something crooked behind this whole scheme when the Minister of Agriculture is afraid to explain it. He says he has the reports down in his office; if so it would not take ten minutes

to send a messenger down and have them laid on the table of the House, and then the item could be properly passed. As to the threat that he will stop the work, it is only necessary to remind him that during the past few years thousands of dollars have been spent by this government for which no vote was taken. The government should have no fault to find with our proposition that this item should remain over until we get the necessary information: then it will likely go through without the least trouble.

Mr. PATERSON. Carried.

Mr. FOSTER. It is not carried. I am anxious the minister should get the important part of this Supply Bill through the House.

Mr. BARR. This is the first time in my experience in this parliament and in the Ontario legislature that I have ever heard a minister say that he had reached the last day and the last hour at which he could continue public works in the country unless the opposition came to his aid and voted money without being in possession of the necessary information. He tells us that he will send a cablegram to England stating that the government is 'bust'

Mr. BENNETT. He will have to send it 'collect.'

Mr. BARR. That is something that has never been before witnessed in this or any other parliament. For three long hours we have had discussed this very important question of the Imperial Institute, and I venture to say that during that time, whilst we have had from the opposition a great many pertinent questions placed before the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Customs, not one question has been answered by either of these hon. gentlemen, although they have talked all around them. The reason they have not given us any information, as they have told us frankly, is that they do not know anything about the matter themselves. The Minister of Agriculture, after being asked how many places the exhibition is at in London, has been unable to tell us. He first told us that it was only at one place, and then he shifted his ground and told us that there were two or three places, but he did not know the exact number. Then, when one hon. gentleman asked him the very pertinent question, who owns these exhibits, how are they sent over there, and what position do they occupy when they are put on exhibition, he tells us he does not know. I venture to say that if hon. gentleman had gone a little further and asked how many years have these goods been exhibited and in what state is the label at the present time, he would have told us that he does not know But we are going to have it all to-morrow. The report is on the hon. minister's desk, not five minutes walk from here, but he could not have it until to-morrow: and during that time the terrible calamity he threatens may happen, and he will telegraph over the ocean that this government must burst or this thing must stop This is an extraordinary state of affairs. In launching out on this new expenditure, we want some information, but we cannot get it. We have taken the ground that we cannot let this vote pass without that information. Then the minister says he will force it upon the opposition. All we can say is, let him call in the members and vote us down. Otherwise we must stay with the position we have taken—we must have some information on this vital question. We want to understand from the Minister of Agriculture whether he is going to bring this calamity upon the country or give us the information.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Next.

Mr. INGRAM. On a subject of so much importance to our friends opposite I am sorry to find that the Minister of Agriculture is not so apt to furnish information as he usually is. I remember on one occasion asking the hon. gentleman an important question in respect to——

An hon. MEMBER. Chickens?

Mr. INGRAM. Oh, no. I was drawing his attention to the fact that the sties on the experimental farm were not properly made—that they interfered with nature; and I asked him how cows should lie with respect to nature; and he told me sometimes one way and sometimes another. But to-day the hon. gentleman states that this work will have to stop unless this money is voted now. I remember a few years ago, when the hon. gentleman was exercised very much over the census question, he did not hesitate to take money voted for other purposes and expend it on the investigation of a census that had been taken ten years previous. I do not know whether the censure he received on that occasion has made him change his opinion; but the hon. gentleman, in failing to lay before this House the information which he has on this question, including the reports which he had in his possession last session, has shown great negligence of duty. I think it is not unreasonable for us to ask that this information be laid on the table before this vote is passed. Some hon. gentleman who was not here when this item was discussed before, have since visited the Imperial Institute in London, and they do not think that the exhibits there made on behalf of the Department of Customs are such as to justify the proposed expenditure of $18,000. In view of these statements, I think the hon. minister should not persist in forcing this item through to-day. The hon. Minister of Customs very often says, when we ask for information, 'Oh, wait for concur-

rence '. But the hon. gentleman has changed his tactics now ; he does not want us to discuss this vote even on concurrence. Evidently he does not want us to discuss it at all ; he does not want the information laid on the table ; he wants to lock the door after the horse is stolen. I for one am prepared to discuss this serious and vital question, as my hon. friend calls it, until midnight, if necessary. We shall have an opportunity to look into the matter between six and eight o'clock and furnish information upon it which has not been furnished by the minister. In the meantime hon. gentlemen opposite will have leisure to think this thing over, and if they cannot make up their minds at six o'clock, they may be able to do so at eight o'clock. Again I ask the hon. minister if it is his intention to pass this item now.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish to point out to the hon. minister that it is now six o'clock and he will have until eight o'clock to get the report. If he lays that before the House, I have no doubt that it will facilitate the passing of this vote.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is another thing I would ask the hon. minister to be prepared for this evening. One of these items is $20,000 to provide for expenses in connection with the Royal Commission on insurance. On what is this estimate founded ? Has any arrangement been made with the commissioners as to the compensation they are to receive ? Generally speaking what is the basis of this estimate ?

Mr. PATERSON. I shall have that information this evening.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall this resolution pass ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the minister succeeded in getting that report ?

Mr. FISHER. I may say that I telephoned my deputy and asked him to send it up to me. It has not yet arrived and I cannot say whether it will arrive tonight. He might not be able to get it at this late hour of the day. You can quite understand that the clerks would be all gone and the office closed, but I will guarantee it will be laid on the table tomorrow.

Mr. SPROULE. Had we not better postpone the item and take something else in the meantime.

Mr. PATERSON. With reference to the information asked by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) I have seen the Finance Minister during recess with reference to the amount for the Insurance Commission. He has given me a memo. to the effect that the item was asked at the request of the Minister of Finance but was not based on a detailed estimate. It is difficult to make a close estimate owing to the uncertainty as to the time to be occupied by the commission. The commissioners are authorized to employ any assistance required. This is intended to cover the expenses of Judge MacTavish, chairman of the commission ; Mr. J. W. Langmuir, commissioner ; Mr. A. L. Kent, commissioner ; Mr. H. F. Ross, secretary ; Mr. Shepley, K.C., chief counsel ; Mr. Tilley, junior counsel; clerical assistance, stenographers and typewriters, Messrs. Butcher & Co., Toronto; and incidental expenses. Having regard to the number of persons employed and the probability that the inquiry may occupy considerable time, the minster thought that an appropriation of $20,000 was not an unreasonable one.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is up to the first of July?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, this vote is included in this year's estimates.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is no arrangement as to the compensation of the commissioners.

Mr. PATERSON. The council have not fixed that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That has not been under consideration?

Mr. PATERSON. It has not yet been determined.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The lawyer's fees were fixed in advance; I did not want to take any responsibility there without knowing where I was.

Mr. SPROULE. As the minister has not the report would it not be better to let this stand until he gets it? Looking over the Hansard for several years, it seems the same subject has been under consideration at different times, and we have practically always got the same answer. The difference between then and now is that heretofore only a very moderate sum of money was asked, and the request was made upon the excuse that the full scheme had not been worked out, but that it would be in the future and the information would be given to the House. We have now evidently reached that stage because the sum asked this year is $18,000 in the supplementary and $8,000 in the original estimates, making $26,000, which must be for the purpose of carrying out some well defined scheme which must have been submitted to the department and through the department to council, before this vote would be asked, and that report should be before the House before we vote the money.

Mr. FISHER. Before six o'clock I explained that the change in the amount was owing to our not being able to utilize the exhibits at Liège and I do not see any information that I can give beyond the report. I tell my hon. friend frankly that I have not the report to lay on the table, I can have it to-morrow. I asked the deputy to get it to-night. He said he would try but he has to see the clerks to get it.

Mr. SPROULE. Might this not be left until it is got ?

Mr. PATERSON. It is an item in the Supply Bill.

Mr. FISHER. There will be an item in the main estimates for the next fiscal year about the Imperial Institute and every question can be discussed on that item as well as on this. Of course I appreciate that this does not mean that this money would not be voted the money would be voted and available until the first of July. I was in hopes that the whole work would be done by the first of July. The item I am now asking for is based on a report which says this amount will be sufficient to do the whole work.

Mr. SPROULE. It is on some report that the minister must have submitted to council.

Mr. FISHER. I did.

Mr. SPROULE. Surely he has that report under his own hand ?

Mr. FISHER. It is in the department ?

Mr. SPROULE. It is a very common practice—the Postmaster General did it the other night—to read to us a report of this kind which necessitated the House voting so much money for certain purposes. The minister has that report and he should lay it before the House.

Mr. INGRAM. Is any part of this $18,000 to be paid out for debts contracted within the last two or three years ?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. INGRAM. Or previous to the present fiscal year ?

Mr. FISHER. No, there were no debts contracted on this account. Mr. Hutchison has, since he left Liége, been doing some work in London. We had available, in the original vote for the current year, something like $4,000. I do not remember the exact figures on which Mr. Hutchison has been working and he has laid out the plans for the procuring of a number of other exhibits which we have taken means to acquire. This has not yet been done because we can only do that work when this money is voted. This will not be used to pay for any work done in former years.

Mr. INGRAM. How far is the Cheapside office from the Imperial Institute building?

Mr. FISHER. The hon. member means the city office ? That must be four or five miles. One is in the heart of the city and the other in South Kensington.

Mr. INGRAM. Are there any exhibits from Canada in that building?

Mr. FISHER. Not at the present time.

Mr. INGRAM. How does it come that we have been paying rent for that for some time and nothing has been done?

Mr. FISHER. This is a building which is rented by the Imperial Institute and we pay a share of the rent. We have had an office there and Mr. Henderson Watson has been there regularly as well as at the Imperial Institute in the West End and has been using that as an office. In addition to the office there is a large room available for temporary exhibitions but we have not yet paid any money on that.

Mr. BARR. What does the minister propose to do with this $18,000 ? Is it to replace the present exhibits, to collect new exhibits, and what kind of exhibits, canned fruits, preserved fruits, grains of different kinds ; and does the Imperial Institute bear any part of the expense ? Having the report on the table we could learn the facts, and would not be obliged to depend on the ipse dixit of any hon. gentleman opposite, who not having seen the report, may not know much more of the fact than we do. It does seem to me that in two hours the minister could have secured this important document which we have sought and waited for so anxiously. We have no desire—I am sure I can speak for every hon. gentleman on this side—to waste the time of the House or protract this discussion ; we are most anxious to press forward the work of the House. But we are asked to vote $26,000 of the people's money, and surely we cannot be expected to do that until this report has been laid on the table. If the money is voted, no matter what we may find in the report afterwards, we may be told : You must not complain because the vote has already been passed. Under the circumstances, why cannot the leader of the House (Mr. Paterson) take up some other business, as is often done in such cases ? It would seem that the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) has taken it into his head that this business must be put through no matter what hon. gentlemen on this side may think of it. If that is the position, we may find it necessary to prolong the discussion. But I can assure gentlemen opposite that we have no desire to do it. Still, we have a duty to perform just as important as that of the government, and our constituents

will hold us responsible for the way in which we perform it. The country will blame us if items like this are allowed to pass without due consideration and it is afterwards found that there is something wrong about them. I submit that it is a very easy thing to get over this little difficulty upon which we have stumbled. If the Minister of Agriculture and the present leader of the House will just put their heads together—and it is still true that two heads are better than one—I am sure that it would be easy to arrange for the business of the House to go on without wasting further time.

Mr. INGRAM. The Imperial Institute is situated in South Kensington. With reference to the part of the building rented on Cheapside, towards the rental of which we have been contributing £100 a year, I understand from the minister that it has not been occupied. It would seem, then, that since 1901, this country has been paying £100 a year—increased to £200 within the past year—for which we have received no return. It would seem that there has been gross carelessness in paying that amount of rent for a building which was not occupied.

Mr. FISHER. As I explained a short time ago, the building in the city has been occupied by Mr. Watson, the curator of the institute, who has been occupying it as a city office, as a place where people might meet him and where he could carry on a great part of his correspondence. He has been using it all the time we have been paying rent for it.

Mr. PERLEY. While we are waiting for this report to come from the Department of Agriculture, I would like to say a word on the subject before the committee. I may say that I know the locality in question very well. The Imperial Institute is a place to which visiting Canadians naturally like to go when in London. But it is situated in the West End of London, a long distance from the business part or from any part likely to be visited by those having business transactions with the people of Canada. It was a very good place for the exhibition of 1862. But I say emphatically that it seems to me the expenditure this country is making in the Imperial Institute brings us very little return. If the country wishes, as a matter of sentiment to keep an exhibit in the Imperial Institute, well and good ; but as a means of bringing business to the people of this country, it seems to me to be absolutely useless. My recollection of the class of people I have seen at the Imperial Institute is that they were sightseers and tourists. But as to the people from the English provinces, from Scotland, Ireland and the continent who wish to do business in London, the last place they would be likely to be seen in is the Imperial Institute. I see no objection to spending a small sum of money to keep up an exhibit in the Imperial Institute, largely as a matter of sentiment, to do our share in making an exhibition illustrative of all parts of the British empire, but if we are going to have an exhibition in London for the purpose of bringing business to this country, it seems far and away better to spend our money in other parts of the city. In Charing Cross, where our immigration offices are, an exhibition could be established which everybody in London would have an opportunity to see. If we had an exhibition there, one could hardly go to London without learning something of Canada because everybody passes that corner. Or the money could be spent with better advantage in the city, in the neighbourhood of the Mansion House or East Cheap. I understand the minister to say that the office of the Imperial Institute in the city is not used for anything except correspondence or something of that kind. I wish to call the attention of the House to the way in which this matter has been brought up here for several years. Reference has already been made to what was said about it last year. On the 20th of February, 1905, the Minister of Agriculture said :

> I have just accounted for about $5,000, and I propose to apply the other $3,000 in preparing and sending forward exhibits to the Imperial Institute, where I hope to have them installed before the 1st of July. Some of the officers who are going to install our exhibits at Liège are expected to be free in time to return to London and start the work at the Imperial Institute. That is one of the advantages of having a permanent staff of officers for exhibition work.

Then he goes on to say, speaking of the city office :

> It is for two purposes. In the first place there has been a constant objection that the Imperial Institute was too far in the West End to be convenient for business men. In connection with the city office there is a show room, where I hope to have brief temporary exhibits. For instance, one week we may have an exhibit of canned goods, another week bacon and pork, another week something else ; and each exhibit will be advertised beforehand to the trade specially interested in the particular line of products exhibited. The exhibits in the city will be exhibits of goods of a perishable nature, lasting only a few days or a week, whereas the exhibition at the Imperial Institute at South Kensington is one of a more permanent and general character.

That was said last year by the hon. Min-
Minister of Agriculture. He was going to have this work done by the 1st of July. He was going to arrange to hold in the office in the city of London exhibits of perishable products and of different goods which would be advertised from time to time to those interested in the trade. I understand that even this has not yet been done. But

I wish to call the attention of the House to what took place in the session of 1903-three years ago. On October 9, 1903, the hon. Minister of Agriculture, in answer to a question in regard to the Imperial Institute, stated:

I would suggest that we in Canada could very properly take one of the rooms in the city branch and from time to time make exhibits of different Canadian products. For instance, at one time we could have an exhibit of dairy products, butter and cheese, another time an exhibit of bacon, at another time of dressed poultry, at another time of minerals, or of some particular mineral with which Canada is particularly favoured. Then we might make an exhibit of certain manufactured goods which we thought we might be able to induce the British people to buy. These exhibits would be temporary, lasting perhaps a week or two weeks. These exhibits could be especially advertised and special invitations could be sent to those engaged in trade in the particular product which might be on exhibition.

In other words, the Minister of Agriculture last year in reference to this subject on February 28, spoke almost as if he had quoted the remarks which he had made on October 9, 1903. This expenditure which was to be made in the city for the purpose of this very good object which has been referred to in these two extracts and which was going to be made three years ago, has not been made yet. The minister states that the office is still not being used and he comes back to this House and asks us to grant him this money and more money than ever to pay for this exhibit at the Imperial Institute. Last year an estimate was passed for the sum of $8,000. The hon. minister stated that he only wanted to expend $5,000 for ordinary purposes and that he wanted to spend $3,000 to try and make this exhibit a better one than it was. At that time nothing was said about this expenditure of $18,000. Now we have come to March 26, 1906. In the meantime the minister has gone on apparently arranging to spend money in London for this purpose, although it was never voted by parliament. It is inconceivable to me that this should be the last day upon which this money can be voted or that otherwise this work in London will be stopped. As my hon. friend from Dufferin (Mr. Barr) said this afternoon: It is impossible that the minister should have waited until the last stroke of the clock before he came here to get this money voted which he says he needs to carry on his work in London. This work has evidently been going on for some time. The minister has told us that he has spent no money over there which has not been voted by parliament. Last year he told us that the $3,000 extra which was asked for was going to be used for the purpose of fixing up the exhibit in London. Now he asks for $18,000. Of course, I accept the statement of the minister, but it seems to me that this government must be pledged to large sums of money which are to come out of this $18,000. I can hardly believe that no work has been done, that no contracts have been entered into, that no pledges have been made, because otherwise there would be no necessity for the immediate voting of this $18,000, but at the same time the minister tells us that he cannot wait any longer, and that all of this money is going to be spent before June 30 next. In view of the debates which took place in 1903 and 1905 it seems to be rather strange for the hon. minister to come here and tell us that he is going to do exactly the same things that he promised to do three years ago and one year ago. The fact of his having made these promises at these different times it seems to me ought to be sufficient to deter him from coming here and asking parliament to vote this larger sum of money for the purpose of rearranging or putting in order this dingy exhibit in the Imperial Institute. I think it would be much better to stop spending money on this exhibit and to spend more in the city of London in the office where the hon. minister told us in 1903 he was going to have the special exhibits, but which he tells us now he has not been able to arrange for them.

Mr. LALOR. Would the hon. minister tell us what class of goods are exhibited in the Canadian exhibit at London ?

Mr. FISHER. At the present time or in the past? There are exhibits from all the provinces, which are not very creditable to Canada, and we are trying to place goods on exhibition which will be creditable.

Mr. LALOR. That seems to be an admission of the hon. minister that the class of goods that is on exhibition in London as an exhibit representing this great Dominion of Canada is not a credit to this country. Having spent year after year large sums of money voted at each session of parliament to keep up this Canadian exhibit in London, the hon. minister now tells us that this exhibit is actually a disgrace to the country. I would like to know what has been done with the large sums of money we have voted each year for the exhibit he has over there. The hon. minister comes forward and asks us for $18,000 upon the promise that he will bring down an explanation at a latter date as to how this money is to be expended. I am not a very old member of the House and therefore I cannot speak from the experience of a number of years as to this particular subject, but we have been told to-day that this same kind of promise has been made to this House year after year by the hon. minister in connection with the Imperial exhibit in the city of London. My own opinion is that the money is absolutely wasted. I do not believe it

is any benefit to this country whatever to have that exhibit over there unless the exhibit is made a very much better one than it is now, and unless the hon. minister in charge of that particular department exercises his ability, in the direction of improving the exhibit we have in that country. We are told that this exhibit cannot continue unless this money is voted actually to-day; that the hon. minister cannot wait until to-morrow for the sum of money that is asked, and we were served with the threat this afternoon by the hon. minister that unless the money is voted he would actually cable over and have this show or exhibition closed up. I do not think it would be a very great loss to this country if it were closed up, and I do not believe it is of very great advantage to the farming interest that this exhibition should be carried on from year to year. We have been told to-day by hon. members of this House who have visited London and visited this Canadian exhibit that it is an absolute disgrace. One of the members of this House who visited that exhibition says that he found in one of the corners of a room where this particular exhibit is located a heap of coal that represented the industries of the maritime provinces. I suppose that heap of coal in a dusty room that perhaps had not been cleaned out for months was to advertise to the people of Great Britain and of foreign countries the resources and wealth of this great Dominion of ours. I think that these items should not only be properly discussed in the House, but that they should be properly explained before we vote moneys such as we are asked to vote to-night. The hon. minister seems to be perfectly determined and sullen in his manner as to the voting of this amount.

He appears to have made up his mind that he is going to force the vote through this House by the slavish majority which sits behind him, and regardless of the fact that no explanation is given. But these gentlemen opposite are not always so anxious to vote money, even in a better cause. A few days ago this House was asked to vote a trifling pension to a man who lost his sight through serving his Queen and country in South Africa, but the Liberal majority in this House refused to vote that small sum of money. Yesterday these same gentlemen refused to vote a small grant to the Fenian Raid Veterans who fought for Canada when most of us were in our childhood. This same government majority on the other side of the House voted down a resolution which asked that a small land grant be given as a recognition of the patriotism and courage of these men who risked their lives in defending Canada. But when it comes to voting $18,000 for an exhibition which the minister says himself is a disgrace to the country, then they are perfectly willing to vote the money. So far as I am concerned I will not vote this money until the item is properly explained and until we know where the money is to go.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall the resolution carry?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why did not the Minister of Agriculture send for the report this afternoon when the difficulty first came up, and when we might have had it in twenty minutes?

Mr. FISHER. I thought the explanation I was giving would be sufficient.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I should think the minister would very soon have been undeceived about that.

Mr. GANONG. Will the minister tell us if he has sent the cablegram to stop the work in London, because if he has done so we are merely wasting time? I would also like to ask him if he has anything to do with that wonderful Canadian exhibit in the Crystal Palace.

Mr. FISHER. My department has nothing to do with that.

Mr. GANONG. All Canadians should thank Heaven that you have not. I was there last summer and I was ashamed to see the name 'Canadian' inscribed over such an exhibit. At the same time I believe that if the money expended on the Imperial Institute located as it is, had been spent at the Crystal Palace it would have been a better inducement to immigrants. I also visited the Imperial Institute and I agree with every word that has been said in reference to it. As it is to-day it is a discredit to Canada. It may serve some scientific purpose, but as to immigration, the people who visit the Imperial Institute are not of the class who emigrate from the old country. How much of this $18,000 goes to new officials who are clamouring for positions?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. GANONG. Does the minister say he does not know?

Mr. FISHER. I understood my hon. friend to ask whether any new officials were to be appointed and I said no.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the minister tell us if we are to expect a report from Mr. Hay and Mr. Brodie at the same time that we get Mr. Hutchison's report?

Mr. FISHER. I am able to some extent to satisfy the curiosity of my hon. friends. My deputy has sent me the blue prints of the plans and two communications, one in the form of a letter, and one a memo. for Mr. Hutchison which deals with the Imperial Institute and other matters.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister read the report ?

Mr. FISHER. I can read parts of it, or the whole of it if hon. gentlemen wish. It will take me some minutes to select the parts which refer to the Imperial Institute.

Mr. SPROULE. I wish particularly to know whether the original plan upon which the Imperial Institute used to be conducted is to be continued or whether some change is to be made ? Under the original plan each colony contributed its share towards the maintenance of the institute but that was not satisfactory, and year after year the explanation was given that it was not creditable to the colonies or to the empire, and that it was intended to make a change. A small amount of money was asked to pay the expenses of Mr. Watson and others; originally there was only one office but later on there was one in Kensington and one in London. Our King, then Prince of Wales. was at the head of the institute, but afterwards the constitution was changed and the High Commissioner for Canada was one of the governors. The Minister of Agriculture informed the House that a change had been made but we have never had from him to this hour a report as to that change. We were formerly asked to vote money upon the plea that it was only a small amount, but to-day we are asked to vote $26,000 for the Imperial Institute in place of the former sum of $8,000. Before that money is voted the minister should tell us what the other colonies intend to do, how the money is to be spent ; what proportion if any is to be spent for buying exhibits, what proportion for salaries and what proportion for rent.

What is the well-defined plan ? That is what the House ought to know, and I think the House is not only within its rights in asking for it, but would be doing less than its duty if it did not demand from the minister that information before we vote such a large amount of money. As the minister has the report in his hand, I have no doubt that after he goes over it he will give us the information which he seems so reluctant to give.

Mr. FISHER. If hon. gentlemen wish me to read this, I think I can read it now. It is written from Liège. After an introduction, it goes on .

You may not be aware that we have made quite a departure from the old way of exhibiting minerals. The minerals which we could use to good advantage are silver, lead, nickel, copper, zinc, antimony, iron, corundum, asbestos, mica and graphite. It is needless to repeat we have been complimented here in the way we have placed this exhibit before the people, because in all of the geological museums in Europe, that is, from all the information we can gather, they stick to the old way of exhibiting the specimens in cases and without any information as to what the mineral is intended for, and furthermore an object lesson is never dreamed of. To make a radical change from what has been done is what I am now suggesting to you, and if carried out, I am more than confident we can make this exhibit draw, besides make many of the doubters admit they did not know what they were talking about.

In the meantime, I will try and explain to you how we intend working on the exhibit, commencing with the minerals. On the blue-print which I am forwarding, you will notice I have marked the street line, then the entrance. Of course all of the exhibits now on this floor will be removed. Just in front as you enter the room commences No. 1 case. This will be used for asbestos, the rock being pyramided up from the base say half way up, then the fine material scattered on top ; above this, small manufactured articles that are well known to the trade. No. 2, nickel is to be placed in the same manner as the asbestos, or as near as possible, taking into consideration the material. This to be carried out with the other materials in the same way until you come to the section taken up by the staircase. You will notice between each case there is quite a space for mineral charts and photographs. The low and high cases shown along by the windows are for small specimens.

After passing the staircase section the agricultural exhibit commences. The large cases against the wall are to contain our immigration pictures or the cattle pictures, just as is thought best. These pictures are to be placed in the centre of each case. From the edge of the picture to the edge of the glass will be filled in so as to make a long bevel. This space will be decorated with grasses and grain and straw, which can be done very effectively. The other cases, similar to the small mineral cases will be used for cereal and grain specimens in bottles, also horticultural specimens. The space between the large cases will be used for photographs and reading material pertaining to agriculture. I am convinced this floor can be made satisfactory to you and any one who may be interested in the welfare of Canada.

In regard to the upstairs section, which will be a mixture of everything, I would like to let this stand before saying what is best to do with it, because when we commence on the lower floor to work I can have time to think out what is best to do with it ; at the same time, I am satisfied I can take care of it when the time comes.

You will notice the cost of the cases will be in the neighbourhood of $7,000. Should it be decided to use our exhibition cases instead of the small cases shown on plan, we would not reduce the cost materially, and, as I have said in one of my letters to you, we would be losing a good advertisement for Canada by taking these cases off the roll and making an alteration in them, no matter how very expensive, which would rob them of the novelty of being knock-downs. These have been admired by many who complimented us on having such ingenious and novel cases.

You will notice the large mineral cases which we intend placing against the wall, the exhibit will be in quantity. Starting at No. 1, asbestos, No. 2, corundum, No. 3, nickel, and so on to No. 9. I estimate the value of the material to be used at $2,500.

I might say any material now in the institute, such as building stones, &c., will have to be repolished and all rust specimens washed.

Agricultural exhibit.—Say ten pictures at $200 each, $2,000. Add to this grain samples, straws and grasses for decorating purposes, say $500; photos, reading matter, neatly lettered, $500. Add to all this, cost of neat signs for main hall and alcove cases, $500.

Upper flat on second floor.—On this flat it may be found advisable to purchase a few cases not to exceed $1,000. Should it also be found necessary we would use some of our mounted specimens and heads. In regard to heads, I notice in the institute they have some which when originally placed there were very good specimens, but they are no good now, therefore will have to be recovered, which will take some time to do; therefore will have to replace them with some of our stock. In doing this, I think it would cost about $2,000.

Woods.—With what they have there and adding to it some we have, I am satisfied $500 will cover this cost.

In the matter of horticulture, I think for fruit and bottles we would require $750.

For labour, cartage in London and living allowance for members of the staff who would be required, say in all $3,000. Add to this for unforeseen expenses, $500.

In making this estimate I am placing everything as to cost high enough to be on the sure side.

The amount of money required to finish the work, not taking into consideration the cost of the specimens required, would be in the neighbourhood of $14,000. Should this proposition be entertained by you it would be necessary to let me know as soon as possible so that I can close with the contractors for the cases. It would take them two months to complete the work.

When in London one question put to me by Lord Strathcona was what it would cost to make the change I intended making? I said about $20,000. He said in that case I would have to see the committee in reference to it, meaning as I took it, he would see how long the institute people would let us remain in the building. I merely made the remark I was only giving to Mr. Fisher an estimate of what I thought would be required to make a first rate exhibit in the Canadian section, and no doubt if he found anything that did not harmonize with the undertaking he would communicate with Mr. Fisher, and I was satisfied Mr. Fisher would be pleased to fall in with his views.

Here are some tenders which have been received: Items of cost of the proposed change to be made in the Canadian exhibit in the Imperial Institute, London:

Statement as to the cost of proposed change to be made in the Canadian exhibit in the Imperial Institute, London.

Cases on ground floor for mineral and agricultural exhibits	$7,000
Cost of minerals to be furnished by exhibition branch	2,500
Photos and charts, agricultural exhibit	500
Ten pictures at $200 each	2,000
Grain samples straw and grasses for decorating purposes	500
Photos, reading matter neatly lettered	500
Cost of large signs for main hall and above wall cases, upper floor or ground floor	500
Cost of cases which may be required	$1,000
Mounted specimens and heads	2,000
Woods	500
Horticulture, fruit and bottles	750
Labour, cartage in London, living allowance for members of staff	3,000
Unforeseen expenses, say	500
	$21,250

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not observe in Mr. Hutchison's report any reference to any exhibit of the fisheries. Is that not to be provided for in any way?

Mr. FISHER. He has not provided for it in this. I think it ought to be.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I should think that the importance of that industry would justify some exhibit, and it would not be difficult to provide one.

Mr. FISHER. I think there are already some specimens there. I have a letter from Mr. Hutchison referring to specimens there which he hoped to utilize. The specimens of fish are rather better than most of the exhibits.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not gather whether any of those cases are to be manufactured out of Canadian woods and in that way bring our forest products into notice.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Hutchison does not mention that fact. The cases are very largely of glass.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is extremely desirable to consider what Lord Strathcona has suggested with regard to the possibility of new arrangements being made by the imperial authorities.

Mr. FISHER. In consequence of this report I wrote Lord Strathcona on that very point and he wrote back that the arrangements were continued and would continue many years.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Some eleven or twelve years ago I saw the exhibit and was very much impressed with its absolute inadequacy. If we are to have an exhibit, we ought to have one worthy of the country. But in listening to hon. gentlemen who have visited England more recently and understand better the conditions there, I have been very much impressed with their suggestions as to the place where the exhibit should be made. It is undoubtedly true that but few people have the opportunity of seeing this exhibit. Under present conditions, that was rather fortunate, but if we are going to spend a very substantial sum each year, and the sum asked for is very substantial—only three years ago the minister thought that $2,000 would be sufficient to prepare and place in that building a fairly good exhibit—if we are going very much beyond what was contemplated then, the

government should very carefully consider the place where this exhibit is to be put. We are going to spend a good many thousand dollars to prepare our exhibit and shall be called on every year to vote a large sum to keep it up, and therefore the question of location becomes very important. This is a matter in which the government must take the responsibility, but still it is not out of place for us to point out that the question of location, under the proposed new conditions, is much more important than it has been hitherto. I trust that before final arrangements are made, my hon. friend will take that carefully into his consideration.

Mr. SPROULE. This is a splendid illustration of the unwisdom of a minister coming before the House without the information which the House ought to have. There can be no doubt that if the information now furnished had been given promptly, this item would have passed before recess. I think it is desirable to ascertain whether the provinces are joining in this or not.

Mr. FISHER. They are not.

Mr. SPROULE. Whether they do or not, we ought to make the best display possible. We are spending too much money to have any of it wasted, and if necessary we should spend more along the same lines so long as it will do good.

Mr. FOSTER. I notice that about $14,000 of the $20,000 is for cases in which to house the exhibits. It strikes me that you will not get a very comprehensive representation of Canadian products with the $5,000 or $6,000 that are left. $14,000 to be put into cases and photographs and fittings generally, rather than into the products themselves, seems rather out of proportion.

Mr. FISHER. The cost of the cases comes to only $8,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, but the other mechanical work comes to about $6,000 more.

Mr. FISHER. I think my hon. friend is mistaken. The items are as follows :

Cases on ground floor for mineral and agricultural exhibits	$ 7,000
Cost of minerals to be furnished by exhibition branch	2,500
Photos and charts, agricultural exhibits	500
Ten pictures at $200 each	2,000
Grain samples, straw and grasses for decorating purposes	500
Photos, reading matter neatly lettered	500
Cost of large signs for main hall and above wall cases, upper floor or ground floor	500
Cost of cases which may be required	1,000
Mounted specimens and heads	2,000
Woods	500
Horticulture, fruit and bottles	750
Labour, cartage in London, living allowance for members of staff	3,000
Unforeseen expenses, say	500
	$21,250

Mr. FOSTER. That carries out my general idea that the amount spent on the products themselves to be exhibited is not very large. For instance what can you show of the agricultural products of Canada which would be at all sufficient for $700 ? It seems to me that would be very small.

Mr. FISHER. Those things are got very cheaply.

Mr. FOSTER. They are got up cheaply.

Mr. FISHER. Not got up cheaply, but obtained cheaply; it does not take much money to get a large quantity.

Mr. FOSTER. But it seems to me that is a very insufficient amount. Has the minister any information as to the number of visitors annually at the Imperial Institute ? I imagine that not many business men go there, nor do the great bulk of the common people who are seeking homes; it is more of a gentlemen's reserve or for people who have scientific tastes, and are comparing the products of different countries. In my time the attendance was very limited and it became almost a question whether it would not have to be shut up altogether owing to the very small patronage. The visiting patronage may have increased but I think the chances are against it; it is out of the current stream of travel and consequently has not many visitors.

Mr. FISHER. I explained to the member from Toronto (Mr. Kemp) that the value of the institute is largely owing to the information it gives to people seeking information for a specific purpose, scientific or industrial. I do not consider that the popular attendance at the institute is likely to be so large as it might be in some other place.

Mr. FOSTER. What would be the cost of up-keep, as far as the staff is concerned ?

Mr. FISHER. That would be covered by the figures I gave last year, $4,500 or $5,000 a year, for the staff and our subscription to the institute.

Mr. BLAIN. What about the reports of the other two gentlemen Mr. Hay and Mr. Brodie ?

Mr. FISHER. My deputy has not sent them. These are two inferior officers of the exhibition staff, that is to say they are under Mr. Hutchison. They were in London attending to some short time exhibitions last year, held under the auspices of the grocers and allied trades, the bakers, &c., and I asked them while there to visit the institute and give me some idea of how the building could be so decorated and arranged as to enable us to make a good exhibit. They sent a short report signed by one of them but it did not go into details as Mr. Hutchison's did, and it was not one on which I would be prepared to act without further information and that I got from Mr. Hutchison.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the minister lay it on the table at a future date ?

Mr. FISHER. I will.

Mr. PERLEY. During the last two or three years the minister has taken votes which he has explained were intended to carry on weekly or periodical exhibits in London of perishable products, poultry, bacon, &c. I understand that has not been done and I would like the minister to explain why he stated this would be done and it has not been done. It seems to me it would have been of great service to the farmers of the country.

Mr. FISHER. Simply because we have not been able to get at it.

Mr. PERLEY. The money has been voted.

Mr. FISHER. It has not been spent.

Mr. J. D. REID. I see that last year the expenditure was $7,940; of that $3,000 is on account of mineral exhibits so that there have been practically nothing but mineral exhibits in this institute up to the present time and it seems that now there is to be a material change in the exhibits in this institute. The minister has only about $750 in that statement for agricultural products. That is a very small amount to be expended in that way and for it I believe it would be almost impossible to give a fair exhibit of our dairy products which are so important owing to the large exports of them. At the same time, I feel that in this exhibit there should be some examples of our manufactures. I do not think there is anything for that included in this item. Perhaps the minister would explain.

Mr. FISHER. We would expect these to be supplied by the manufacturers. We shall be glad to receive them and to see to their being properly exhibited.

Mr. J. D. REID. Has any notice to that effect been sent out ?

Mr. FISHER. I could not do that until I knew whether the money was to be voted. But as soon as the work is in progress that will be done.

Progress reported.

SUPPLY BILL.

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 56) for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending June 30, 1906.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

Mr. PATERSON. I would like, if the House unanimously agrees, to put the Bill through its several stages at once.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not see any objection to that.

Bill read the second time, considered in committee and reported.

Mr. PATERSON moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have not seen copies of the Bill, but I assume that it is in the usual form and contains only the items that have been passed.

Mr. PATERSON. It is the Bill that was handed me by the clerk of the House.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY—DIRECTOR OF GEOLOGICAL SURVEY.

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, there is a matter to which I would like to bring the attention of the government. On the 20th of this month, just a week ago, there was a discussion with regard to the appointment of a permanent head of the Geological Survey. The hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) made inquiry of the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) with regard to the matter, and the Prime Minister replied as follows :

> The government has decided to make an appointment and it will be made inside of a week.

Would the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) be good enough to tell us who has been appointed ?

Mr. PATERSON. I understand that the appointment is about to be made. The House will probably be informed to-morrow.

JAPANESE TREATY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I also direct the attention of the government to a request I made on the 12th of March for copies for the orders in council and correspondence with regard to the new treaty with Japan. From the discussion that then took place it appears that the treaty was signed on January 31. We were promised that the documents relating to it should be laid on the table, and I should be glad if this request should receive the attention of the government at the earliest possible moment. I would refer the Minister of Customs to page 126 of 'Hansard' of this year, where the minister will see what it was that I asked for.

RURAL MAIL DELIVERY.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I wish to again inquire of the

Postmaster General (Mr. Aylesworth) with regard to the return to the order of the House made upwards of a year ago for documents with reference to free rural mail delivery. The hon. gentleman has not given me any information as to when we may expect that return.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Postmaster General). The papers are in course of preparation.

Mr. LENNOX. Has the hon. minister ascertained the cause of the delay ? A good deal more than a year has elapsed since the order was passed. It seems a very long time to take for a return of this kind.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The matter had never been called to my personal attention until it was mentioned in the House by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox). I then made an investigation as to the stage at which the matter had arrived, and promptly gave directions that the papers should be prepared in answer to the order of the House.

Mr. LENNOX. Can the minister say when we may expect the papers ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I have not made inquiry lately, but, I should think, within a few days.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Lewis) had given notice that he wanted to speak when supply was moved for. But he does not seem to be in the House at the moment. I mention it now in case——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I suppose that on account of the late hour the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lewis) has decided to postpone it until a future day.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There are a number of returns which have been ordered this session, and which should be brought down soon. I mention this to the government, because, in a great many cases, I took the precaution to notify the departments ten days or a fortnight before the House opened that these returns would be moved for. I did this in order that the necessary preparation be made and that no undue delay should occur in bringing down the documents. I do not think that any of them have yet been brought down. I gave this unusual notice in order that we might expedite the work of the session. That would be entirely in vain unless the returns are brought down somewhat earlier than we might otherwise expect them. I took it for granted that when I gave the departments notice ten days or two weeks before the House opened some work might be done on the documents and that we would not need to wait a month or six weeks in order to have the returns brought down. It seems to me that some of the returns asked for might already have been brought down.

Mr. PATERSON. We think that we have been very prompt this year.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Have they been brought down ?

Mr. PATERSON. There have been a great many returns brought down. I am only speaking from memory, however.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Have there been ?

Mr. PATERSON. I think so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I was not aware of it. I will look into that.

Mr. PATERSON. I only state this from general observation. I do not know.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of course, I speak under correction. I have not observed that any returns ordered by this side have been brought down. However, I will make inquiry of the clerk.

Mr. PATERSON. I thought the hon. gentleman spoke about returns made for last year.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No, this year.

Mr. PATERSON. You mean returns moved for this year ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes. I was endeavouring to explain to the hon. Minister of Customs—I may not have made myself understood—that in order to expedite the work of the session I gave notice to all the departments that certain returns would be moved for in order that the preparation might be commenced and that these returns might be brought down at an earlier date than they would otherwise be expected. In view of that it seems to me that we should expect some of these returns very soon; in fact, we have been expecting them before this. I mention this in order that all possible expedition may be used, because, the Minister of Customs understands, of course, that if returns which are required are not brought down delay must necessarily ensue. We cannot properly discuss subjects unless we have certain information and it was with the view of avoiding delay that I gave notice to the departments about ten days or two weeks before the session opened in order that the departments might begin the work of copying the documents which the House would require.

Mr. PATERSON. As far as my department are concerned they are working on returns and I think they were doing that before they were really moved for and I have no doubt that other ministers are expediting these returns as much as they can. Some of the returns are voluminous and take some time to prepare.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understand that.

Mr. PATERSON. We have one return desired by my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) that we are prepared to lay on the table almost as soon as the House orders it and there is another that has been moved for that is now in course of preparation. I have no doubt that all the ministers will note what the hon. gentleman has said. I will mention it to them as well.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have spoken twice to the Prime Minister, I think, asking for a return from the office of the Secretary of State of all orders of the House during the past two sessions that have not yet been complied with. The Prime Minister thought there would be no difficulty in procuring a return of that kind from the department mentioned. We have not yet had it and I would be very much obliged indeed to the hon. Minister of Customs if he would take a note of this also and endeavour to expedite the preparation of such a statement or memorandum.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the attention of the hon. leader of the House for a moment to a return ordered by this House a year ago giving the number of civil servants who have been employed from 1896 to 1905, both in the inside and outside service. That return was moved for early in March. The Order of the House issued then, the return was only brought down a few days before the close of the session, which I believe ended on the 19th or 20th of July, and even then there was only a partial return. The Department of Public Works had not included their return in it and there is no information since then, as far as I can learn, as to whether an effort has been made to comply with the Order of the House. I think it is not as it should be. A return is of little value unless it is as complete as possible, and surely it is not so voluminous that it could not be got ready for the House inside of one year. It must be over a year since the House ordered that return. I would ask the hon. leader of the House to take note of it and endeavour to ascertain whether the Order of the House has been complied with and if not to have it complied with at as early a date as possible.

Mr. PATERSON. Perhaps the hon. gentleman, having knowledge of the matter, would send me over a little note which refers me to some date or page to assist me in finding it.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, I will do that.

Mr. BARKER. I would ask when we may expect the report of the Department of the Interior. It has been asked for over and over again and promised. We ought to have it.

Mr. OLIVER. The report is completely in the hands of the Printing Bureau and having made inquiry within the last day or two I am informed that it will be available for presentation to the House within a day or two.

Mr. BARKER. We have had that before. I hope you will realize the promise immediately. I would also ask when we shall have the report of the Department of Marine. We have had the Fisheries Report but not the Marine Report.

Mr. PATERSON. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) is not in just now. I think that all the reports will be in the hands of the printers and I suppose they are pushing them forward as fast as possible. If the hon. gentleman would renew the question when the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries is in he might be able to get an answer.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is he within the precincts of the House ?

Mr. PATERSON. I fancy so. If not unwell you will find ministers somewhere in the vicinity if not in the chamber.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps you had better send for him.

Mr. BARKER. I would like to call the hon. minister's attention to one more matter. On the 14th of the month I asked for a statement from the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals as to certain transactions with the Eastern Railway Supply Co. The hon. minister answered two or three of the questions and promised a return as to the others almost immediately. He said : 'There will be no unnecessary delay in bringing the papers down.' The minister has not been here for some days and we require the papers for the public accounts committee. I call attention to the matter because from the nature of the papers I think there is no reason why they should not be in the department and possibly it is only owing to the absence of the minister that we have not them here. Without them our proceedings before the public accounts committee will be delayed.

Mr. AMES. May I ask the Minister of the Interior whether the reports of the Dominion Lands Branch and of the Surveyor General are also in the hands of the printer and will come down at the same time as the report of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. OLIVER. The complete report of the Department of the Interior, as I have already said will be available to the House within a very few days.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And will include these ?

Mr. OLIVER. Will include these, so I understand.

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

Indian school, maritime provinces, Ontario and attendance and medicines, Quebec, $4,200.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). For all services under which expenditure is continuous throughout the twelve months a reduction has been made in these items on the basis of nine months. This applies to expenses of management, school grants, medical attendance, miscellaneous charges, implements, live stock, &c. But there are certain sub-heads under which a reduction cannot be made as the expenditure takes place early in the year. In these cases the full amount of the requirements for the fiscal year of twelve months has to be voted and this fact accounts for the estimate not being the even twenty five per cent reduction. Under the partial reduction of twenty-five per cent the estimates are less than for 1895-96 by $325,601. If they had been made out on the old basis, twelve months compared with twelve months, it would have shown a reduction of $60,000 approximately which occurs under the sub-heads of cattle, school buildings, and food supplies for Manitoba and the Northwest Territories.

Indian school, maritime province, Ontario and Quebec, $40,072.50.

Mr. BARR. How many schools are there?

Mr. OLIVER. In Ontario 72 day schools and 6 industrial and boarding schools.

Mr. BLAIN. Where are these located?

Mr. OLIVER. Fort William boarding school, Mohawk Institute, Brantford; Mt. Elgin Institute, Mt. Elgin; Wawanosh and Shingwauk, Sault Ste. Marie; a school for boys and a school for girls, Manitoulin Island.

Mr. SPROULE. There is an increase of about $4,000.

Mr. OLIVER. That is on account of repairs to the Mt. Elgin Institute which cost $3,000.

Mr. J. D. REID. Are these teachers required to have any certificates?

Mr. OLIVER. They require to have at least third-class certificates.

Mr. FOSTER. Normal school training?

Mr. OLIVER. Normal school training is not an absolute requirement.

Mr. BARR. As a matter of fact, have they all certificates?

Mr. OLIVER. I am informed that they all have certificates.

Mr. J. D. REID. Do they teach any other language than English?

Mr. OLIVER. In Ontario English is the only language taught. In Quebec French is taught in some of the schools.

Mr. DANIEL. How many schools are in the maritime provinces, where are they situated, and how many pupils are there?

Mr. OLIVER. The number of day schools in Nova Scotia is 11, in New Brunswick 6, and in Prince Edward Island, 1.

Mr. DANIEL. Where are those in New Brunswick situated?

Mr. OLIVER. Burnt Church and Eelground in Northumberland County, Kingsclear and St. Mary's in York County, Tobique in Victoria County, Big Cove in Kent County.

Mr. DANIEL. What is the number of pupils attending these schools?

Mr. OLIVER. The total number enrolled is 153, with an average attendance of 87.

Mr. BLAIN. Is there any system of inspection in these schools, and if so, what is the system?

Mr. OLIVER. They are inspected by the public school inspectors of each province, who make returns in regard to their inspection to the Indian Department.

Mr. FOSTER. What has the minister to say with reference to the progress of Indian children in these schools? Are they making satisfactory progress? What are they fitted for? What do they become as products of the schools?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know just how to answer the question. There is no doubt that the Indian children are fairly capable and apt pupils, but as to the effect the education which they have acquired has had upon their general life, I am not able to answer definitely.

Mr. FOSTER. I would not expect the minister, with his short acquaintance with the work, to be able to answer definitely; but what I want to get at is this. Does the Indian Department, which cares for these children and provides the means of their education, pay attention to anything besides simply paying the salaries of the teachers and the fees of the medical men and so on? Does it keep track of the progress of the Indian children, beyond simply teaching them to read, and may be write and cipher a little? What progress do the Indian children make more than that, and what progress do they make in these lines?

Mr. OLIVER. In the province of Ontario the Indians are showing considerable progress in education and in civilization, and are taking some interest in the ordinary work of civilization in their vicinity according to their condition in life.

Mr. BARR. Are they taught to work on farms in Ontario?

Mr. OLIVER. There is no system of farm instruction in Ontario, but a large

percentage of the Indians are practical farmers and some of their work is highly creditable.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have been a little interested in this question, and have taken some opportunities of endeavouring to find out what advantage it is to the Indian children to receive instruction in these schools; and the very limited attention I have given to the subject has led me to the conclusion that if you send the Indian children back to the tribe and among those who have no education at all, they relapse almost immediately into the same condition of barbarism as their ancestors; but if you segregate those who have had some education, if you send them out to employment of some kind, or put them on a separate part of the reserve and keep them by themselves, a very decided improvement ensues. That is the information which has come to me in a more or less fragmentary way from different sources. I would like to know if there is anything in that suggestion, which seems to point to the conclusion that a great deal of care should be paid by the department to the after course of life of the Indian children educated in the schools. It does not seem to be of much use to educate them and send them back; it does seem to be of some use to educate them and segregate them from the old life. In the latter case there has been a very marked improvement, not only in the Northwest, but in British Columbia.

Mr. OLIVER. We are dealing at the moment with the Indians in eastern Canada, and I think the long-continued and immediately surrounding conditions of civilization are an important part of the total effect upon the life of the Indians, of which the education received in the schools is another part. There is not the same difference between the Indian in eastern Canada and his white neighbour as prevails in the western country, and the danger of Indian children going back to their original condition is not so great on reserves in eastern Canada as it is in our western country. What we are attempting to do is to give the Indian children the best educational opportunities we can so that they may work out their own civilization to the best advantage, influenced by the example of the white population around him.

Mr. FOSTER. In the maritime provinces, for instance, do many of the Indian children go to the white schools?

Mr. OLIVER. Only to a limited extent. In Cumberland county, N.S., the Indian children, in some cases, attend the white schools.

Mr. FOSTER. In the maritime provinces you cannot get a large number of Indian children together in the one spot as with some few exceptions, they are very scattered. I am inclined to think that the Indian schools are ineffective because there are so few children you can get together and keep together for any length of time in the year, which makes it more difficult to get the kind of teacher best qualified to help those children along. It takes probably more special ability in a teacher to take hold of children of that kind and instil into them the desire to learn than it does in the case of white children. It strikes me that most of the money spent on these Indian schools is pretty well wasted. I do not know how far these children get an idea of education. You may teach them to read a little English, but do you go much further than that? But there is one thing which you seem able to do to any extent and that is distribute medicine. They seem to be able to take as much medicine as you are able to dole out to them. The bill for medicines is probably much large than the bill for schooling. Is the struggle still on between the department and the medical men as regards this constant medical care?

Mr. OLIVER. Of course in the case of a race such as the Indians, which is often described as a dying race, they necessarily require more medicine and medical treatment than white people who are living under more favourable conditions and who are more vigorous and progressive. Then there is more expense in the medical care of the Indians who live distant from the medical practitioners, scattered as these Indians are here and there throughout the maritime provinces.

Mr. BARR. Are the medical men paid by contract or for the work they actually do?

Mr. OLIVER. In some cases they are paid a salary and in others fees.

Mr. GUNN. Did I understand the minister to say that the Indians are not taught farming in the eastern provinces?

Mr. OLIVER. What I said was that there are no Indian farm instructors in eastern Canada as there are in the reserves in the west. But I fancy that practical farming is taught at the educational institutes which exist in eastern Canada.

Mr. J. D. REID. Are the physicians who attend the Indians on salary allowed outside practice?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. BARR. If we take the expenses in connection with medicine and medical attendance in the provinces of Ontario and Quebec, we find that the charge per capita for the Indians is greater than it is for the whites, although it is well known that the Indians, if left to themselves, have no desire to take much medicine. It seems to me that there must be a number of medical men who are good politicians and have a

pull with the government, and probably the government takes this way to recoup them for their political work.

Mr. BLAIN. Is the same standard of education asked on the Indian reserves that is found in the other counties ?

Mr. OLIVER. No, it is not. The course of study is different in Canadian schools. The third-class certificate is the necessary certificate, the higher certificate is not requisite.

Mr. BLAIN. What kind of books do they use ?

Mr. OLIVER. The same series of school books is used in all the schools in the province of Ontario. The books are purchased through the stationery department of the goverment.

Mr. BARR. And who revises those books, who prepares them ?

Mr. OLIVER. They use the Gage series.

Mr. AVERY. Who applies for the books required ?

Mr. OLIVER. The school teacher.

Mr. BLAIN. I see that some teachers are engaged at a salary of $100 per annum, and others at higher rates, some at $300. Who engages these teachers ? Are there trustees on the reserve ?

Mr. OLIVER Would the hon. member mention the schools ?

Mr. BLAIN. One on page J—6 of the Auditor General's Report.

Back Settlement, teacher, Isidore Whitlock, 12 months to June 30, $100.

And there is another.

Bear Creek, teacher, Alma H. Norsworthy, 12 months to June 30, $100.

I need not give other instances.

Mr. OLIVER. I am informed that the Indian Department engages the teachers, and in the case mentioned, in the Back Settlement school, the department pays $100, and the Indian band pay $200. So the teacher receives $300.

Mr. BARR. The government pay one-third ?

Mr. OLIVER. We pay one-third and the band two-thirds.

Mr. SPROULE. Are these schools inspected the same as the other schools ?

Mr. OLIVER. They are inspected by the provincial school inspector, who reports to the Indian Department and, of course, is paid for his services by the Indian Department.

Salaries of chiefs, Cape Croker and Gibson, and agent, Oka, $112.50.

Mr. BARR. How many chiefs are there that receive this $150 ?

Mr. OLIVER. The two chiefs receive $50 each and the other vote of $50 is for the departmental agent for the Iroquois at St. Regis.

Payment of Robinson treaty annuities, $12,450.

Mr. BARR. Does this treaty continue in perpetuity ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, the annuity payments are continuous.

Mr. SPROULE. What stand is the department taking with regard to this ? My recollection was that a demand was made on the province of Ontario for either a refund of the money or the land. If the decision of the Privy Council was that the land belonged to Ontario, then I think the Dominion made an application for a refund of the money. How are the negotiations between the Dominion and Ontario in regard to this question ?

Mr. OLIVER. I understand that the question as between the Dominion and the province has been settled, and that the province has paid in a capitalized amount of $205,000, capitalized in 1903 at 3 per cent, and then a further amount of $88,000, capitalized in 1903 at 5 per cent, giving a total annual payment or revenue of $10,550.

Mr. SPROULE. Paid in by the province ?

Mr. OLIVER. To the Dominion.

Mr. SPROULE. But we continue to pay the treaty obligation ? If this was on account of the payments made in pursuance of the treaty obligation in the past what arrangement is there to be for the future ?

Mr. OLIVER. This is the amount that was paid in in settlement of the claim ; this was the final settlement of the claim.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not understand just how the settlement is. This treaty goes on in perpetuity. There must be a payment made to the Indians by somebody ; has the federal government to pay it in the future, or the provincial government ?

Mr. OLIVER. The Ontario government pays this amount in settlement of our claims against them, and we pay the balance of whatever annuity is required.

Mr. SPROULE. We pay in perpetuity the balance and this is a final settlement as between the province and the Dominion ?

Mr. OLIVER. This $10,550 is a payment in perpetuity. It goes on annually as a settlement of that claim and whatever further amount is due the Indians has to be paid by the Dominion.

Mr. SPROULE. The treaty annuity is $12,450 for the one year, and it was the

same last year. Why is it made $10,000, the payment of the province $10,000 when we are required to pay $12,450 ?

Mr. OLIVER. The total amount to be paid is $23,000, of which the Ontario government pays $10,550 and we pay $12,450.

Mr. SPROULE. Since what date has that contract run?

Mr. OLIVER. It was a settlement of a claim that has run since 1903.

Mr. SPROULE. And what about the payments made previous to that date?

Mr. OLIVER. Of course, this government made the payments in the past. And this payment annually in perpetuity of $10,550 by the Ontario government is accepted by the Dominion in respect of past payments by the Dominion and future obligations on the part of Ontario.

Mr. BARR. Then, do we understand that for many years the Dominion government has been paying this and the Ontario government, though receiving the benefit, did not pay anything until 1903?

Mr. OLIVER. I find, on consulting the officers of the department, that I rather misstated the case. The Ontario government returned to this government some $90,000 that had been paid, and this is the payment of the awarded obligation of the Ontario government beginning with 1903.

Mr. BARR. Has the House ever been favoured with the papers on this subject?

Mr. OLIVER. They are printed in the report of the Finance Department.

Mr. FOSTER. I notice that in these payments, Woods, Limited, come in, as they usually do everywhere. In this case they make a sale of a down robe for $25. Was that given to a chief?

Mr. OLIVER. That was in connection with Treaty 9, and was for one of the commissioners who negotiated the treaty last summer for the part of Ontario lying north of the height of land.

Mr. FOSTER. And who owns the robe when the commissioner is through with it ?

Mr. OLIVER. The work of the commission is not yet ended.

Survey of Indian reserves, $7,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Here is a big increase What is it for ?

Mr. OLIVER. The increase in this item is asked for to enable certain works which is pressing to be carried out; $2,500 is required to subdivide the lots in rear of the Restigouche reserve in order that they may be settled on by Indians who have no cultivatable land. Another reserve requires to be properly allotted to the members of the tribe in order that their holdings may not conflict ; $2,750 being required for this purpose. In Caughnawaga village the department has constantly to settle disputes between the holders of lands in the reserve and the holders of land in Caughnawaga village, and as no proper survey of the village has been made it is almost impossible to settle the disputes. In addition, the department requires $500 to pay for incidental and unforeseen services which may arise during the course of the fiscal year.

Mr. FOSTER. Can the minister tell us the total amount spent in surveying the Caughnawaga reserve—how many hundreds of thousands of dollars? Ever since I was a child in politics they have been surveying that reserve. What is the whole area of the reserve?

Mr. OLIVER. I am told that it is 14,000 acres.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, if the minister will supplement that information by stating the amount spent so far in surveys we shall be able to figure out the number of thousands of dollars per square foot or so that it has cost.

Mr. OLIVER. I am told that the Walbank survey made about 15 years ago cost about $14,000.

Mr. FOSTER. That being only one of many?

Mr. OLIVER. My officer informs me that it was the only survey. Of course, it covered more than one year, but it was one piece of work.

Mr. FOSTER. And there is still surveying to be done?

Mr. OLIVER. This is a survey of the village, not of the reserve.

Mr. FOSTER. But the village is in the reserve?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes; but I assume that the survey of the reserve itself did not take notice of the requirements of the village or else that the requirements of the village have increased, possibly by increase of population.

Mr. FOSTER. Does this mean subdividing lots?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, and resurveying.

Mr. FOSTER. They take out the stakes, do they, and have the survey over again?

Mr. OLIVER. There may be something to be said in favour of that theory.

Mr. SPROULE. Is any of this money to be spent in surveying the islands in Georgian bay ?

Mr. OLIVER. The surveys of the Georgian bay islands are completed as far as the North Shore. That was done some

three or four years ago, and there have been no surveys of these islands since that time.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the government doing with reference to these islands ? Is the department selling them ?

Mr. OLIVER. The survey was made with a view to selling the islands. But before a sale can be made a relinquishment of the right of the Ontario government to the islands to be sold has to be secured. When the survey was made a valuation was placed upon the islands by the surveyor and now, when an application is made to purchase an island, if the consent of the Ontario government is secured, the island is sold at the surveyor's valuation to the first applicant.

Mr. SPROULE. What arrangement has been come to between the Ontario government and the Dominion in regard to these islands ? I understood there was a distinct line dividing the property as claimed by Ontario and that held by the Indian Department for the Indians. What division was made or is the claim not settled yet?

Mr. OLIVER. There was an arrangement attempted to be arrived at whereby the Dominion government would administer the islands south of Moose Deer point and the Ontario government those north of the point, but after the arrangement had to a certain extent been agreed to a dispute arose in regard to some islands lying in the north channel west of this boundary and the result was that the whole matter was thrown into confusion again. The whole question is still finally unsettled, but a provisional arrangement has been arrived at whereby the Ontario government will formally relinquish its right to the islands in order that the islands may be sold. Of course, the Ontario government's right in the matter will be established when the dispute, now in course of adjustment, is concluded.

Mr. BARR. Have any of these islands been sold?

Mr. OLIVER. Quite a large number have been sold.

Mr. BARR. How was the money divided between the province and the Dominion?

Mr. OLIVER. The money secured is funded by this government and when the dispute is finally settled, of course, the money will be divided according to the judgment given.

Mr. SPROULE. Is there not a certain locality where the Ontario government have the right to sell and other localities where the Indian Department have the right to sell ? I was informed that there was some kind of a tentative arrangement of that kind.

Mr. OLIVER. The Ontario government have not sold any in recent years. I presume they did sell some islands some years ago. No doubt while the arrangement I spoke of a short time ago whereby they were to control the islands north of Moose Deer Point and the Dominion those south of Moose Deer Point was pending, the Ontario government did sell some islands. But since the dispute has become general I am informed they have not sold any islands. The Dominion government have not sold any north of Moose Deer Point.

Mr. SPROULE. You did not sell any?

Mr. OLIVER. The Dominion government have not sold in the area which at the time of this arrangement they practically conceded to Ontario.

Mr. SPROULE. If these islands belong to Ontario, and we would seem to admit that allegation on account of funding the money till the final disposition is made of it, how do you arrange as to the cost of surveys ? The Ontario government surveyed a lot of these islands and the Indian Department surveyed a certain number of them.

Mr. OLIVER. The Indian Department has only made surveys south of Moose Deer Point and the matter of the cost as between the Ontario government and this government has not yet been adjusted.

Mr. KEMP. How are you going to identify these islands ? They are marked with white paint which comes off in the course of a few years ? Is it the intention to paint them again in a few years ? Is it very difficult to identify them ?

Mr. OLIVER. That, of course, is a detail that I suppose will receive attention in due course. Of course, the islands are laid down on a plan or map which prevents any possibility of mistake, but for the convenience of the public the department might very well take notice of the suggestion and see that they were made easy of identification.

General legal expenses, $6,350.

Mr. J. D. REID. We would like to have some explanation as to how this is made up. I see by the Auditor General's Report for 1905 that only $1,000 has been spent for legal expenses, while, according to this vote, $8,500 per annum is required. In the Auditor General's Report, page J—9, under the heading of 'General Legal Expenses' I find that the expenditure was $2,134.74. Included in this amount is $1,465.31 to repay Heber Archibald security for costs thus reducing the amount to $1,000 for legal expenses. Perhaps the hon. minis-

ter will also explain if there are not two or three officers of the department who are legal officers and if so what part they take in performing the legal services which the department require. I do not see the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Lemieux) in his place just now. I would like to know what the hon. Solicitor General does in so far as this department is concerned. I understood, when the Solicitor General was appointed, that he was to take some active part in so far as these legal matters are concerned and yet in the Interior Department I find that there was $11,000 spent as legal expenses last year. Will the hon. minister tell us whether the hon. Solicitor General takes charge of the legal work of his department, or has he to farm it out to different lawyers throughout the country ?

Mr. OLIVER. The legal work is done by agents of the department of Justice in the locality in which the case is to be dealt with. This item is necessary to provide for any case that may arise in which it may be thought advisable to engage counsel for the defence of the Indians charged with serious crimes which are altogether of a personal character and for which they cannot he held responsible for the fees, such as murder, incendiarism, trespass, &c. A very large expenditure was necessary in 1902-3 in the defence of the Indian Wabey, accused of the murder of a fur trader, and in the present year a large expense has been incurred in defending the Indian Joseph Bennett, who was accused and found guilty of murder. Legal services are frequently required in connection with the purchase and transfer of land for legal purposes. Of this amount $750 is to pay the cost of litigation in respect to lands at Oka.

Mr. J. D. REID. I understand the practice is that the Indians give an order on the annual grant for the payment of the solicitor they employ, and his fees are deducted.

Mr. OLIVER. I am informed that no such orders are honoured, and that payments have not been made as the hon. gentleman has suggested.

Mr. J. D. REID. That statement will not go down so far as I am concerned, because I know that what I am saying is true.

Mr. OLIVER. Will the hon. gentleman give an instance ?

Mr. J. D. REID. I am not going to give the solicitor away. I do not want it to go on record in the House, but I know it is the case.

Mr. OLIVER. But it will have to go on record that the officers of the department say it is not the case.

Mr. J. D. REID. I have no objection to that, but at the same time I wish it to go on record that so far as I am concerned I have my doubt as to that being correct ; I am not doubting the officers statement because I dont think they know anything about it. By the way, does the Solicitor General do any work in connection with these matters ? I understand he was appointed, and that his salary was increased on the ground that he would undertake legal work for the department. They have probably more officers in the Justice Department now than they had before the Solicitor General was appointed, and yet he does not do any of the law work. I have been trying to find out for some time what the Solicitor General does, but I have not succeeded. He was here a few minutes ago and perhaps the minister can get him into the Chamber to let us know what his department does.

Mr. FOSTER. How much was spent last year in legal expenses ?

Mr. J. D. REID. $11,000.

Mr. OLIVER. The amount spent for the the year 1904-5 was $2,134.74.

Mr. FOSTER. Why do you take such a large vote in the presence of such a small expenditure ?

Mr. OLIVER. Of this amount of $8,500, there is $3,750 required to pay the cost of litigation in respect to the land at Oka. The balance is to provide for expenses that cannot of course be foreseen.

Mr. SPROULE. This Oka matter has been going on since I came to this House. In what state of advancement towards completion is this dispute. Is there going to be any finality to it ?

Mr. OLIVER. The Indians and the Seminary agreed to submit a case to the Privy Council, the Indian Department agreeing to pay the Indian's share of the expense, but afterwards that agreement was dissolved and the matter is still open.

Mr. SPROULE. Which of the contracting parties refused to live up to the agreement ?

Mr. OLIVER. I beg pardon, the matter is not altogether dissolved but they have not yet agreed as to the form of the stated case.

Mr. SPROULE. Are the Indians being removed as formerly, or are they still in possession of the property ?

Mr. OLIVER. They are still in possession and claim ownership.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The administration of Justice in relation to the Indians in the county of Brant, is in a very unsatisfactory condition and I beg to call the attention of the minister to it. In round numbers the county of Brant contains a population of 40,000 which includes 4,200 Indians or one-tenth of the whole ; and yet not a penny is collected from these tribes nor is a penny

allowed by this government towards the expenses of the administration of justice. Last year one Indian was killed by another on the reserve, a most expensive trial was held in Brantford and the cost of that trial in which the white population had no concern amounted to about $1,200 which sum has been assessed on the white population of Brant. I am not finding fault with the Indians more than any other class of the community, but I must say that the matter of which I now speak is in a most unsatisfactory condition. Brant with a population of 40,000 has the largest Indian reservation in North America within its confines, and the 36,000 white people are obliged to pay the cost of administering justice for the Indians, without a cent of compensation in return. I believe representations have been made from time to time to the department in connection with this matter. In the year 1877 the federal government acknowledged its right to contribute and a certain amount was paid to the county, but although frequent claims have been made since, the Indian Department has never recognized them. It is estimated by the legal adviser of the county council of Brant that about $25,000—I speak from memory—has been paid by the white population for the administration of justice to these tribes, and no return whatever has been made on account of it. I want to know from the minister, whether there is a fund out of which the cost of certain trials, the expensive ones at any rate—there are always petty trials for minor offences about which perhaps we need not now concern ourselves —may be recouped to the white population.

In addition to that there have been other claims. I recently filed one with the department in regard to a large fire that took place and caused immense damage to a farmer. I merely mention this to show that there is no way of getting justice in these cases. The Indians are wards of the whole Dominion, not of the county of Brant; they have large funds invested, and are receiving the benefit of the interest on these moneys; but there is no fund provided for the administration of justice to these tribes. Representations, I believe, have been made to the government from time to time, and are likely to be made again in the near future, that injustice is being done to the thirty thousand inhabitants of the county of Brant in shouldering upon them the burden of this expense. This is a serious matter which the minister should take into consideration. I would like to hear from the minister whether this item embraces any amount for the administration of justice to the Indians in the county of Brant.

Mr. OLIVER. I am afraid that after I have made the explanation which I necessarily must make, my hon. friend will have even stronger objections than ever to this item, because so far from being for the purpose of administering justice upon the Indians, it is for the purpose of defending the Indians in the course of justice. In regard to the matters of which my hon. friend has spoken, I am informed that returns have from time to time been made through the department in that regard, and I think it must be plain to every one that under such circumstances the municipality does suffer some hardship from its proximity to a large Indian settlement. At the same time, there is nothing in the Indian Act or in the authority vested in the Department of Indian Affairs that would warrant the department in assuming responsibility on behalf of the municipality for the administration of justice in regard to the Indians. The matter is an important one, but it is one that in my estimation calls rather for legislation which would apportion the burden as between the Indian Department and the municipality than for departmental action. It is a condition which was of course not contemplated when the reserve was set apart, and might very well be dealt with, but I cannot think, as head of the Indian Department, that I am entitled to deal with it departmentally.

Mr. NORTHRUP. The hon. minister will pardon me if I have not understood his explanation in regard to this item. Last year, according to the Auditor General's Report, $2,100 odd was the amount for legal expenses ; but of that $1,400 was not strictly for legal expenses at all, but was put up for costs; so that as a matter of fact the legal expenses were only about $700. This year he asks for $8,500 for legal expenses. Surely he must offer definite explanations as to why he is multiplying the amount tenfold this year over the amount spent last year.

Mr. OLIVER. I am informed that the vote ordinarily asked for is $3,500, but for the current year it is $8,500, because $5,000 of that was required to meet a part of the expenses connected with the Oka litigation, just as out of this sum of $6,350 asked for the coming nine months, $3,750 is required to meet the special litigation expenses in connection with the same case. As I have explained, it is impossible to foresee what legal expenses may amount to, and it has always been thought well to provide what would be a reasonable and sufficient amount. The fact that in the year past the actual expenditure was only $700, although the vote was $3,500, is evidence that the expenditure is not extravagant.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I am not casting any reflection on the minister when I say that we have had experience in this House of counsel sending in a bill to the Department of Justice and that department kindly raising the bill several hundred dollars; and with that experience before us, we are anxious that nothing more should be asked for legal expenses than has been expended previously. But I presume that we may

rely on the minister to see under his new regime that the bills for legal expenses are properly taxed.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Will my hon. friend be good enough to mention the name of the counsel whose bill was raised in the way he mentions ?

Mr. NORTHRUP. It was the firm of McCarthy, Osler & Hoskins, of Toronto. Mr. Osler, I think, was the counsel.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. B. B. Osler. That was in the good old days.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I want to call the minister's attention to the fact that this kind of claim was recognized by the department at one time, up to 1877, I think. An arrangement was come to with the county council that it should send in the bills periodically and they would continue to be paid; but unfortunately the county council was dilatory and failed to send in the bills regularly; so that the accounts have accumulated and they have not received any attention from the department. The hon. Minister of Customs will remember that this claim has been sent in from time to time and I believe he himself together with Mr. Heyd, my predecessor, have pressed for consideration of this claim upon the department. The hon. minister says that we are at a disadvantage because we are near the Indian settlement. We do not feel that to be a disadvantage. We have always looked upon the Indian tribes of the county of Brant as being in a way the forerunners of civilization. I do not think that Brantford would have been as big or important as it is to-day if it had not been for the Indians in the first place; and when the whites settled there, they knew that they were settling in the vicinity of their red skin brethren and therefore it is out of place for any white man to cast reflections on them. I understood the minister to say that Brantford is not an exception to the general rule, but that it is simply unfortunate in possessing the largest Indian reserve in the Dominion. Well, I would ask him whether in his own province a special fund is not provided out of the general treasury for the administration of justice to the Indians. I think he will find that the whites are not saddled with that expense but that it comes out of a general fund. If that be the case in certain provinces, why should the old province of Ontario and certain counties in Ontario in particular have to shoulder this expense which properly belongs to the whole Dominion and not to any particular locality.

Mr. OLIVER. In the Northwest there are no municipal organizations adjoining the Indian reserves as there are in Ontario, and therefore the whites adjoining the reserves are not saddled with the expense of the administration of justice to the Indians. It is the province which pays that expense, and it pays the cost of the administration of justice whether in the case of the whites or the Indians. Therefore, if the province of Ontario is to be treated in the same manner as the provinces in the Northwest, that expenditure is one appertaining to the province and not to the Dominion, and any inequalities in the apportioning of that expense, is a matter for adjustment by the provincial government.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Do I understand the hon. minister to contend that the Indians are wards of the provincial government ? I have always understood that they were wards of the Dominion and that the treaties with the Indians come under the jurisdiction of the Dominion and not of the province. In fact, this government has recognized to a very moderate extent its liability to the county of Brant last year, because I find in the Auditor General's Report that out of the legal expenses of the Interior Department there was an amount of $30 paid Mr. G. D. Heyd for legal services in connection with the Indians, but whether these services were given in defence of an Indian or for prosecuting him, I do not know. In any event, the government should pay the costs either of the prosecution or of the defence and not leave the whole burden to be borne by the people of Brantford.

Mr. OLIVER. The department pays the cost of defence, but not the cost of prosecution.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. That was not done in this case.

Mr. OLIVER. The department does not enter into every case because the Indians on the Brantford reserve are to some extent in the position of citizens, and it is only when the department enters into a case that it assumes responsibility for the payment of the expense.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. The Indians have no franchise. They did have the franchise once and exercised it for several years, but this government disfranchised them and they are not citizens any longer. It is therefore no argument to say that they are in a certain sense citizens. They are simply members of a reserve just as are the Indians on any other reserve. True they are more advanced and civilized but the government says they are no more fit for citizenship than the Indians of the Northwest.

Mr. CROCKET. While this item is under consideration, there is a question of law which concerns the department, and to which I would draw the attention of the minister. It is this. The Indian Act defines a number of offences with respect to Indians and prescribes penalties. It provides also that prosecutions shall be taken under the provisions of the Summary Convictions Act. But there is a provision re-

garding appeals from convictions under the Indian Act which is different from the provisions respecting appeals from summary convictions in ordinary cases, and a good deal of uncertainty and confusion exist in the minds of lawyers and judges as to just how an appeal should be taken from a conviction under the Indian Act. The provision in that Act is :

That no appeal shall lie from any conviction under the 14 sections next preceding except to a judge of a superior court, county, circuit or district court or to the chairman or judge of the court of the sessions of the peace having jurisdiction where the conviction was had, and such appeal shall be heard, tried and adjudicated upon by such judge or chairman without the intervention of a jury, and no such appeal shall be brought after the expiration of thirty days from the conviction.

That is the only provision in the Act respecting appeals. The Act provides no machinery for the carrying on of the appeal. It has been held by some of the judges in Ontario that the appeal is subject to the provisions respecting appeals from summary convictions in ordinary cases ; but upon examination of the provisions of the Summary Convictions Act, it is found that these appeals, when taken to a judge of a Supreme Court, cannot be carried out under the conditions applicable to summary convictions in ordinary cases, because the Summary Convictions Act provides for an appeal to a county court sitting as a court at its regular sitting. This provision provides for an appeal to a county court judge or superior court judge or one or other of the classes of judges mentioned in that section, and the provisions of the Summary Convictions Act cannot be complied with, in any other case at least than when the appeal is taken to a county court judge, so that I think the matter should be considered by the legal officers of the department and machinery be provided for carrying out the appeal mentioned in the Indian Act or else provide that the appeal should be subject in all respects to the same conditions as appeals from summary convictions in ordinary cases. I was interested in a case in which a good deal of confusion arose. Neither judge or counsel seemed to be clear upon the matter. It was suggested that the matter should be brought to the attention of the law officers of the department and the Minister of Justice, so that some remedy might be provided.

Mr. OLIVER. I shall call the attention of the Department of Justice to the remarks of the hon. member. There are no law officers connected with the Indian Department. We depend on the Department of Justice.

Annuity, gratuity and expenses, treaty No. 9, from which payments may be made, notwithstanding anything to the contrary in the Civil Service Act, $600, $29,200.

Mr. OLIVER. This amount is required to complete the negotiations with the Indians and to pay the annuities to those who came into treaty last summer.

Mr. BARR. Is that treaty finally settled ?

Mr. OLIVER. It will be with the negotiations of this summer.

Indians, Nova Scotia—relief and seed grain, $2,025.

Mr. BARR. How is that grain purchased, by tender ?

Mr. OLIVER. By the local agent, by ordinary purchase.

Medical attendance and medicines, $2,775.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are the physicians paid by salary or according to attendance ?

Mr. OLIVER. Nineteen are paid by salaries running from $50 up to $400.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why do you have the two systems ?

Mr. OLIVER. Because in some places the Indians are so scattered that the salary is not justifiable.

Indians, New Brunswick—salaries, $1,056.

Mr. CROCKET. How many Indian agents are there in New Brunswick and what are their salaries ?

Mr. OLIVER. There are two, W. D. Carter, who gets $500, and James Farley who gets $600.

Medical attendance and medicines, $2,625.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. 'Medical attendance and medicines' seem to be about 50 per cent more than the relief and seed grain vote. If you gave less medicines and more seed grain do you not think it would be better for them ?

Mr. OLIVER. I will bring what has been said to the attention of the officers of the department ; there may be justification for it.

Indians, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and the Northwest Territories—annuities, $146,405.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I have noticed that for some years past there has been a decrease in the annuities but this year there is a considerable increase. Is it owing to the increase of the Indian population or what is the basis on which annuities are paid ?

Mr. OLIVER. The note I have on that point is that the increase is accounted for by the fact that a large number of Indians only come for payment every second year, and next year, during the coming summer, these are expected to be present, That is those who were absent last year are expected to be present this coming summer.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Will the minister inform us the amount of the similar vote last year and the year before ?

Mr. OLIVER. For the current year the vote was $141,265, that is about $5,000 less than the vote asked for the coming year. The vote for the preceding year was $143,000 odd, slightly more than that.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Are any of these agencies in the west and Manitoba self-sustaining ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am informed that the agency of Qu'Appelle and Five Hills is self sustaining.

Implements, tools, &c., $8.307.

Mr. BARR. That is a large increase ? How are those tools, &c., purchased, by tender ?

Mr. OLIVER. This increase is principally accounted for by a request for a threshing outfit for the Saddle lake agency, and more implements and tools for Indian Station No. 8. This increased demand is owing to about 300 acres more land prepared for crop last year.

Indians, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and Northwest Territories—seeds, field and garden $1,689.

Mr. BLAIN. How does it come that the government has to supply seeds for the Indians every year ? Are we to understand that the Indians use their whole crop to live upon, or is this to supply Indian farmers who are just commencing seeding?

Mr. OLIVER. The Indians on the reserves supply the bulk of their own field seeds—wheat, barley and oats. Of course, there are reserves here and there that require these seeds. Then garden seeds are supplied year after year from outside, as the Indians do not grow their own.

Live stock, $20,867.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Does the agent of the department purchase this live stock or is there any special officer to perform this service?

Mr. OLIVER. The live stock is purchased by Inspector Markle for Alberta and by Inspector Graham for Saskatchewan.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I understood the Minister of the Interior to state last session that it was the intention of the department in the future, as far as possible, to purchase stock at the cattle sales held at Calgary, and, I presume, at some other points. Can he state how many cattle were purchased last year at these sales?

Mr. OLIVER. A large number of the purchases made at the sales were of thoroughbred bulls. We bought the maority of these animals at the Calgary sale last year. There was no such sale last year at Regina, but there will be one this year. We hope to buy what thoroughbreds we require for the Alberta agencies at the Calgary sale and those for the Saskatchewan agencies at the Regina sales. In Manitoba the small number required will be purchased locally to the best advantage.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. A number have been purchased in Manitoba for Alberta and shipped westward. If the majority of this stock has been purchased at the cattle sales at Calgary, there must have been a great quantity of stock purchased. I find in the Auditor General's Report many names given as those having sold thoroughbreds to the department, for instance Mr. Head sold $1,400 worth; Mr. P. M. Brett $300, and Mr. Talbot, formerly a member of this House, sold 28 head. Mr. Head, as the hon. minister knows, was the Liberal candidate in the last election in the province of Manitoba. And I know that his sales were sent to the west. I also know that, while he has been a little more modest in his price this year, only getting in the neighbourhood of $100, his price last year was $125 for each thoroughbred, whereas he purchased them for $40 to $50. Mr. Paul Brett is an immigration agent for this goverment. The hon. minister knows him well. He took a prominent part in the recent provincial elections and has always done the same in Dominion elections. When I see such names it makes me suspicious that the inspector has been directed to purchase from friends of the government. I think the minister stated last year that the purchases of thoroughbreds up to that time would be sufficient to stock these reserves for the future. But there have been very large purchases since then. What is the reason for these purchases going on year after year? Do the Indians destroy these animals? Do they kill them for beef ? The annual expenditure on this account seems to be tremendous. But if purchases are to be made the minister should send his agents to well known breeders and purchase from them direct, thus saving the profits of the middleman. Mr. Head is not a breeder of stock, but only a cattle buyer.

Mr. OLIVER. The Auditor General's Report to which the hon. gentleman (Mr. W. J. Roche) has referred deals with the year ending June 30, 1905. I was dealing with the current year, which ends June 30 next, and the estimates which are now before us are for the nine months ending March 31, 1907. I am not able to give the actual figures of thoroughbreds purchased last year, but I believe we purchased 72 or 75 head, of which the larger number were purchased at the Calgary sale. Other purchases had been made before the Calgary sale, and, I fancy, before I made the statement to the House to which the hon. gentleman has referred. I may say that in-

structions have been issued, and I presume will be acted upon, that thoroughbreds required for agencies in Alberta shall be purchased at Calgary and those for agencies in Saskatchewan at the Regina sale. We believe that this will be the most satisfactory method both from a financial standpoint and from the standpoint of quality. It will also obviate such criticism as to that which my hon. friend (Mr. W. J. Roche) has, very fairly, I suppose, expressed. Of course, it may be that the sales will not turn out to be adequate for the purpose, in which case we should have to supplement our purchases there with purchases from private individuals. But if we can secure the animals at the sales, that will be done.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I see that the department has a maximum price which they instruct their inspectors not to exceed. Can the minister tell us what that maximum price was?

Mr. OLIVER. The maximum price was $125, but the inspector was allowed some latitude at the Calgary sale. He was allowed to go a little higher than that, but I am informed that the average price paid was considerably below that.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The hon. Minister of the Interior spoke about Inspector Markle being authorized to purchase these animals. What agencies has Inspector Markle jurisdiction over ?

Mr. OLIVER. The agencies included in treaty No. 7. That would be from Edmonton south. They are nearly all the reserves in Alberta—the Blood, Piegan, Blackfeet, Sarcees, Stony, Hobbema, Battle River, White Lake, Stony Plain and Alexandria.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. minister has referred to the purchase of bulls for the Indians in the Northwest Territories. I notice by the agricultural and industrial statistics that there are 304 bulls in the Northwest Territories. It seems that they are pretty well supplied with bulls up there. Then, I find that there are of stallions and geldings 2,853. Considering the amount of stock they have I cannot see the necessity of making any further purchases. Perhaps the hon. minister can explain the necessity of purchasing more bulls when we have such an enormous quantity as that.

Mr. OLIVER. I think perhaps the debate has taken a technical turn that scarcely will be suitable for the pages of 'Hansard.' But as my hon. friend persists, of course, I will have to give the explanation he calls for.

Mr. INGRAM. Well, I do not wish to persist, but if the hon. gentleman is bound to give the information, why then, I suppose it is in his power to do it. The statistics are here at all events, and it does strike me that the statement the hon. minister has made as to the necessity of purchasing that class of stock calls for some explanation. I would ask him why we are purchasing stock that is really not required. There surely should be some reasonable excuse for adding to this enormous number of animals which I find recorded in these statistics. The list of these animals is as follows : Stallions and geldings, 2,853 ; mares, 8,151 ; colts, fillies and foals, 1,578 ; bulls, 304 ; oxen, work, 698 ; steers, 2,667 ; milch cows, 8,800 ; young stock, 12,774 ; sheep, 361 ; lambs, 101 ; boars, breeding, 6. There is the total of the stock of these classes on the agencies included in treaties No. 4, No. 6 and No. 7, comprising 19 places in the Northwest Territories. Would the hon. minister explain this ? I do not think it will damage 'Hansard' very badly to give these figures, but if the hon. minister thinks that 'Hansard' will be damaged then they need not include them in this report.

Mr. OLIVER. Does the hon. member ask the explanation as to why there is so much stock required ?

Mr. INGRAM. Not at all. The hon. minister, in the discussion this evening, mentioned the necessity of purchasing more bulls. I pointed out to the hon. gentleman that they have already about 304. Why the necessity of purchasing more when you have now that amount of stock ? The proportion is out of all keeping.

Mr. OLIVER. I can only say, that, without becoming too technical in my explanation ; according to the best information I can get from the officers of the department, these additional purchases are necessary. At any rate that is a matter which might very well be discussed on the technical side of it elsewhere than here and a decision could be reached that would probably be satisfactory. In regard to this matter of stock on the Indian reserves it is a well known fact that it is by means of stock raising that the Indians will come most nearly to being self-supporting and therefore it is wise economy on the part of the department to deal liberally with the Indians not only in regard to the quantity, but also in regard to the quality of the stock supplied to them. If they have erred on the side of being over-liberal, I am sure the House will excuse the error, recognizing the desirability of putting the Indians as rapidly as possiblee in a position to be self-supporting.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. At page J—44 of the Auditor General's Report I find that the department purchased 222 two year old heifers at $30 apiece. These were purchased from a gentleman in Ottawa. Is it necessary to come all the way down here to purchase heifers ? Are there not sufficient

raised in the three provinces of the west to supply the demand ? These are for the Sarcee agency. They were purchased from Mr. E. Devlin. Is that the gentleman who is known as Senator Devlin in the city here, and was that $30 the f.o.b. price here ? Were they purchased in the province of Ontario and were they shipped to the west ?

Mr. OLIVER. That was for delivery on the reserve.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. That is the price for delivery on the reserve ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Well, I could refer you, if I had a few minutes, to purchases that were made in the west at a similar figure and 1,500 miles nearer the reserve.

Mr. HERRON. I would like to draw the attention of the hon. minister to a few items in reference to the delivery of cattle in the Northwest Territories. Would the hon. minister tell us if the government have any system of inspection of these cattle on delivery at the different agencies in Alberta or in the west ? I drew the attention of the hon. minister last year when this estimate was going through to the fact that $27 or $28 was too high a price to ask for these cattle. These are two year old heifers. There were 500 or 600 head of these cattle delivered at the Piegan agency near where I live this year. I suppose that I could have found out if I had asked for an Order of the House what price was paid for them, but I have been told on good authority that the price paid was $28 a head. This system has been going on for a number of years in that part of the country and I can assure the hon. minister that they are paying $28 a head for cattle that are not worth $15. They are not worth $12. The cattle delivered in this instance at McLeod would not have sold for $12 per head at auction in that country. I do not understand why the government do not call for tenders and get stock that is raised in the country. They could get a better class of stock for about $18 or $19 per head. I refer to cattle of this age, good acclimatized cattle which are worth a great deal more to the Indians than they are to any other class of people in the west because they do not take as good care of the cattle as others do. The cattle supplied from Manitoba and Ontario are not the best class to turn over to the Indians. The officials of the department will tell the minister that there are large losses among these cattle, and that even this winter 25 per cent of the animals delivered last summer were dead months ago. The cattle were not worth one-half the price paid for them. I do not understand why the government should not call for tenders and get the best animals that are going in the country. It is true that this is a good system to encourage the Indians to be self-sustaining, but as the system is now administered it is bound to be a failure in that regard. Does the minister know who received the cattle when they arrived in that country. I can vouch for it that the cattle were landed at the railway station and turned loose, and there was no one to receive them except a few Indians who knew nothing about their value or how they were to be delivered.

Mr. OLIVER. I am very much surprised to hear the definite statement made by the hon. gentleman that the cattle were so far below in value the price paid for them, and also that an officer of the department was not present when the cattle arrived. It was the duty of the agent to receive the cattle and not only to report to the department if they were not approximately of the value paid, but to refuse to accept them. I will have the matter at once inquired into, and I will be able to state at an early date what action has been taken in regard to that shipment. It has been brought to the attention of the department that for the reasons stated by the hon. member (Mr. Herron) it was desirable to make the purchases in the west. In the past these cattle were purchased in the east probably because many of the ranchers in the west also purchased in the east and brought out carloads of young stock. Conditions have somewhat changed, and it is the desire of the department to keep pace with the change of conditions, so this year instructions have been issued to purchase on the western ranches a considerable proportion of the breeding stock required.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why were cattle purchased elsewhere when there are so many in the west.

Mr. OLIVER. In past years many of the ranch men found it profitable to purchase young stock in eastern Canada. In the past there were difficulties in breeding stock on a large scale on the ranches, but the herds have now become smaller and the owners are able to give better attention to breeding of young stock and it has come to be recognized as part of the cattle industry. There is now available in the west a supply of young stock which was not available a few years ago.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The minister stated that the maximum price paid for thoroughbred bulls was $125.

Mr. OLIVER. That is the maximum fixed by the department but the officer was allowed some latitude in the purchases at the Calgary sale.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Do you pay as much for Shorthorns as you do for Herefords ?

Mr. OLIVER. The Shorthorn is the most expensive, for some of the other breeds we only pay as high as $100.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The minister is correct in saying that the Shorthorns are the most expensive. and so far as I can glean from the Auditor General's Report the max-

imum price paid for Shorthorns was $125. But I notice from the Auditor General's Report (J—45) that the department has purchased from Mr. J. A. Chapman of Beresford, Man., quite a number of Herefords for which they paid $136 each. That is only a sample, because the same gentleman's name appears in different parts of the Auditor General's Report. Although the Shorthorns are the most expensive and only cost $125, the department paid this gentleman $136 for Herefords.

Mr. OLIVER. I am unable at the moment to give an explanation of the matter, as it occurred before I was in the department.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are these cattle purchased under a written contract and what supervision is exercised to ensure that adequate value shall be received ? The present system seems to be a little lax, but of course the minister has only been in the department a short time. I think this matter may very well be made the subject of fuller explanation before we get through with this item.

Mr. OLIVER. Orders were given that part of the thoroughbred stock last year, and the whole of the thoroughbred stock this year for Alberta and Saskatchewan shall be purchased at the thoroughbred stock sales at Calgary and Regina. When the animals are put up every opportunity is given to inspect them and they are sold to the highest bidder. Our inspector for the province, there, responsible in his official position and in the knowledge which he is supposed to possess, is expected to use his best judgment in getting the best animals he can within the maximum price. We think that where these thoroughbred stock sales are being held, if they are a success, they offer the best means at the hand of the department for the purchase of that class of stock.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why do you persist in buying such an enormous proportion of bulls ?

Mr. OLIVER. That is a very technical question. I can only reply that we do not understand that we are purchasing an enormous proportion. As a matter of fact, that particular class of stock is only considered to be at its best value for two seasons, and the supply requires to be continually renewed.

Mr. LALOR. How are the provisions purchased—by public tender ?

Mr. OLIVER. Tenders are called for by public advertisement, and the supplies are taken from those giving the lowest tender, according to sample.

Some resolutions reported.

ARRIVAL OF PRINCE ARTHUR OF CONNAUGHT.

Hon. WM. PATERSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Mr. Speaker, I feel sure that all the members of this House are delighted to learn this evening that Prince Arthur of Connaught has reached the western shores of our Dominion. Returning from an imperial mission to the empire of Japan, which is allied to us by treaty, he has been graciously permitted to visit this country. He will find here a people proud of the extent and resources of the Dominion, and inspired with a firm determination to develop those resources to the utmost ; a people inspired also with very high hopes of the position and the influence to which this country will attain as one of the great sister nations of the empire. He will receive a loyal and hearty welcome from the citizens of Canada, and when he leaves our shores he will bear away with him a sincere tribute of respect and affection to His Gracious Majesty, who has done so much since he ascended the throne to inspire sentiments of devotion in the hearts of all the citizens of this country, and indeed in all the citizens of this great empire to which we in Canada are proud to own allegiance. I thought it proper on this occasion to say these few words expressive of the welcome which I am sure the parliament of Canada, in common with all the citizens of this country, are glad to extend to Prince Arthur of Connaught upon his arrival on our shores.

Mr. PATERSON. I had not heard the welcome announcement that has been made by the hon. leader of the opposition, but I am very pleased to know that Prince Arthur of Connaught has reached Canada. I could not better express my sentiments at this time than to say that I fully concur, as I am sure every hon. member of the House does, in the words that have been uttered by the hon. leader of the opposition.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I ask whether the government intend to take any government business to-morrow in case we should get through with the business in the hands of private members ?

Mr. PATERSON. I hope that the Prime Minister will be present to-morrow. I do not feel able to speak as to that, but if it is the desire of the House that we should go on, I presume that we shall be ready to proceed with the estimates of the Indian Department, and I believe that the Minister of Justice is ready with those for penitentiaries, and the Minister of Inland Re-

venue is ready with those of his department.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, March 28, 1906.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

ROYAL ASSENT.

A message was delivered by the Gentleman Usher of the Black Rod as follows :

Mr. Speaker, His Honour the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of this honourable House in the chamber of the honourable the Senate.

Accordingly the House went up to the Senate.

And having returned.

Mr. Speaker informed the House that His Honour the Deputy of the Governor General had been pleased to give, in His Majesty's name, the Royal Assent to the following Bill :

An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the financial year ending the 30th June, 1906.

MONTREAL, OTTAWA AND GEORGIAN BAY CANAL COMPANY.

Hon. N. A. BELCOURT moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 57) respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Explain.

Mr. BELCOURT. The Bill is for an Act to amend the present charter of the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company and to extend the authorized capitalization and issue of bonds with the view of going on with the work if the government should decide not to do the work itself.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. H. GUTHRIE (for Mr. L. G. McCarthy) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 58) respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.

Mr. BERGERON. Explain.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I only introduce the Bill in behalf of the hon. member for North Simcoe. It was only handed to me this minute and I have not had an opportunity of reading it. We will have to let it speak for itself.

Mr. FOSTER. Let it stand.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 59) to incorporate the Woman's Art Association of Canada—Mr. Grant by Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 60) to incorporate the Inter-Ocean Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Bole by Mr. Jackson.

Bill (No. 61) to incorporate the Grand Trunk Pacific Telegraph Company.—Mr. McCarthy by Mr. Guthrie.

RAILWAY ACT, 1903, AMENDMENT.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 62) to amend the Railway Act, 1903. He said: A number of the amendments are designed to correct some little difficulties in the administration of the Railway Act ; they are intended to amplify and enlarge the provisions of the Railway Act with respect to the administration of the railways and also as to the working of the Railway Commission. Probably the most important sections of the Bill are those which deal with telephone companies, and they are intended to correct what must be recognized as abuses in connection with the operation of telephones in this country. The provisions of the Bill are not so radical as some people of this country would like, but I think it will be admitted that every change is not an advancement, and the whole question relating to the administration of telephones is so complex and involves so many interests that any startling changes might require to be adjusted again and again before a common platform would have been reached. The provisions of the Bill guard the public interest without in any way being revolutionary in their character in reference to their telephone organization. The Bill provides for the protection of patrons of telephone companies; the public interests are recognized and I trust that all other interests will be found to have been conserved. The first clause of the Bill provides with respect to appeals. Subsection 3 of section 44 now reads:

An appeal shall lie from the board to the Supreme Court of Canada upon a question of jurisdiction, but such an application shall not lie unless the same is allowed by a judge of the said court upon applications and hearing the parties and the board, &c.

The amendment as proposed will make the latter part of the sentence read:

Unless the same is allowed by a judge of the same court upon application and notice to the

parties and the board, and hearing such of them as appear and desire to be heard, &c.

This amendment is suggested on account of an opinion expressed by Mr. Justice Sedgewick upon an application for leave to appeal, that there was considerable doubt as to his power to make an order allowing an appeal unless the board itself was actually represented before him on the application. Subsection 2 of the Act relates to the acceptance of evidence, and under it, unless the board were sitting at a particular time in a certain locality, parties who make application to the board would have to bring their witnesses at great expense and trouble to Ottawa. It is proposed by this amendment to enable the board to accept affidavits and declarations. This refers more particularly to such questions as railway crossings of public highways and matters of that description in which the general public are interested. The section provides for this easy method of applicants getting their case before the court. The third section repeals section 91 and makes provision as follows:

Dividends, at and after the rate of so much per share upon the several shares held by the shareholders in the stock of the company, may, from time to time, be declared and paid by directors out of the net profits of the undertaking.

This is simply to make it possible for directors to declare dividends. Under the law as it has stood in Canada for many years, railway companies could only declare dividends with the sanction of their shareholders; but this has been entirely disregarded. It is proposed to eliminate that condition. The fourth section deals with section 122 of the Railway Act, which provides for a company filing with the Department of Railways and Canals a route map containing such information as will enable the Minister of Railways to deal intelligently with the question of location. As a matter of fact, the provisions of the Act have been practically ignored. Within a few months the department at my suggestion did inaugurate an entirely different system, and framed regulations which governed in all applications to have route maps approved of. There has been some doubt as to the jurisdiction of the Minister of Railways in regard to this action. If section 122 means what it seems to mean by a fair reading and interpretation of it, every railway company, before it could get a route map approved of, would necessarily require to have location surveys. We all know that in actual practice the kind of maps that have been filed with the department on such applications are simply tracings across ordinary maps in many instances, and certainly without any preliminary surveys. This is to remedy that difficulty. Subsection 1 of section 123 is proposed to be repealed and the following substituted:

Such plan, profile and book of reference shall be submitted to the board who, if satisfied therewith, may sanction the same, and by such sanction shall be deemed to have approved merely the location of the railway and the grades and curves thereof, as shown in such plan, profile and book of reference, but not to have relieved the company from otherwise complying with this Act. In granting any such sanction the board shall be bound by the general location as approved by the minister, provided that the board may, unless the minister otherwise specifically directs, sanction a deviation of not more than one mile from any one point on the said general location so approved.

That is to say, section 123 gave the board certain powers. There was a question as between the location map that had been approved of by the department and the proposed deviation. In many instances an approved route had been deviated to the extent of twelve, fifteen, and I think I have heard instances of as much as thirty miles. It is proposed to remedy that by providing that before the board can take any such action there must be practically a conference between the minister and the board with respect to the application. Subsection 1 of section 139 makes provision with respect to the taking of land. That section is repealed, and greater powers are given to railways to take such lands as may be necessary in the safe operation of their railway in the public interest. It is proposed to add the following as a subsection to section 139:

The board may, upon consent in writing having been first obtained from the minister in that behalf, repeal, rescind, change or vary any certificate of the minister made under section 109 of the Railway Act, chapter 29 of the statutes of 1888.

It will be recalled that a certain certificate is required to be furnished by the company to the railway board. The question as to whether the minister, having once exercised jurisdiction, could amend this certificate. This remedies that difficulty. Section 171 is also amended in the same direction. Section 8 provides for the creation, development, enlargement or changing of any water power or any electrical or power development by means of water. It gives full powers to the board in that regard.

Subsection 2 of section 212 of the Act of 1903 is repealed and a subsection substituted which reads as follows:

The board shall endeavour to provide for uniformity in the construction of the rolling stock to be used upon the railway and for a uniformity of rules for the operation and running of trains, and may make regulations designating the number of men to be employed upon trains, or providing that coal shall be used on all locomotives instead of wood in any district, and generally with respect to the running and operation of trains by the company for the protection of property, and the protection, safety,

accommodation and comfort of the public and the employees of the company.

The provision in the Act relating to this subject is found to be somewhat limited and this gives larger powers and has greater regard for the safety of the general public.

Section 10 repeals section 235 of the Railway Act of 1903 and substitutes the following:

Every company shall, as soon as possible, and immediately after the head officers of the company have received information of the occurrence upon the railway belonging to such company, of any accident attended with personal injury to any person using the railway, or to any employee of the company or whereby any bridge, culvert, viaduct or tunnel, on or of the railway has been broken or so damaged as to be impassable or unfit for immediate use, give notice thereof, with full particulars, to the board; and every company which wilfully and negligently omits to give such notice shall forfeit to His Majesty the sum of $200 for every day during which the omission to give the same continues.

At present accidents may occur involving loss of life and destruction of property and inconvenience to the public, and no notice is required to be given the Board of Railway Commissioners. It is true the provisions of the Act of 1903 do require that certain returns shall be made to the Department of Railways and Canals with respect to accidents, but this would throw the responsibility upon the company operating the road of furnishing to the railroad board a return giving all particulars.

Section 11 relates to the movement of trains. Section 12 repeals subsection 4 of section 303 of the present Act and substitutes the following:

The minister may, from time to time, change or vary the forms in the said schedule one contained, or may substitute other forms in lieu thereof, and, upon any such change, variation or substitution being so made, the company shall in the manner above provided, prepare, make and forward returns accordingly; the company shall also, at all times, give such information to the minister as the minister may from time to time require for statistical purposes.

Under the present law the requirements regarding statistical returns are very meagre indeed and it is recognized by those familiar with the subject that the returns sent in are practically valueless for the purpose of comparison. The returns required in most of the states of the Union are very comprehensive, give the public full information and are recognized as satisfactory, whereas those furnished in Canada are considered very unsatisfactory.

Section 13 relates to telephones. It amends section 193 of the Railway Act respecting telephone connections with railway stations by adding the following subsection.

Notwithstanding anything in any Act heretofore passed, the board, in determining the terms or compensation upon which any such connection or communication, is to be provided for, shall not take into consideration any contract, lease or agreement, now or hereafter in force, by which the company has given or gives any exclusive or other privilege to any company or person, other than the applicant, with respect to any such station, or premises.

That has been a matter of serious complaint and some litigation, and it is hoped that the provisions of section 13 will remedy the abuses which have grown up.

Section 14 provides:

In this section and the following sections of this Act, unless the context otherwise requires, the expression 'company' means a company, within the meaning of the Railway Act, 1903, having authority to construct and operate or to operate a telephone system or line, and to charge telephone tolls, and includes also the telephone company and every company and person having legislative authority from the parliament of Canada to construct and operate or to operate a telephone system or line, and to charge telephone tolls; and the expression 'telephone toll,' means and includes any toll, rate or charge to be charged by the company to the public, or to any person, for the use of a telephone system or line or any part thereof, or for the transmission of a message by telephone, or for the installation and use of telephone instruments, lines or apparatus, or for any service incidental to a telephone business.

Mr. BERGERON. What is the proposed change?

Mr. EMMERSON. This section does not make any change. It is simply more comprehensive and intended to remedy the abuses which have been complained of.

Section 15 provides for the regulation of telephone tolls by the board.

Section 16 authorizes any province, municipality or body corporate which operates the telephone system, through the board, to connect its system with any telephone system subject to parliament for the purpose of direct communication, provided the standard of efficiency of the telephone systems is such that such communication can, in the opinion of the board, be satisfactorily obtained.

Provided that the standard of efficiency of the telephone systems is such that communication can, in the opinion of the board, be satisfactorily obtained.

Section 17 deals with the question of joint tariffs where two telephone systems are connected. Section 18 deals with the publication and posting of telephone tolls in the offices of the company. Section 19 deals with contracts between companies with respect to their telephone systems, and makes such contracts subject to the approval of the board.

The question, I admit, is a very large one. The operation of telephones is one of recent years, it is developing every day, and widens

out to the full scope of the interests affected by it. The public are very largely interested; and those also who are doing the work, whether municipalities or otherwise, have their own rights which must be respected. It seems to me that the provisions of this Bill will correct the abuses that are complained of, while at the same time the Bill does not go to the radical extreme which some favour. Though it may be necessary to go that far in time, the necessity has not yet been demonstrated to exist in the public interest.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (North Lanark). Without discussing the Bill in general, I would like to draw attention to two or three prominent points in it. The principal amendment relates to the form of procedure before the commission. There is another important amendment in reference to the approval of plans which are filed in the minister's office.

Before approving such map and location the minister may, subject to the Special Act, make such changes and alterations therein as he may deem expedient.

That is, the minister may virtually locate the line of the road.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The minister can only touch the line, as it is presented to him by the company, in so far as that line deviates from the line laid down in the Act of incorporation.

Mr. HAGGART. The two terminal points may be Toronto and Ottawa, the location of the line between these two places is left entirely in the power of the minister. The minister may make such location as he likes. He may say to the parties presenting the proposed line : A friend of mine represents a certain constituency, and he is very anxious to get the line located in such a place—and the minister may use his influence for the purpose of changing the location in the direction that his supporter desires. It is a power which should not be given to a minister. Once a line is adopted and approved by parliament, all the minister should have to do is to see that a map is filed showing the location of the road, in order that public interests may be preserved, and after that, it should be left to the company themselves to run where they find it most convenient.

Mr. EMMERSON. Let me explain to my hon. friend that this Bill does not change the law in that respect.

Mr. HAGGART. It does change the law in that respect. Clause 122 in the old Act says that the company should prepare a map showing the general location of the proposed line of railway.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is not touched at all.

Mr. HAGGART. Subsection 3 of the Bill reads :

Before approving such map and location, the minister may, subject to the Special Act, make such changes and alteration as he may deem expedient, and upon being satisfied therewith shall signify his approval upon the map and the duplicate thereof, and when so approved, the map and application shall be filed in the Department of Railways and Canals, and the duplicate thereof with the Board.

No change or alteration from the general location of the line of railway as approved by the minister shall be allowed unless such change or alteration has been first approved by the minister. This gives a more absolute power to the minister than does the old Act.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The only change there is to give to the minister power to approve of that new map in sections, instead of his being obliged to approve of it as a whole.

The minister, in approving any such map and location, may approve the whole or any portion thereof, and where he approves only a portion thereof, he shall signify his approval upon the map and the duplicate thereof accordingly.

The section remains as it is, with the exception of these words which are added.

Mr. HAGGART. Well, if that is all the amendment there is, it is not of much importance. Another part of the Bill relates to damages to be allowed by telephone companies in making connections with other telephone companies, and provides that the board shall have power of awarding damages. There can be no objection to that.

Mr. EMMERSON. I may add that doubts have arisen with respect to the approval of a portion of the line without approving of the whole of it.

Mr. HAGGART. The minister states that it gives power to the board to fix rates or tolls of telephone companies. This Act does not give them any such power.

Notwithstanding the provisions of any Act heretofore or hereafter passed by parliament, all telephone tolls to be charged by the company shall be subject to the approval of the board.

They have the right of regulating the tolls, subject to approval. Once a toll is adopted by the board they have no power whatever of changing it in any respect until there is an application made by the telephone company again for the approval of their tolls, and the board may refuse to approve of them.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Will the hon. gentleman read subsection 3 in that section, page 6.

Mr. HAGGART (reading).

Such telephone tariff may be dealt with by the board in the same manner as is provided by the Railway Act.

Well, I should think that the Railway Act does not go further than clause 15 of the new Bill. I think that full power for fixing tolls for telephones is provided in clause 15. However, when the Act is printed we will be better able to judge.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I should think the latter clause would probably be more effective if it stood without the first. As the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) has said, the first clause might limit the operation of the clause last referred to.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Of course we have to see to it that we give effect to our intentions. Our intention is, of course, to give to the Board of Railway Commissioners, such control over telephone rates and telephone charges as they now have over freight and passenger rates in reference to railways.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). I do not think the government is to be congratulated on the telephone amendment to the Railway Act. The country was led to believe last session, when the late Postmaster General asked this House to appoint a special committee to consider the telephone question, that a radical and important change was about to take place and that public ownership of the telephone service of this country was about to arrive. True, the declaration was not made in specific terms, but if ever a country was led to expect that a new departure was to be made, it was in connection with this very question of telephone ownership. Organs of hon. gentlemen opposite, all over the country, declared that this great reform was coming, that we were to have public ownership of telephones, and that the then Postmaster General was to be the apostle of the new movement and to introduce it in the House. He persuaded the House to grant a special committee which, at great expense, investigated the subject very fully. I happened to be a member of that committee, $17,000 and more was the cost of the committee, we examined any number of witnesses, collected information in all quarters, retained the services of experts and before the session was over the then Postmaster General was suddenly called to England. As a consequence, while that committee had collected a lot of evidence, it had not time to digest it and the idea was given out that at this present session the then Postmaster General would still be in his place, that the committee would be reorganized on much the same lines, and that all that evidence would be considered and the outcome in all likelihood would be public ownership of telephones. No step of that kind has been taken ; on the contrary that Postmaster General who posed before the country as the advocate of public ownership of telephones and also of telegraphs has disappeared from public life. and in his place has come a new Postmaster General. In the election of that new Postmaster General in North York some months ago the statement was made to the public that he would continue in the footsteps of his predecessor and the public were given to understand that legislation of a very important character in regard to telephones would be forthcoming at this session. True the public were somewhat surprised to see that the advocate of public ownership of telephones in this government was to have his place taken by a gentleman who had been the champion of the Bell Telephone Company before that very committee, that so ably investigated this question. But the public were told that no matter what the new Postmaster General had said before the committee in regard to telephones, he had said it purely as a lawyer, he was speaking for a corporation, and the doctrine was set up that a man in public life in this country, who appears before a committee of this House or in the courts may express opinions altogether different from his own opinions ; that he can be a double faced man, a Jekyll and Hyde, that he can profess to be in favour of public ownership as a public man and can go into the courts or before a committee and plead the case of a monopoly or a corporation. The new Postmaster General led the people of North York to believe that he would follow in the footsteps of his predecessor and we were told that we might look out for a new Paul, a Paul greater than the preceding Paul ; but instead of that we have a Saul who stoned the prophets, and stoned public ownership before that committee.

That hon. gentleman, as counsel for the Bell Telephone Company before the committee, said that public ownership was an unmitigated nuisance, an unmitigated cause of expense to the people, and he denounced it in every respect. He said parliament had no right—he, the present Postmaster General, before this committee, said that parliament had no right to regulate a corporation once it had created it. A change of heart has taken place to some extent ; he came before the committee and he said—I never heard so extravagant or drastic a proposition—that parliament, once it had called a corporation into existence, had no right to regulate it thereafter, that there was a contract between the two and that any attempt to regulate it was a violation of contract. He also laid down this doctrine that it was iniquitous for the public to claim any jurisdiction over telephone companies who occupied public highways in this country. He said the people of this country did not own their highways, the doctrine he set out was that in some way the Bell Telephone Company owned the highways of this country, and a great many other things were stated by him on this occasion.

Mr. SPEAKER. Might I call the attention of the House to the fact that it is not customary on the introduction of a Bill to debate it at any length. It is customary for the mover to give a general explanation, but it is not customary for a general discussion or debate to take place on it.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. While I admit that is the custom I am certainly within my right in criticising this new measure that has been introduced here to-day, and which we were told was to deal with this matter in a very wide way. Now, the hon. gentleman not only denounced public ownership but scoffed at it too. He denounced the independent telephone companies, he spoke of some farmers' telephone company that had the audacity to ask to have connection for its line with the Bell Telephone Company. There is a change of heart here to-day. Now we are to have a law that this connection is to be allowed; but that hon. gentleman when he appeared before this committee as counsel for the Bell Telephone Company, denounced this idea of independent telephone companies, indicated that they had no rights whatever, and that we, as a committee, were trying to take away the rights, to take away, as he put it, the gold of the Bell Telephone Company. Now then we are to have, as this measure shows to-day, certain amendments in the law. We are to have the grievance that I presented year after year to this House, the grievance that was derided and scoffed at, redressed. At last it has been admitted that the great railways of this country did an injustice to the independent telephone lines when they refused them access to their stations. That point has been conceded at last, but it has only been conceded after that the Bell Telephone Company has strengthened its monopoly all over the country. Another thing for which I fought before that committee and on which we collected any amount of testimony was that all telephone companies should be compelled to give an interchange of business. We have got that to-day, but after a very hard struggle. Another thing is given us; we are told that there was to be a regulation of the rates. That may or may not be secured, I have not had a chance yet of reading the Bill, but the great grievance has not been remedied, that is that no provision is made for what the late Postmaster General thought was the most important matter of all, namely for the establishment of trunk telephone lines all over this country which would convey the messages of all the independent lines. We were told and led to believe that at least the government would nationalize these trunk lines, but instead of that everything in this Bill here to-day has one object in view, to leave the trunk lines of this country in the ownership and possession of the Bell Telephone Company, the public to have the use of them on the terms of the Bell Telephone Company.

That is the grievance that remains. It is not removed at all; on the contrary it is aggravated and now, to-day, in this House, for the entrenchment of the Bell Telephone Co., a Bill has been introduced increasing the capital stock of that company to $50,000,000. I believe it can be shown that the capital of the Bell Telephone Co. is largely made up of water, and that notwithstanding an effort which was made to cover it up in the committee, the controlling majority of that stock is owned by the great Mackay Cable and Telegraph merger which has its headquarters in the city of New York and all they are doing is to strengthen the Bell Telephone monopoly in Canada and give it a position that will enable it to control and regulate the smaller companies. It was known to the public that the late Postmaster General even went so far as to enter into negotiations with the view not only of nationalizing telephones but telegraphs as well in this country. I believe that both of these things ought to be done to-day in the interests of the people. I believe in the public ownership of telegraphs and telephones and I know that the late Postmaster General was a warm advocate of both of these principles. Let me mention one important feature in connection with public ownership of telephones and telegraphs in this country. A Bill was introduced to-day to give the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company power to go into the telegraph business. What is the result of allowing railway companies to do telegraph business in connection with their railways—it is that they control the news service of Canada to-day. Not only do they control the traffic of the country but they control the telegraph messages of the country. The Canadian Pacific Railway, by reason of its powers in regard to the telegraph business, is the censor of the newspapers of the country. All the news going to the papers in the west has to pass the censorship of the Canadian Pacific Railway. What are called the associated press reports of this country to-day pass through the Canadian Pacific Railway and you cannot get a definition from them as to what contract they have with the newspapers. The other day a most serious accident happened on the Canadian Pacific Railway between here and Port Arthur. No account of it whatever was given to the public.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. May I ask, Mr. Speaker, is it usual to discuss the question of public ownership on the introduction of a Bill of this kind?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The principle is involved in the Bill and a promise was given——

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I rise to a question of order, Mr. Speaker. It is time we had an end to this sort of thing.

Mr. SPEAKER. The practice is not to enter into a general debate upon the introduction of a Bill. There is no absolute rule on the question, but that is the practice.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I still say that I am within my rights and for a few moments I propose to continue. I want to show the relationship between the telephone and telegraph business and the public interest and to show that the late Postmaster General was moving along lines in direction of public ownership. He committed the country to the adoption of the principle of public ownership in regard to the cables. I can bring that subject in.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Agricultural societies might come in, perhaps.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Aylesworth) does not like this. He does not believe in public ownership in connection with telephones. Let me read what public ownership has done for telegraphs and telephones. In the current number of 'Everybody's Magazine' there is an article about public telephones in Switzerland:

> This same government operates all the telephones in Switzerland—for the convenience and benefit of the people. The charge for a telephone in Switzerland is $8 a year, and one cent for each call within the city or district in which you live. For long distance telephoning the charges are from three cents to fifteen cents according to distance, fifteen being the highest charge.

From Toronto to Montreal the charge is $1.25.

> For fifteen cents you can telephone from Schuls in the east to Neuchatel in the west, 175 miles of line. From Brooklyn to New York you pay fifteen cents, for the like distance in Switzerland you would pay three cents. Telephones are very common in Switzerland. The service is as remarkable for its smooth excellence as for its cheapness.

The present hon. Postmaster General said that he found public ownership of telephones in England a nuisance, but the Postmaster General of England to-day is introducing the telephone system there. Now let us come to the telegraph system of Switzerland. This article says:

> This government also operates the telegraph system—for the public benefit—maintaining what is said to be the best telegraph service in the world. In proportion to the population, Switzerland has more miles of line, and I think, more offices than any other country. You can send a telegram anywhere in Switzerland for six cents and half a cent a word. Thus a message of ten words costs eleven cents. You can put postage stamps on a telegram and drop them into a post office or letter box and you do not have to think of it again; it will be forwarded promptly.

In Switzerland, where they have public ownership of telephones and telegraphs, in Norway and Sweden, where they have the same, and in all the countries in Europe the cost of telephoning is one quarter of what it is in this country. This legislation which is being introduced to-day, instead of placing this great convenience within reach of the people at the smallest cost, is all in the direction of making a monopoly of it in the interest of the Bell Telephone Company. So, I say that this measure which has been introduced here to-day is not in the public interest. It is almost altogether in the interest of the Bell Telephone Co., and what we are going to do is to give them a monopoly of the long distance telephone business. We intend, apparently, to give them power to water or increase their stock to $50,000,000 and the people of the country, instead of getting a telephone service at cost price—and they ought to get it at cost price as they do in other countries—will be obliged to pay the price which this monopoly demands. Surely the Globe newspaper and papers of that character speak more or less for the Liberal party. We were told by them that we were on the eve of the public ownership of telegraphs and telephones, but instead of that the Postmaster General who was friendly to public ownership leaves the cabinet and his place is taken by the then counsel of the Bell Telephone Co. On top of it comes this legislation, which, while it goes a short distance, does not go to the length it ought to go, does not go in the direction of public ownership, but it does go in the direction of strengthening the Bell Telephone Co. In addition to this we are to-day creating another monopoly in regard to telegraphs in connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. Everything is being done by this government and by this parliament to strengthen the hands of these monopolies. The Prime Minister said that this was the country of the twentieth century. If it is the country of the twentieth century. tury why do we not have twentieth century principles applied to our problems? Why have we not public ownership of telegraphs and telephones? Can the Postmaster General stand up in his place and by figures, by statistics, by any evidence whatsoever, show that public ownership is against the public interest? I defy him to do it. On the contrary I ask him to justify what is being introduced here to-day as carrying out the pledge he gave to the people of North York that he intended to follow in the footsteps of the late Postmaster General. When we go into this in detail and after I have had a chance of examining the Bill I will have something further to say, and while I may be somewhat violating what Mr. Speaker has said has been the custom of the House I think I am perfectly justified and especially am I justified in going the length that I have gone when there has been such a departure from

the promises that were made to this House. The hon. Minister of Justice had a good deal to say about my remarks to-day. He still likes to be the champion of vested interests as he calls them. Let him be the champion of the vested interests of corporations. The public have vested interests and they are entitled to what the President of the United States the other day spoke of as at least a fair deal and to a fair chance for their money. They are not getting it. This parliament seems to be occupied with measures for the entrenchment of corporations at the expense of the people. There is no work being done in the way of emancipating the people, but everything is being done to increase the privileges and monopolies of corporations. It may suit the Minister of Justice still to continue that line of argument and always be ready to take the part of vested rights of corporations, but there are some left yet in this country and in this House who will take the part of the public rights whenever they are assailed.

If there is anything worth maintaining to-day in Canada, whether in provincial or Dominion politics, it is public rights; because public rights are being assailed in all directions by great corporations, and the regrettable thing is that those who are in power appear to be the allies of all these corporations in the assaults they are making upon public rights.

Mr. INGRAM. Last session of parliament the attention of the Minister of Railways was called to the fact that the Railway Act made no provision to compel the railway commissioners to furnish a report to parliament. It is very important that the report should be furnished by the railway commissioners, but nevertheless an amendment to that effect seems to be omitted from this Bill.

Mr. EMMERSON. There will be other amendments; some have been suggested to me even to-day, and of course there will be an opportunity for discussing them in the committee.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). The suggestion of the hon. member (Mr. Ingram) should receive the attention of the government. If we have a report each year from the Railway Commission, we may in that way receive suggestions from time to time as to improvements in the Act. The Canadian Railway Act is a remarkably comprehensive enactment. I suppose the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada is in many respects the most important of our judicial bodies; it more closely touches the rights of the people than any other court in Canada; it has not only judicial powers but it has administrative powers; and the suggestion made by my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) should certainly be acted upon. A moment ago I suggested to the Minister of Justice that I thought there might be some doubt as to whether the clause referred to by my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart) went as far as the Minister of Justice thought. I had not then read the clause, and I would not now be inclined to persevere in the suggestion which I made as to its effect. The clause as a whole, seems to go about as far as language could be expected to go for the purpose. There seems to me to be quite as much reason for the regulation of telephones as for the regulation of railways, and perhaps more reason. If the Bill does not go as far in the direction of regulating and controlling telephones as the Act already goes in the direction of controlling and directing railways, then I would support and indeed introduce any amendment necessary to that purpose. The government has not yet seen fit to embark upon the principle of public ownership. It was thought by those who observed the attitude of the late Postmaster General that it was in that direction he was tending when he moved for this committee. The scope of the investigation before that committee seemed to indicate that. Apparently the views of the Postmaster General did not commend themselves to the rest of his colleagues, and we do not know how far that particular question may have had to do with the retirement of that hon. gentleman. But, if the government are not prepared to go any further in the direction of public ownership, then the only alternative is the most effective control that can be devised by statute with respect to what is in most cases a monopoly. A monopoly should either be operated by the government in the interests of the people—there are arguments for and against that policy which I will not discuss now—or else, the government should create the most efficient control of it that can possibly be devised. I trust that when we come to examine this Bill we shall find that it gives every possible control over the operation and regulation, and especially over the tolls of telephone companies, including compulsory interchange connection between the great telephone companies and the smaller companies whose usefulness is greatly impaired by their being debarred from direct communication with the great trunk lines.

Mr. R. BLAIN (Peel). This would be an opportune time to suggest for the consideration of the government, that it is in the public interest, that the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada should be given the same control over freight and passenger rates on the Intercolonial as they are given over the rates on other railways. We have discussed that question for the last three or four years, and we have been generally met with the statement that the Railway Act had not yet an opportunity of being tested. Now that the government has decided to make certain amendments, it

seems an opportune time for them to provide that the Railway Commission should have absolute control over the freight and passenger rate of the Intercolonial Railway.

Hon. CHAS. FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). I expect to suggest other amendments to the Minister of Railways at an early date, and I think I may say it is the intention of the government to insert a provision that the railway commissioners shall make an annual report to parliament. It is proper that we should have such a report, and it apparently was in contemplation when the Act was passed. I quite agree with the leader of the opposition with respect to the importance of the Railway Commission. It undoubtedly is one of the most important tribunals we have in this country; not only that, but I think I am safe in saying that it is the greatest step in advance that has been taken in any country in the world with respect to control over railways, short of public ownership. In that connection I would draw the attention of the member for York (Mr. Maclean) to what has been said by the hon. gentleman from Peel (Mr. Blain) with respect to public ownership ; he does not want public ownership to the extent that my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) wants it ; he sees what has occurred on the Intercolonial Railway. I do not say that I am very far apart from him, I cannot commit myself beyond that, but in the judgment of that hon. gentleman we should have control of the freight and passenger rates on the Intercolonial Railway. To my hon. friend from York (Mr. Maclean) I would say that one swallow does not make a summer, even in the House of Commons.

As to the telephone clauses in this Bill, they go as far as it is possible to go in the direction of consecrating the principle of private ownership with effective government control. The intention of one of these amendments is to meet the difficulty that was suggested with respect to the Port Arthur case. Hereafter when a telephone company applies for leave to enter a railway station it will not be in the power of the commissioners—when they are determining the condition on which that telephone system shall have the right to enter the railway station—to take into account the exclusive contracts which the railway company may have with the telephone company already in possession.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is the provision retroactive in this sense, that it applies to contracts already made ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. To all contracts in existence at the present time.

Mr. BERGERON. Last year it was stated before the telephone company that all these contracts had been abrogated by the last Railway Act.

Mr. BLAIN.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If there are no contracts in existence, no harm is done. If there are contracts in existence, this will provide a remedy for the difficulty that arose in the Port Arthur case. Then, the government intend to provide for the complete and effective control of telephone rates, as complete and effective as we now have with respect to passenger and freight rates on railways.

Mr. SPROULE. That simply means, if I understand it correctly, that you cannot reduce rates, but you can refuse to approve of a new schedule.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, it does not mean that at all. My hon. friend is aware that by the Railway Act as we have it today, every railway company, in order to have a tariff of rates which it can apply, must submit that tariff to the Railway Commission, and until it is approved of the company cannot collect anything. That is the condition with respect to railway companies at the present time, and that will be the condition with respect to telephone companies if this Bill passes. In the next place, it is intended to provide for interchange of traffic between all existing telephone companies ; and it is intended to provide for direct oral communication. Provision is to be made for interchange of messages between two telephone companies, subject of course to conditions to be fixed by the Board of Railway Commissioners, and, in addition, when the conditions are such as to enable it to be done effectively, there may be direct oral communication from one telephone system to another subject to conditions to be fixed by the Railway Commission. There is one condition with respect to that to which I wish to direct the attention of the House, that is, that the equipment of the telephone company seeking to obtain the privilege of direct oral communication with another company must be up to such a standard as will permit of effective communication and not be a nuisance or a detriment to the other company. I have explained briefly what the situation is, and I am bound to say to my hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) that when this Bill comes up again, we shall be prepared to discuss the question of public ownership if he desires ; but we do not think that this is the time for that discussion. So far as I am concerned, I look upon the telephone at the present time as being an essential requisite of our modern civilization. It is as necessary, it seems to me, under existing conditions almost as water and light, and in that view it is important that we should make provision for as effective control over telephone companies as we can have consistent with private ownership ; and I think myself that private ownership, with effective government control, is an ideal system.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

EMPLOYMENT OF UNITED STATES DREDGES.

Mr. TAYLOR asked :

1. Were any of the dredges owned by Messrs. Daly & Hanman, of Ogdensburg, N.Y., employed by the government during the season of 1905 ?
2. If so, how many of the said dredges were employed, and what are the names of the dredges so employed, and what was paid per day for the same ?
3. How long did each dredge work, and during what months ?

Mr. R. LEMIEUX (for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries) :

1. Yes.
2. Two dredges employed, Nos. 3 and 5 Eleven dollars per hour.
3. No. 5 dredge 36 hours in October, 1905 ; No. 3 dredge 200 hours in October and November, 1905.

WILSON'S BEACH BREAKWATER.

Mr. GANONG asked :

1. What was the total cost of the breakwater at Wilson's Beach, N.B.?
2. What was the total amount paid to James M. Johnston, in connection with this work ?
3. What was the total cost of tools and other appliances supplied by the government, in any way connected with the erection of this work, and what disposition has been made of such tools and appliances ?

Hon. CHARLES S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works) : All of this question, except the last part was answered yesterday. In reply to a telegram from the department the resident engineer has replied that no disposition had been made of the tools in question.

CENTRAL EXPERIMENTAL FARM.

Mr. TAYLOR asked :

1. What has been the total expenditure in connection with the Central Experimental Farm at Ottawa for each year from 1890 to 1905, inclusive ?
2. What has been the total revenue received from the same for each year from 1890 to 1905, inclusive ?

Hon. CHARLES S. HYMAN (for the Minister of Agriculture) :

Year.	Expenditure.	Revenue.
1890-91..	$49,142 18	$2,426 81
1891-92..	30,416 52	2,561 93
1892-93..	26,261 21	3,150 12
1893-94..	36,071 43	2,186 56
1894-95..	39,563 73	3,784 74
1895-96..	37,396 13	3,785 84
1896-97..	41,429 26	3,182 09
1897-98..	37,717 63	2,814 84
1898-99..	38,357 46	2,886 53
1899-00..	49,573 25	2,446 47
1900-01..	42,040 82	2,553 80
1901-02..	56,375 07	2,254 63
1902-03..	49,615 64	2,972 60
1903-04..	47,671 76	3,074 64
1904-05..	48,250 12	4,971 58

JOSEPH DEMERS CLAIM.

Mr. BOYCE—by Mr. Cockshutt—asked :

1. Has the Department of Marine and Fisheries been made aware of a claim by one Joseph Demers, of Sault Ste. Marie, that his property at the corner of Superior and Hudson streets, Sault Ste. Marie, is injuriously affected by the erection and maintenance of a range light abutting and encroaching thereon ?
2. If so, what action has been taken ?
3. Is the erection to be removed ? If so, when ?
4. Has the department offered compensation ? If so, how much, and has it been accepted ?

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

1. Yes.
2. The tower will be removed.
3. This spring.
4. No; as the grievance will be removed compensation is not necessary.

PROTECTION OF GREAT LAKE FISHERIES.

Mr. BOYCE—by Mr. Cockshutt—asked :

1. How many officers are employed for the protection of fisheries in the Great Lakes ?
2. Who are they and where are they stationed ?
3. What are they paid respectively ?
4. What are their duties ?
5. Do they all report periodically ? If so, how often ?
6. Has it been reported to the department that fish spawn lodged in Canadian waters around the shores of Manitoulin Island, and of lakes Huron and Superior, in Canada, is annually taken by American boats to American hatcheries ?
7. If so, when and by whom were such reports made ?
8. Has the matter been investigated ?
9. Has any action been taken by the department ? If so, what ?

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

1. Three inspectors of fisheries and three officers on board the cruiser 'Vigilant' are so employed by the federal government.
2. J. M. Hurley, Belleville, salary $1,200 per annum; O. B. Sheppard, Toronto, salary $1,200 per annum; A. G. Duncan, Marksville, salary $1,200 per annum ; the cruiser 'Vigilant' patrols the waters of Lake Erie. The officers on the cruiser are: E. Dunn, captain, salary $1,250 per annum ; J. Inkster, 1st officer, salary, $60 per month; J. McPherson, 2nd officer, salary $55 per month.
3. Answered by No. 2.
4. The inspector's duties are to carry out a general supervision of the enforcement of the Dominion fishery laws within their districts.

The cruiser's duty is to exercise a general supervision and to prevent encroachment by foreign fishing vessels.

5. Yes ; annually, monthly and on all matters referred to them or which may arise in their districts from time to time.

The captain of the cruiser makes daily reports.

6. It has not been reported to the department that fish spawn lodged in Canadian waters around the shores of Manitoulin Island and of Lakes Huron and Superior in Canada is annually taken by American boats to American hatcheries.

7, 8 and 9. Answered by No. 6.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY CONTRACTS.

Mr. GAUVREAU asked :

1. How many persons have tendered, respectively, for the following contracts : (a) The water tank for the Intercolonial Railway at Rivière du Loup ; (b) the round house for the Intercolonial Railway at Pictou ; (c) the Intercolonial station at Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island ?

2. What are their names ?

3. What are the amounts of the tenders in each case ?

4. To whom were the contracts awarded ?

5. Were they the lowest tenders ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. (a) 4. (b) 7. (c) 4.

2. (a) Canadian Fairbanks Company, Chicago Bridge and Iron Works, Emile Dubé, E. A. Mallberg. (b) Emile Dubé, E. A. Wallberg, H. McDonald, Rhodes Curry & Co., R. P. P. Fraser, Dixon & Falconer, Willard Kitchen. (c) Rhodes, Curry & Co., E. A. Wallberg, Emile Dubé, H. & S. Lowe.

3. (a) Canadian Fairbanks Company, $4,900 ; Emile Dubé, $4,900 ; Chicago Bridge and Iron Works, $4,780; E. A. Wallberg, $4,470. (b) Emile Dubé, $98,185.20 ; E. A. Wallberg, $62,523.55; Rhodes, Curry & Co., $70,763.90; H. McDonald, $88,076.95; Dixon &Falconer, $65,699.95; R. P. P. Fraser, $68,689.55; Willard Kitchen, $73,011.60; (c) Rhodes, Curry & Co., $86,390; E. A. Wallberg, $58,900 ; Emile Dubé, $67,890 ; H. & S. Lowe, $83,698.

4. (a), (b) and (c) to E. A. Wallberg.

5. Yes.

LAPRAIRIE ICE PIER.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Did the government give to Messrs. Amiot & Lemay the contract for constructing new work in connection with the Laprairie ice pier, after the final payment on their original contract had been made ?

2. What is the amount involved in said new contract ?

3. Did the government call for tenders in connection with this new work ?

4. If not, why not ?

Hon. CHARLES S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works) :

1. Yes.

2. $13,500.

3. Yes.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY PENSION SYSTEM.

Mr. DANIEL asked :

1. Is it the intention of the government to inaugurate a pension or superannuation system in connection with the employees of the Intercolonial Railway ?

2. If so, will such system be inaugurated this year ?

3. If not this year, when ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways). The matter is under consideration.

OTTAWA ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATORY.

Mr. AMES asked :

1. What steps were taken to obtain competition for the electric wiring of the Ottawa Astronomical Observatory ?

2. Were tenders called for by public advertisement ?

3. If so, what offers were received ?

Hon. CHARLES S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works). Ahearn & Soper, Lt'd., were asked to submit prices, their tender was thought to be reasonable and was therefore accepted.

CORNWALL CANAL ELECTRIC POWER.

Mr. LANCASTER asked :

1. Has the government a contract or arrangement with any company or individual in reference to supplying electric power for hauling vessels in and out of the locks of the Cornwall canal ?

2. If so, when, with whom, and for how long was such contract made ?

3. Has the government, since the opening of navigation in 1905, received any protests, remonstrances, or petitions from vessel owners, masters or others, in respect of delays consequent upon the carrying out of the new arrangement governing the hauling of vessels by electrical power in and out of the locks of the Cornwall canal ?

4. Will the government lay on the table of the House a copy of the said contract, and of the rules issued in consequence thereof ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. The government has a contract with a company for the supply of electric energy for the various purposes of the canal, such as driving the machinery in the workshops, lighting the various buildings and the canal itself, opening and closing the lock gates, valves, &c., working winches for the purpose of towing boats into and out of the locks.

2. The contract is dated June 25, 1896, and made with Mr. M. P. Davis, and is for twenty-one years from July 1, 1896, and is renewable for eighty-four years from July 1, 1895, and was supplemented and varied by agreements, dated October 19, 1900 and August 13, 1903, respectively. These were assigned to the St. Lawrence Power Company by assignment dated May 2, 1904.

3. Yes, a memorial has been received from the Dominion Marine Association. The rules so far as they apply to passenger steamers and small tugs are now under revision.

4. There appears to be no objection to this, but I think they will all be found in the sessional papers.

CANADIAN PACIFIC RAILWAY LANDS.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE asked :

1. When was the arrangement made by which the Canadian Pacific Railway completed its final selection of lands in the Northwest, exclusive of British Columbia ?

2. What limit of time was allowed said company in which to complete their selection ?

3. After the areas of selection were determined, how long a period was granted to the company to file their list of final selections ?

4. Will the minister lay on the table of the House a copy of said final arrangement ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. August 22, 1903.

2. For the main line subsidy, till June 30, 1904. For the company's land subsidies other than the main line subsidy, till December 31, 1903.

3. Answered by the answer to question 2.

4. Yes, on an address being moved for and presented.

RIDING MOUNTAIN TIMBER RESERVE.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE asked :

1. Has any change been made in the boundaries of the Riding Mountain timber reserve since 1st January, 1904 ?

2. If so, what are the changes ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Yes.

2. The following lands which were included in the said reserve on the 1st of January, 1904, have been withdrawn therefrom, viz.:—the west half of township 18, the west half of township 19, and the two westerly tiers of sections in township 20, range 15; sections 1, 12 and 13 in township 21, range 16; section 23 in township 18, range 17; sections 25, 26, 27, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35 and 36 in township 18, range 18; sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 in township 18, range 19; the south half and northwest quarter of township 18, range 20; sections 6, 7 and 18 in township 20, range 21; sections 12, 13, the north half of section 22, sections 23, 24, 25, 26, the south halves of sections 27, 28, 29 and 30, sections 35 and 36 in township 23, range 21; the south half of township 20, range 22; the south halves of sections 25 and 26 in township 23, range 22; sections 31, 32 and 33 in township 23, range 23; sections 3, 9, 15, 22, 27 and 34 in township 24, range 25; section 6 and the west half of section 5 in township 23, range 26, all west of the principal meridian.

The following lands which were not included within the boundaries of the same reserve on the 1st January, 1904 have been added thereto, viz.:—

The west half of section 1, sections 2, 3, 10, 11, the west halves of sections 12 and 13, sections 14 and 15 in township 22, range 17; sections 19, 20, 29 and 30 in township 23, range 18, west of the principal meridian.

TRANSCONTINENTAL SURVEYS.

Mr. CROCKET asked :

1. How many parties are now at work surveying and locating the proposed Transcontinental Railway between Quebec and Winnipeg and between Quebec and Moncton, respectively?

2. Between what points are said parties working ?

3. Has survey and location work been continuous during the winter on both sections, or on either, and which of them ?

4. If the work was suspended on both sections, or either of them, when was it so suspended, and for what reason ?

5. When does the commission expect that the work of survey and location will be completed on each section ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. Between Winnipeg and Quebec, 31. Between Quebec and Moncton, 3.

2. Winnipeg to Lake Nepigon, eleven parties. Lake Nepigon to Kebinakagami river, three parties. Kebinakagami river to Kenojevis river, six parties. Kenojevis river to Waymontachene, five parties. Waymontachene to Quebec, six parties. Quebec to Moncton, three parties.

3. Yes, on both.

4. Answered by No. 3.

5. Impossible to say at present.

MARCONI WIRELESS STATIONS.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. What amount has been paid up to 31st December, 1905, on account of Marconi wireless stations and expenses ?

2. What stations are now being operated ?

3. What vessels are now equipped ?

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

1. Paid to Marconi Company up to 31st December, 1905, on account of wireless stations and expenses $118,542.73.

2. Fame Point; Heath Point ; Whittle Rocks; Point Amour; Belle Isle; Point Rich, Newfoundland ; Cape Ray, Newfoundland ; Cape Race, Newfoundland ; Sable Island ; Camperdown, Halifax Harbour; Cape Sable; Partridge Island, (entrance St. John Harbour) ; Cape Bear, Prince Edward Island.

3. The government vessels equiped are the 'Canada' 'Minto' 'Stanley' Montcalm' 'Druid' 'Lady Laurier'. I cannot give the names of other vessels. Did the hon. gentleman wish for other vessels ?

Mr. FOSTER. Only those that are equiped at government expense.

Mr. BRODEUR. Then these are the only ones.

FOG SIGNALS.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. What amount of money has been paid to date to the Canadian Fog Signal Company ?
2. Were the goods supplied on calls for tender and contract ?
3. Will the minister lay the calls for tenders and the tenders received and the contracts ultimately entered into, on the table of the House ?

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

1. 1903-1904.. .. ..$ 14,600 00
   1904-1905.. .. .. 428,489 00
   1905-1906.. .. .. 1,132 63

2. No tenders were called but agreement was made as to prices.
3. Copy of agreements as to prices can be furnished.

PAYMENTS TO GEO. T. MERWIN.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. What amount of money has been paid to date to Geo. T. Merwin ?
2. Were the goods supplied on calls for tender and contract ?
3. If so, will the minister lay the tenders and resultant contracts upon the table of the House ?

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

1. $404,308.87.
2. No.
3. See answer to preceding question.

CONTRACTS FOR GAS BUOYS.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. What amount of money has been paid to date to Thomas L. Willson for gas buoys ?
2. Were the goods bought in tender and contract ?
3. Will the minister lay the tenders and contracts on the table of the House ?

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

1. $192,500.
2. No tenders were called but agreement made as to prices.
3. Copy of agreements as to prices can be furnished.

JURISDICTION OVER IN-SHORE FISHERIES.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked :

1. Is the government aware that in the speech of the Lieutenant Governor of Prince Edward Island, in opening the provincial legislature, the following clause appeared : Measures for the better protection of our most valuable in-shore fisheries and the cultivation of our oyster areas and beds will be submitted to you ?
2. Is it the intention of the government to take any action in regard to preventing such grave complications as might arise from any such interference with powers now exercised by the federal authorities ?
3. Has the government taken any action in this regard ? If so, what ?

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

1. Such intention on the part of the provincial government has been intimated to the Dominion government.

2 and 3. The government hopes to reach an early adjustment of the matter without the necessity for any interference of one authority with the other, and it is proposed to hold a conference with the several provinces at the end of the present session of parliament, at which this, among other matters, may be considered.

PILOTAGE COMMISSIONERS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN asked :

1. Do the members of any board of pilotage commissioners in Canada receive remuneration for their services as such members, whether by way of salaries, allowances for expenses, or otherwise ?
2. In what cases is such salary or allowance granted or permitted ?
3. What is the amount allowed or permitted in each case ?

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

1. Members of boards of pilotage commissioners do not receive remuneration for their services as such members.
2. Salary is allowed in the case of a commissioner being appointed secretary treasurer of the board. The salary is fixed by the board.
3. There is no fixed amount allowed pilotage commissioners except in the case of a commissioner being also secretary treasurer of the board.

ACCIDENTS ON THE ST. LAWRENCE.

Mr. BERGERON asked :

1. How many accidents have happened on the St. Lawrence route below Montreal since 1890 ?
2. How many between Montreal and Quebec, and how many below Quebec ?
3. What is the number of vessels of 100 tons and over wrecked, what are their names, and the date of the accident ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). Will the hon. gentleman allow that question to stand, as it will require a large amount of work ?

Mr. BERGERON. Instead of saying vessels of 100 tons, I desire to make that read vessels of 1,000 tons and over. Less work will therefore be required to make up the answer.

Mr. BRODEUR. I would much prefer that the question should stand, because it will take some days to prepare the answer.

Mr. BERGERON. I only want to know in reference to sea-going vessels.

LAND GRANTS TO RAILWAYS IN THE NORTHWEST.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE asked :

1. When was the selection of the land grant to the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway and Steamship Company completed ?

2. Has the land grant to the Manitoba and Southeastern Railway been selected ?

3. If so, when completed ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of Interior) :

1. A portion of this company's land subsidy was retained by the government as security in connection with the transport subsidy contract, dated August 5th, 1889, and such portion is not yet selected. The balance of the company's land subsidy was selected prior to December 31, 1905.

2. No.

3. Answered by the answer to question 2.

DISMISSAL OF POSTMASTER AT EAST ROMANS. N.S.

Mr. LANCASTER asked :

1. Has Patrick Walsh been dismissed from the office of postmaster at East Romans post office, in the county of Guysborough, N.S. ?

2. If so, what was the reason for such dismissal ?

3. Did the government receive any petition asking for his dismissal ?

4. Did the government receive any petition asking that he be not dismissed ?

5. Who has been appointed in his place, and upon whose recommendation was such appointment made ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Postmaster General). Under direction of the Postmaster General, of date 21st September, 1905, Mr. Patrick Walsh was removed from the postmastership of East Roman Valley (not East Romans), county Guysborough, N.S., because of active and offensive political partisanship.

A petition calling attention to the facts had been previously received, and after the dismissal, another petition was received asking that Mr. Walsh should be continued in the office.

Mr. John M. Rogers has been appointed to the office on the recommendation of Mr. J. H. Sinclair, M.P.

PAYMENTS FOR EXTRA SERVICES IN DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. Has the government taken cognizance of the correspondence between Deputy Minister Gobeil, and Mr. J. L. McDougall on the subject of payment to Deputy Minister Gobeil, Chief Engineer Lafleur, and Engineer Brophy, for extra services during the fiscal year 1904-5 ?

2. What action was taken by the Treasury board in this matter ?

Hon. CHAS. S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works) :

1. Yes.

2. Matter was referred to the Treasury board, but as the main objection of the Auditor General was the lack of an order in council, no other action was taken beyond the passing of one authorizing the work to be done and the payment of reasonable compensations to officers named, out of and within the appropriation made.

REPORT OF TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION.

On the order being called :

That in the opinion of this House the government should, at the earliest possible day, present the report of the Transportation Commission, together with all the evidence taken before the said commission, and that the same should be thereupon dealt with by the House.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT. I would ask the Minister of Public Works when that report of the Transportation Commission is to be published. It is now two or three weeks since he promised it would be published.

Hon. CHAS. S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works). I do not think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) is correct in saying two or three weeks, but I promised it would be brought down. It was put on the Order Paper about two weeks ago. As soon as possible it will be brought down. I have communicated several times with the printers, they promise it will be brought down early next week.

Mr. BENNETT. Then I will ask that the resolution be allowed to stand.

JUDGES SALARIES, &c.

Mr. H. LENNOX (South Simcoe) moved :

For a return showing : (a) The number of judges whose salaries are paid out of the consolidated revenue of Canada ; (b) the name and residence of each judge ; (c) the amount of salary and expenses paid to each judge ; (d) the area of the judicial district in which such judge exercises jurisdiction, and in the case of local, district and county judges, the population of the district ; (e) the number of cases tried by each judge in each year since the 1st January, 1901 ; (f) the number of motions, petitions, &c., disposed of by each judge during each year, at chambers or in a summary manner ; (g) the number of days during which each judge was actually engaged in the performance of judicial duties ; (h) the number of days during which each judge was engaged in any occupation, business or matter other than the performance of his judicial duties.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). I am afraid my hon. friend will embarrass me somewhat if he insists upon a categorical answer to subsections (e), (f), and the following subsections of his question. That information is not under the control of the Department of Justice.

Mr. LENNOX. If the minister would intimate when he is ready with what he has, then I might speak to the motion. I

intended to draw attention to certain matters in connection with this if that information could not be returned.

Mr. SPEAKER. The motion will stand.

ADDITIONAL CLERKSHIPS—POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. SAM BARKER (Hamilton) moved :

For a copy of the report of the Deputy Postmaster General, that an additional first-class clerkship is necessary for the proper performance of the public business in the department, for which clerkship parliament is asked to vote money. Also for a copy of the report of the Deputy Postmaster General, that an additional second-class clerkship is necessary for the proper performance of the public business in the department, for which clerkship parliament is asked to vote money.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Postmaster General). There is, of course, no objection to giving to the hon. gentleman, or to the House, the fullest information in the possession of the department upon any such subject as is mentioned or indicated in this proposition, but I had supposed when the answer was given to the hon. gentleman during the consideration of the estimates in connection with this question that he would perfectly understand from what I said that there was no formal or written report upon this subject from the deputy Postmaster General. I stated in answer to a question then put to me that the estimate under consideration had been prepared by the deputy Postmaster General. He discussed the subject with me informally at the time and it was upon his verbal recommendation so made to me that I approved the estimate and presented it for consideration upon that occasion. The deputy Postmaster General at present, as hon. gentlemen are aware, is not in the country; he is attending the Postal Conference in Rome, and this is a matter in regard to which, as I say, there simply is a verbal report to me of the necessity for the offices mentioned in this resolution.

Mr. FOSTER. Bring down the verbal report.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. You have it now.

Mr. BARKER. I now understand that after all there is no report such as the Civil Service Act calls for. I understood from the hon. gentleman that there was such a report, and it must be very clear to everybody that I had ground for so thinking. When the minister was asking money for certain new clerkships, a first-class and a second-class clerkship, I asked :

Has the deputy minister reported that these additional offices are necessary ?

When estimates are being passed through the House a member has a right to know whether the deputy has reported in accordance with the Civil Service Act, which requires not only that the deputy shall report on the need for the new office but state his reasons for that report. Now, when I first asked the minister :

Has the deputy minister reported that these additional officers are necessary ?

His answer was :

Yes, the deputy minister is responsible for this very estimate.

We have had that sort of answer very frequently from the several departments and it was not what I was seeking. I repeated :

I asked if he had reported ?

The minister said :

He has reported it to me.

Well he would report it to nobody but his chief. That is what the Act calls for. The hon. gentleman's deputy would report to his superior officer, to the Postmaster General, but that report, I presume, would be one that would enable the minister to explain to this House the need for the offices he was creating. I wanted that information. The hon. gentleman seems to think he is not obliged to give it. I can only say that in compliance with the spirit of the Civil Service Act, he ought to give it, and to lay that report on the table of the House. The 17th section of the Act provides :

A first-class clerkship shall only be created by order in council, passed on the report of the deputy head, concurred in by the head of the department, setting forth the reasons for creating the office, and after the salary has been voted by parliament.

Now, we are asked to vote the money, and I think that before we vote the money we are entitled to the information to which the minister is entitled.

We ought to know from the deputy, who is the officer entrusted with the duty, that he needs this officer and we ought to know what his reasons are. It was for that purpose I called for this report, and I say again I have a right to assume that when the hon. minister said his deputy had reported to him, he meant such a report as is referred to in the statute. I am surprised to learn now that he has no such report.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I apprehend the meaning of the Civil Service Act quite differently from the way in which the gentleman (Mr. Barker) seems to understand it. As I understand the meaning of the statute, if this House votes the money the office would be created by order in council upon the recommendation of the minister proceeding upon the report of his deputy, and when the time comes, if this House votes the money, I have no doubt such a report will be made.

Motion agreed to.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a return showing the number of mail contracts in Peel county, giving location, number of miles, names of couriers, and price paid. Also date of commencement, date of expiration, and names of bondsmen; also if public tenders were asked; the name of each preceding contract, with name of courier, and the price paid.—Mr. Blain.

For a return showing the original tenders received by the Department of the Interior in connection with the leasing of timber berths Nos. 1158, 1175, 1192, 1219, 1231, and 1232, during the years 1904 and 1905; with copies of all correspondence in reference thereto, had with the Minister of the Interior, the department itself, or any officer thereof; and the various transfers, if any, made of the leases after they were granted to the successful tenderers, giving name of transferee and date of transfer, in each case.—Mr. Foster.

For a return showing our exports to Germany for each year from 1896 to 1905, inclusive, on the following articles: wheat, flour, oats, bacon, hams, butter, cheese and apples. —Mr. Armstrong.

For a return showing: 1. What proprietary rights, or rights of licensing, or control or other rights, if any, are vested in the government of Canada or the Crown, in the right of Canada in respect to, (a) sea fisheries; (b) inland fisheries in each province.

2. What such rights are vested in each provincial government or the Crown in the right of each provincial government, in respect of the matter aforesaid?

3. What rights, powers or jurisdiction to lease or otherwise regulate or control, manage or interfere with sea or inland fisheries, are exercised by the federal government or any department thereof?

4. What such rights, powers or jurisdiction, if any, are exercised by any provincial government or department thereof?

5. What jurisdiction to legislate is possessed or exercised by, (a) the parliament of Canada; (b) any provincial legislature with respect to; (c) sea fisheries, or (d) inland fisheries in regard to; (e) proprietary rights; (f) licensing; (g) other regulations; (h) control or management.

6. Whether any differences or disputes between any provincial government and the federal government now exist with respect to any of the matters above mentioned; and, if so, a statement of the exact nature and form of such disputes or differences?—Mr. R. L. Borden.

For a return showing: All amounts paid for dredging in the province of Ontario, from the 1st July, 1905, up to the present time; the place where such work was performed; the names of parties doing such work, and the amount paid therefor. Also of any unpaid amounts due or alleged to be due for dredging, showing the amount, the parties claiming, and where the work was done.—Mr. Bennett.

For copies of all contracts for supplies of food for the permanent military forces and mounted police of the Dominion; also for all the supplies of food to the volunteers at their annual drill camps last summer; also for supplies to the military schools of the Dominion.—Mr. E. D. Smith.

For copies of all correspondence between the Collingwood dry dock and any department in reference to bounty payable to said company. Also a copy of the valuation of said dock, if any, made on behalf of the Department of Public Works.—Mr. Bennett.

For copies of all correspondence, telegrams, memoranda, reports and orders in council, in possession of the government, or any member or official thereof, in connection with the grant of an additional subsidy to the province of Prince Edward Island in 1901, of $30,000 a year, and the basis on which the said subsidy was agreed to be paid to the province.—Mr. A. Martin.

For copies of all reports made subsequent to April 3, 1905, in respect to Joseph Nixon, land agent at Macleod.—Mr. Foster.

For a return showing what land sales have been made in blocks or area of more than one-half section, during the years 1903, 1904 and 1905, in Manitoba, the Territories, including the new provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, and British Columbia; to whom the same were sold in each instance; the price per acre, and the date of sale in each instance.—Mr. Sproule.

For copies of all orders in council, reports, memoranda, correspondence, valuation, documents and papers, of every kind and nature and description, relating to the property situated on the south side of Spring Garden road, in the city of Halifax, upon which the old drill shed was or is situated; or relating to the leasing, conveying, disposal, or user of the said property, or of any property conveyed to the Crown in consideration or in part consideration therefor.—Mr. Fowler.

TENDERS FOR FLOUR FOR PENITENTIARIES.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR (S. Leeds) moved:

For a list of the names of persons who were asked to tender, otherwise than by newspaper advertising, for flour supply at Kingston, Dorchester and St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiaries; and for copies of tenders received in reply to such request for prices.

Hon. CHAS. FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). In answer to the motion I produce the information.

FLOODING OF RIVER THAMES.

Mr. H. S. CLEMENTS (West Kent) moved:

For copies of all correspondence, plans, specifications, surveys, &c., pertaining to relief from River Thames, say between the city of London and Lake St. Clair, for the overflow of water from the said river, pertaining to canal or cut of to Lake Erie or other points.

He said: Mr. Speaker, my object in moving for this return is to call the attention of the government and the individual ministers of this House to the very serious situation of that immense and valuable tract of land lying along the River Thames. I had occasion to bring this matter up in a somewhat different form last session. I want hon. ministers to understand the po-

sition in which the people living adjacent to this river are placed. The River Thames is 160 miles in length running through a narrow peninsula comprising, I suppose, some of the best farming land in the province of Ontario. There is also a large population in the villages, towns and cities including Chatham, Glencoe and London and extending up to St. Mary's as well as along the tributaries of the main stream. This River Thames is, on the average, about 300 feet wide and the territory upon each side of it is possibly 20 miles in extent. This river has to take care of all the overflow water of these districts extending from its rise to Lake St. Clair into which it empties. Up to a few years ago the residents in these districts have had no serious complaints to make because of the overflow of this particular river, but for the last four or five years there has been very serious damage done to the magnificent farming lands and city property throughout the district from London to Lake St. Clair by the immense floods which have taken place.

Previous to last session there was a severe ice-jam in the river which caused an immense flood in the district, and last session I brought the matter before the Minister of Public Works. It was thought that if the government took measures to prevent the ice-jam the floods might be prevented also. The Minister of Public Works lives in the city of London, and while that city is not so seriously affected as the district below towards lake St. Clair, yet I have no doubt that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hyman) has the interests of his constituency at heart just as I have the interests of mine. At the mouth of the St. Clair river there is a sand bank extending for miles, with only a narrow passage a few feet wide to allow boats to enter the river, and if the mouth of the river were dredged to the full width of the channel into the deep water of Lake St. Clair, it is thought that it would at all events have the effect of lessening the floods. I commend that suggestion to the government. A deputation of prominent citizens from the district waited upon the Prime Minister and Sir Frederick Borden last year and made representations with regard to this matter. The Minister of Public Works was then busy in his election, and the Prime Minister informed us that as soon as his colleague returned he would give the question serious consideration and endeavour to come to some conclusion. In my many discussions with the Minister of Public Works on this question, he seemed rather to be inclined to the idea that it was possibly one with which the provincial government should deal. I am not a lawyer, but I have taken the advice of the best counsel in the district and their opinion is that the Thames being a navigable river it is within the jurisdiction of the Dominion. However that may be, I am quite sure that the province of Ontario would be glad to join with the Dominion government in endeavouring to find a remedy for the evil. In order that the House may understand the serious importance of this question, I would point out that the district where the floods occur has rich and fertile farms worth from $75 to $100 an acre; it is one of the oldest settled districts in Ontario, and there is no more fertile land in that rich province. I remember that during one of these floods there was some seven to nine feet of water covering a great extent of these beautiful farms, and the resident engineer of the Grand Trunk Railway at St. Thomas was present with me when the farmers of that district and their families had to be taken from the tops of straw stacks and the roofs of houses to save their lives. I think I may safely say that during the last four or five years the damage caused by these floods would amount to $1,000,000. This winter, even though the flood was not very serious, the residents of the city of Chatham lost $30,000 by reason of it. There must be some action taken to prevent the renewal of these floods. While the country was in its original condition and clothed with forests, the snows melted gradually and the natural bed of the river was doubtless able to take care of the flow of the waters in it, but with the disappearance of the trees and the improved system of tiled draining and so forth, the water rushes down in the spring in four or five days, instead of moving gradually as it did in former times when probably the same volume of water would take five or six weeks to discharge. I submit to the Minister of Public Works that he should send to that district one of the ablest engineers in his department to consider the question carefully and to propose some remedy. May I point out that the assessment of the one township of Raleigh amounts to about $25,000,000, a fact which is sufficient to impress upon the members of this House that this question is one of vast importance. The Minister of Public Works promised me last session that if it were at all possible he would send an ice crusher there in the spring to try and to prevent a jam occurring in the river, and I have reason to believe that the minister made every effort to relieve the situation. Last spring the ice melted away gradually with the heat of the sun and there were no abnormal conditions, but yet the flood was almost as disastrous as in former years. I do not wish to force upon the government any suggestion of my own, but it does seem to me that there are several remedies which might be applied. There might be a cut-off made to Lake St. Clair or Lake Erie or Lake Huron which would give relief to the district. I am satisfied that according to the highest authorities on constitutional law, including that eminent lawyer, Mr. Clement, and others, that this is a Dominion matter and not a

provincial matter. I am not suggesting what should be done, but I do in all seriousness ask the Minister of Public Works, who I am sure is interested in the district as well as I am, to place that eminent engineer on the ground and endeavour to provide some solution for this difficulty, and thus save the vast amount of property which is going to waste each year, and which must necessarily increase as the years go by so long as this difficulty remains unsolved.

I ask the pardon of this House for taking up so much time on this matter, but I feel that it is a very serious matter to a great many residents of that district. If I had the time I could mention a hundred families whose ancestors settled in that district seventy-five or one hundred years ago, who were well to do, and who were never troubled with these floods until the last few years, but whose farms have been practically ruined and who have lost every dollar they had through the overflow of the water of the Thames, and are at present working by the day upon any job they can get. Some of these farmers were worth $10,000 or $15,000 or $20,000. I only mention this to show that the hon. minister should take this matter into his consideration and give us some relief from the present difficulty.

Hon. C. S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works). Mr. Speaker, I can have no possible objection to the motion which the hon. gentleman has moved, and I have every sympathy with him in the case he has presented to the House. This is a matter that has been brought up in the House of Commons by the hon. gentlemen who have represented the county of Kent at various times and I realize its importance. The hon. gentleman is in error when he says that it has only been within the last two or three years that these floods have occasioned any serious damage. In 1881 the city of London suffered very seriously by reason of these floods. The damage done on that occasion was in the neighbourhood of $1,000,000, in addition to which a sad loss of life occurred, some fifteen or sixteen people being drowned. I only mention this to indicate my deep sympathy with the hon. gentleman in presenting this matter to the House. So far as the Public Works Department is concerned, there is a very grave difficulty in dealing with a matter of this kind. While it is the duty of the department to do whatever may be necessary to maintain navigation on the Thames, the question of making a large expenditure solely for the benefit of the people living on the banks of the river who suffer from floods, is a question of very serious importance to the government and this House. There are a great many constituencies in Canada where there are rivers of similar character, and where floods do as great damage as is done by the floods of the River Thames. Hardly a week has passed since I have been in the Public Works Department in which similar representations of the strongest kind have not been made to me. I think that this House fully realizes that this is a provincial matter. The provincial houses deal with questions of drains and drainage, and it is almost always recognized that there ought to be a charge made against lands which have been drained by public expenditure. That is not within the purview of this House, but lies entirely within provincial lines. I may say that I have already had a report from an engineer who has gone very carefully over the whole question, and I shall be very glad to bring that report down and discuss the substance of it with the hon. member, and if it is felt that there should be further inquiries into the subject, I have no objection to placing another engineer on the work to report upon any points that need to be further looked into.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). The hon. mniister says he has no objection to bringing down the papers, but he intimates that the government can do nothing. What reason does he assign? First, that the question belongs to the provinces, because they have to do with drainage works, and, secondly, that it would be a very expensive undertaking. It does not seem to me that these are valid reasons or even plausible excuses. Is the minister not aware that we voted money some years ago for the drainage of the Nation river to prevent its flooding the land in the same way that the Thames river does? Attention was drawn to the fact that this was to provide better drainage, and the government justified the vote on the ground that a large area of land was submerged through the damming of the water by ice. If the government provided a remedy for that in the past, why cannot they do so in the present instance? It was very properly suggested by the hon. member who brought this matter to the attion of the House that the government might provide ice-breakers to break up the ice in the spring and thus prevent the overflow. The government have an icebreaker on the lower St. Lawrence to assist navigation, and what is to prevent them from providing similar means to break up the ice on the River Thames? It would not be such a great expense as the minister seems to intimate that it would be, because the distance over which the icebreaker would have to work is not very great. The distance that ice-breaker would be obliged to work would not be very long or very great. I think the hon. member deserves the thanks of the people of that section of country for bringing this matter to the attention of the House, but I do not think that the government are showing themselves equal to the occasion because the

remedies which they might provide, and which they undoubtedly have furnished to other localities of Ontario, they do not propose to supply to these people, but propose to let them continue suffering from the evils under which they are now labouring.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). If the hon. minister would consult some of the legal members of the cabinet, for instance his colleague the Postmaster General, he would find that the Thames, being a navigable river, lies within the jurisdiction of the Dominion government and not of the province. I was told the other day by one of the leading lawyers of Chatham, Mr. Matthew Wilson, who is no doubt well known to the hon. minister, that some years ago a by-law was passed by the city council of Chatham requiring a certain bridge across the river to be closed a half an hour every day at noon in order to enable the labouring men to reach their homes more quickly during the dinner hour. The Dominion government however refused to allow the by-law to be carried into effect on the ground that as the Thames was a navigable river, the Dominion had control and they would not allow any interference of navigation. The government having assumed control in that way and having prevented the people of Chatham exercising the rights they otherwise would have over the river, they can hardly now repudiate all responsibility or liability. There is a great difference between drainage under the Ontario Act relieving the lands from the overflow of water and damage caused by a river overflowing its banks. Possibly a little dredging at the mouth of the river would remove all difficulties.

Mr. HYMAN. The Thames is navigable from its mouth to Chatham and possibly a few miles further up, but that is the only navigable part in an extent of about 175 miles. With regard to the ice-breaker, I did try in every way possible last year to have something done, but it was impossible to get an ice-breaker across the lake in time to be of any service.

Mr. F. R. LALOR (Haldimand). I might point out that there was a parallel case to this in my own constituency where the waters of the Grand River overflowed the lands on both sides and where the government on two occasions paid the damages to the parties whose lands were overflowed. The government even went so far as to buy the land on both sides of the river in order that they might own the banks and thus avoid having to pay compensation. I am not objecting to the government having done this. On the contrary I think it was right that these people should be reimbursed for the damages caused by the overflow, but I merely call attention to the fact to show that the cases are parallel and that the government would be warranted in following that precedent by paying for the damages done in connection with the overflow of the Thames. If in the one case the Dominion government had jurisdiction, surely they have in the other.

Mr. HYMAN. Was it not claimed that the government had put up some works on the river the effect of which was to cause the flood ?

Mr. LALOR. That is correct. The government have works and embankments on the river which forced the water back and caused this overflow. At the same time I desire to say that there are still many damages unpaid in connection with the overflow of the Grand River. All along the river on both sides are small streams leading into it, and the embankment at Dunnville which caused the waters of the Grand River to overflow, has enlarged the streams leading to the river to such an extent that the bridges are very much longer and more expensive to keep up. The attention of the government has been called repeatedly by the county council to the fact and the government have been urged to take over those bridges and help to pay the expense imposed on the county of Haldimand in connection with keeping them up. A large deputation from that county, representing the county council, waited on the minister in this connection and asked him to have the government assist in defraying the expenses of keeping up these long bridges which were rendered necessary by the embankment at Dunnville. I shall probably at a later day bring this matter again to the attention of the government, but in the meantime I hope the hon. minister will take into his serious consideration the case presented to him by the deputation which waited on him last year.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton). I think my hon. friend from Chatham deserves credit for the able manner in which he has placed this question before the House. I am sure the Minister of Public Works realizes its importance. He has frankly admitted that the river from Chatham to the St. Clair is navigable and therefore under his control and that that is the part which requires dredging. Dredging is required especially at the mouth of that river, and I fail to see any reasonable excuse for not giving any assistance to those people whose case my hon. friend from Chatham so ably placed before the House. I have visited that section, part of my riding is tributary to it, and I can emphasize the remarks of my hon. friend with reference to the damage done in that country. This damage is continually going on. Year after year the people suffer great loss owing to the overflow of that river, and when we take into consideration the large expenditure being

made on the rivers in this eastern province, I am sure the hon. minister will find that he is in duty bound to do something for the relief of the people of Chatham. Many such works are carried on in these eastern provinces for the protection of the people along their rivers. In my own riding on the river Au Sable the government have spent $20,000 to $30,000 at its mouth for the purpose of keeping it open so that boats may go up into the small town. I believe that such an expense is justifiable and that the minister would be perfectly justified in spending a considerable amount to open up the mouth of the River Thames.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I think the hon. minister will bear me out when I say that in the district in question, we have prominent men whose opinion on such matters would have weight in any part of this Dominion. A great many letters have been written in the public press by prominent drainage men in that district, and, as the hon. minister knows, we in that district are the fathers of drainage in the province of Ontario. These eminent men, thoroughly acquainted with drainage, have offered suggestions as a solution of the trouble. In almost nine cases out of ten they have advised a cut-off, either to Lake Erie, or to other points. My own personal opinion is that if the government would dredge a cut equal in width to the river and out into deep water in Lake St. Clair, this would be a partial solution. But I am certain it would not entirely prevent trouble which will arise in future years. I am not asking for anything pertaining to drainage, I am simply asking the Dominion government to take charge of a stream over which they have full control, and to take charge of the overflow of water.

Motion agreed to.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Department of the Interior. —Hon. Mr. Paterson.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 41) respecting the Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Railway Company. —Mr. Macpherson.

Bill (No. 42) to incorporate the Buffalo, Niagara and Toronto Railway Company.— Mr. German.

Bill (No. 43) to incorporate the Brandon Transfer Railway Company.—Mr. Sifton.

Bill (No. 44) respecting the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company.—Mr. Hall.

Bill (No. 45) respecting patent of the Anderson Puffed Rice Company.—Mr. Hall.

Bill (No. 46) respecting the St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Company.—Mr. Tisdale.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 6) in amendment of the Railway Act, 1903.—Mr. Lancaster.

RAILWAY ACT, 1903 AMENDMENT.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 9) to further amend the Railway Act, 1903. He said: Mr. Speaker, the first clause of this Bill proposes to deal with express companies. I did think that in the legislation which was introduced here this afternoon by the government dealing with the Railway Act, they would have adopted the principle of government regulation of express companies. I have pointed out time after time in this House that the express companies are an integral part of the railways, that they are owned by the railways, that they carry freight, that the service they perform for the public is largely increased and that a large number of industries are altogether dependent for their success on reasonable rates being charged by the express companies. It seems to me there is no way of obtaining reasonable express charges other than by the control of the railway commission. In this connection I would call attention to an interview which is referred to by several organs of hon. gentlemen opposite, given by Sir Thomas Shaughnessy in New York the other day as to the efficiency of the Railway Commission in this country. He says that the railways have found it is a good thing for them to be under a railway commission and if it is a good thing to be under it in connection with the freight tariff it is a good thing to have it in connection with the express tariff now imposed on the public by these companies. The area of the market open to the fruit growers of this country is altogether governed by the express tolls; if these tolls are high that market is limited, but if the tolls are regulated and kept within reasonable bounds their market is widened. I believe there is a delegation to-day on its way to the capital to ask the government to include express companies within the purview of this Act, I have never heard a reason why they should not be so regulated. I did hear the Minister of Justice in his role as apologist of the corporations say they could not quite reach them and I did hear other hon. gentlemen use the same argument, because the express companies did their business partly by rail and partly by water. That may be, but a parliament advised by eminent lawyers and having a Minister of Railways ought to be able to make the law so that the tolls of the express companies will come within the regulation of the Railway Commission. Boards of trade all over the country have asked that these express charges be regulated by the Railway Commission.

Farmers in their conventions have made the same request and, as I said before, no reason has ever been given that has commended itself to my judgment or that has received any endorsement from the public, why it is impossible to regulate these express companies. Of course the railways have at times put up the pretense that they did not own the express companies, that they are private corporations aside from themselves; but I was able to quote a year or two ago from the annual report of the Canadian Pacific Railway and in that annual report they speak of the Dominion company as 'your property' in their address to the shareholders. That is they admit in their own document that the Dominion Express Company was the absolute property of the Canadian Pacific Railway, just as the Canadian Express Company is the absolute property of the Grand Trunk Railway. These express companies are doing more and more business. The big express trains carry from three to six express cars to handle the business, and all this business is without any regulation, they can charge what they like, and do charge what they like. Not only are these express companies overcharging their clients but they are all powerful here at Ottawa, all powerful with the government to prevent extension of the parcel post system of this country.

We had recently a Postmaster General in this country who also believed in the extension of the parcel post system and there are people in the United States today who are advocating the extension of the parcel post system in that country as they have it in Great Britain, but the public enemies in the United States, as in this country, to the extension of the parcel post system are the express companies as they are consolidated and organized at Washington and as they are consolidated and organized in this country. The hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) said here this afternoon that the greatest tribunal we had in this country was the Railway Commission and that it was doing good work. If that be so, I say it is hampered, its importance is very much decreased as long as it remains without jurisdiction over the express companies. It is incumbent upon the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) to tell us why he has not brought these express companies within the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission in the Bill which he introduced to the House this afternoon. I understand that an hon. gentleman in this House has a Bill which he will introduce a little later on dealing with this same question, and that he has gone to the extent of going through the Railway Act and drafting a Bill that may meet the difficulties that will crop up later. I understand and appreciate that there are these difficulties, but what I propose here to-night is to bring the principle into the Railway Act as it exists to-day and once we bring the principle in we can go into committee and wherever we find that the Bill conflicts with the present law we can straighten it out. I think that is the proper way to deal with a Bill of this kind. However, I will be glad to support the Bill of the hon. gentleman who is also moving in the same direction and if it clears all the difficulties out of the way so much the better, but this goes on to introduce the principle of placing the charges of express companies, as well as those of railway companies, under the control of the Railway Commission.

The second section I will leave in my Bill till it comes up in committee although the Bill introduced by the government this afternoon deals with that point. At least the government have conceded the point that the independent telephone companies of this country are entitled to access to railway stations. I introduced that measure session after session in this House. It was derided, it was denounced, it was stated to be an attack on vested rights. The principle is at last admitted and the government are undertaking the responsibility of conceding this convenience to the independent telephone lines. So far as that goes some headway is being made in telephone legislation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my third amendment is in regard to passenger rates charged in this country. That too will soon become the law of this country. Hon. gentlemen opposite and hon. gentlemen on this side of the House may scoff at that idea but the great item in railway reform that is sweeping through the United States to-day is the two cent a mile passenger rate. We are told that in this country we have made provision for the regulation of passenger rates by leaving the matter to the Railway Commission. That has never been done in any other country in the world as far as passenger rates are concerned. The maximum passenger rate is fixed by parliament. The rate is made by the legislature whether in Europe or America. The other day in the great and flourishing state of Ohio the legislature passed a two cent a mile passenger rate and it went through both sections of the legislature almost like lightning. Now, in Indiana, in Ohio, in Illinois, in Pennsylvania, in nearly every state of the union the most prominent railway question before the legislatures is the regulation of passenger rates and in some of these states two cents a mile is made a maximum passenger rate. Some of the railways have had the wisdom, have had the discretion to admit the reform and reduce their rates without an Act of the legislature. The great Boston & Maine did not wait for two cent a mile legislature to be passed in that state, but on all their lines, whether in New York, Connecticut

or Massachusetts and on almost all of their lines in New England they have conceded a two cent passenger rate. This idea of a two cent a mile rate was laughed at in this House, yet I can say to hon. gentlemen who said that they did not think it was good for the public and they did not think it was good for the railways that it is good for both. The railways make more money and the public get cheaper travel. On every railway in this country the charge is over two cents a mile. Take the great Canadian Pacific Railway so largely bonused by this country with land and money; it to-day is paying six per cent in dividends, it to-day is in a position to pay eight per cent in dividends, its stock is valued at 170 when the ordinary face value of the stock is $100. That great corporation is extending its system in every direction. I travelled over it last summer and I saw its great express trains running in three sections and every section crowded with passengers as it is to-day. That railway is crowded with passengers from one end of the line to the other and yet there are places in the Northwest Territories where it is charging four cents a mile.

Mr. MACPHERSON. You can buy a ticket from the city of Montreal via. the Canadian Pacific Railway to the city of Vancouver, a distance of about 3,000 miles, for $48. That is one and a half cents a mile.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I know it and I know that there are lots of people buying transportation over that line at four cents a mile. The public are not after commutation tickets; they are after the lowest possible standard passenger rate.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Is not that a pretty low passenger rate ?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I do not say it is not, but I hope the hon. gentleman is not justifying four cents a mile.

Mr. MACPHERSON. No, I am not justifying four cents a mile; I am simply calling the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that here is a rate which is less than three cents a mile. He should be gracious enough to concede that.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I concede the point. But, they should not be permitted to charge more than two cents a mile in any case. Take the great province of Ontario from which I come and where the railways are surfeited with traffic ; they are charging, between Montreal and Toronto, three and a third cents a mile, while in Manitoba, by reason of legislation introduced by the government there, they have a maximum passenger rate of three cents a mile. In Ontario they are actually charging three and a third cents a mile, in the west the Canadian Pacific Railway are charging four cents a mile, in Quebec they are charging between three and four cents a mile and they will continue to charge it just as long as this parliament fails to do its duty in the matter. In the state of Michigan the legislature tackled this question, they reduced the rate and the railways had to accept it. As I have pointed out to this before these great companies that ran across the province of Ontario and Quebec handling traffic from Boston and New York to Chicago and the west charge the travel that originates in the United States two cents a mile and less than two cents a mile while sitting alongside of these passengers are Canadians whom they are charging three and three and a third cents a mile. Is that fair treatment of the Canadian public by the parliament of Canada? I doubt if that question will ever be approached and dealt with by the Railway Commission. The Railway Commission is not competent to deal with it, it would not undertake the responsibility of dealing with it and it looks to parliament to fix a standard passenger rate. The railways are doing such a business in this country that the old argument that they are opening up new country will not now prevail. Even in the new country the railways are overcrowded. The new line of the Ontario government running up north is overcrowded every day. It is making money; all the railways are making money and they ought to concede something to the public. The only railway that has put up rates on the public is the Intercolonial Railway. I regret that this has happened. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals told us in the House that he had increased the rates. They had a two cent a mile rate on the Intercolonial Railway. They might have it yet, but it is very limited in its application.

Mr. EMMERSON. It was very much too low at two cents a mile.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Then it should have worked out very much to the profit of the Intercolonial Railway. I would like nothing better than to see the experiment tried on the Intercolonial Railway; I think it would justify itself. The province of Ontario to-day is making a maximum passenger rate of two cents a mile for the electric lines in that province, and that follows what has been done in the United States. There is any amount of traction in the United States to-day for a cent a mile and the companies are making big money. Wherever railway travel has been reduced in price the result has been greater profit to the railways and less cost to the travelling public. Every time railway rates have been reduced the traffic has been increased, the convenience of the public is enhanced, and the profit of the railways larger. Time and again I have presented these facts in the House and I do not want to reiterate

them. I trust that parliament will now accept the principle of the regulation of express charges by the Railway Commission, and that a maximum rate of two cents a mile on all railways in this country will be fixed by legislation. I move the second reading of this Bill.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). It is always an agreeable task to deal with some of the points raised by my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) because he presents them in a novel if not in an erratic way.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. And an erratic government adopts them a little later on.

Mr. EMMERSON. The hon. gentleman has propounded the same old question with respect to express companies; but oftentimes those who are not freighted with the responsibility of enacting legislation, can see a clear road ahead when others cannot. However, there are difficulties in this case. Year after year the hon. gentleman, presenting his case, has never yet suggested anything in the form of a remedy. In the first place, one difficulty is that express companies are not in the same position as are the railways. The Dominion parliament has subsidized railways from the beginning, and it can be claimed that this parliament should hold the strings on these railways and exercise control of them. The same argument would not apply to the control of express companies. An express company is an incorporated body—whether it be under the control of a railway company or not—having for its object certain methods of transportation. They call around at different places with their wagons and their delivery teams and gather merchandise to be transported by rail or steamer to certain points. They seek the cheapest and speediest means of transportation, but their care of the freight does not stop at the railway station because they deliver it to the place of business or the residence of the consignee.

Mr. J. D. REID. The railway company does the same thing.

Mr. EMMERSON. Only in certain large centers, such as Montreal.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. But it is done.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is done but under special circumstances.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. It is no obstacle then.

Mr. EMMERSON. In the case of freight carried by railways, the Railway Commission can form a judgment as to a reasonable rate, but in the case of express companies, the goods for example are taken out by rail to some town on the prairie, a private team by an arrangement or the mail carrier, will take it thirty or forty miles and deliver it to the farmer right at his home, and it would be very difficult for any tribunal to determine under these circumstances what a rate should be.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the minister say that is the usual custom with express companies ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I say it is the universal custom.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman is speaking without knowledge, because I am familiar with the custom in my part of the country and the express companies do not deliver freight or gather it up either. It is taken to the railway station and presented to them and when freight comes by express it comes to the station and you have to hunt it up yourself.

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not know exactly where my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) lives, but it is the custom in eastern Canada, and it is the custom in the west, and it is the universal custom in the United States.

Mr. SPROULE. I can tell the hon. gentleman—

Mr. EMMERSON. Will my hon. friend wait till I am finished.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to merely state this—

Mr. EMMERSON. No, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPROULE. I am living on the Canadian Pacific Railway, and to-day—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the hon. gentleman should be allowed to say where he lives.

Mr. EMMERSON. I had no intention of calling into question the place of residence of my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) or to say that the hon. gentleman did not have a place of residence either in Ontario or elsewhere in Canada, but I do question the knowledge which the hon. gentleman has of the custom of express companies.

Mr. FOSTER. I live in the east, or used to, along the line of the Intercolonial Railway and what the minister says is news to me.

Mr. BENNETT. It is news to everybody.

Mr. FOSTER. The custom must have been changed since I was down there two or three years ago. The express companies never hunted me up and delivered a parcel; I had to go to the station and get it.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) was never there when he was living in that section of the country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is a pretty good Irish bull, but what I mean is that when my hon. friend was living in New Brunswick he was in Ottawa all the time.

Mr. FOSTER. Seriously, what you say is not the custom of the express companies in the east.

Mr. SPROULE. Nor in the west.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen to make statements of this kind. My statement is made on the authority of a member of parliament who has had actual practical experience, and I know it is true with respect to eastern towns and cities. I am not going to question the experience of the hon. gentleman, but I am speaking now with a knowledge of facts which have led me to a conclusion with respect to the difficulties of bringing express companies under the rule. It will be admitted that railway companies will carry their freightage from one point on their railway to another point or to a connecting railway. Express companies do not depend on their own powers of transportation, but are dependent upon other companies—railway lines, steamship lines, private conveyances, mail carriers, in different sections of the country. I do not say that it would not be desirable to have the tolls of the express companies regulated and controlled, but I do say that there are not the same reasons why this parliament should put its hands on these companies as on railway companies, because they have been granted no subsidies and there are practical difficulties in the way of attempting to deal with them that do not exist in the case of railways. Changes are going on every day in the methods of transportation. The mover of this Bill has said that he has made suggestions in years gone by that are bearing fruitage to-day. The tree that would bear fruitage to-day may not have been a fruitage-bearing tree a few years ago. In the process of evolution the changes going on from time to time make applicable to-day what was perhaps very inapplicable a few years ago under the conditions then prevailing. We must all recognize with respect to passenger rates that you could not apply arbitrarily the same rule in a sparsely settled section of the country that you would apply in a thickly settled section. My hon. friend speaks of populous centres where there is a very large passenger traffic. In such conditions a very low passenger rate would be applicable, but my hon. friend who comes from the east will bear me out in the statement that there is hardly a railway in the eastern provinces that is paying a dividend—why? Because they serve sparsely settled sections, and they have not the freight or the passenger traffic to justify this parliament in arbitrarily fixing a low rate on these lines because a certain rate would be applicable between Toronto and Montreal. With the very moderate rates charged over these branch lines of railway in the east, they do not make any money; indeed, in some cases, their earnings are not sufficient to meet their expenses. The main point we must all recognize is this, that traffic governs. It is all very well to cite the illustrations of Ohio and Massachusetts. We all know that the Boston and Maine system has such an immense traffic and its earnings are so great that it is compelled, I will not say to waste its money, but to expend it in permanent betterments, because under the law of Massachusetts, which governs its charters, after its dividends reach 10 per cent the excess goes into the state treasury. What has been the result? That though its earning power, in spite of everything, has exceeded 10 per cent all along its lines; it builds stone and concrete embankments and stations in order that its surplus earnings may not reach the 10 per cent dividend. It will hardly be contended, even by my hon. friend from York, that that illustration should govern us. They needed no law to control them; the conditions controlled them. The same is true of Ohio. Those who know anything with respect to the progress of that country, the increase of population and the expansion of manufacturing interests, know that the railways might under certain circumstances have been compelled to charge a rate not in excess of two cents per mile. That has not been found necessary, and the railways are enabled voluntarily, without any compulsion of the legislature, to lessen their rate.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Will the hon. gentleman let me say that I hold in my hand the statement of the Pennsylvania lines west of Pittsburg in connection with the proposition to fix a maximum passenger rate of two cents a mile which railways may charge in the state of Ohio. Here is the whole case presented by their own lawyer. They would not admit it until they had to. So my hon. friend's whole argument falls on the ground.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend says they passed the law. The legislature recognized that the conditions had changed, and that the rates should be lessened. But no man who knows anything of railroads and railroad conditions in Canada will say that outside of a certain area there is that earning power that will justify parliament in taking the railroads under their control and compelling them to reduce their rates. It may be true that the Canadian Pacific Railway, by reason of its large land grant and the large subsidies given it, might be in a position to have its earning power curtailed and might be fairly compelled to reduce its rates. But there are so many other railways in Canada which are not in that position that it would seem to me we should hesitate before saying arbitrarily to them all: You shall do this. I am not antagonistic even to the principle of controlling express companies although I can see many

reasons why there is no justification for this under the circumstances. It is unfortunate that my hon. friend should indulge in the statement that because one is not able to see eye to eye with him, either as to the time a thing should be done or as to whether it should be done at all, one is necessarily under the control of some corporation. Such charges and imputations of motives are unworthy of the cause the hon. gentleman is attempting to espouse. It will hardly be said that I am in any way connected with railway or other corporations or am a very great friend of theirs because my position with respect to the government railway would surely militate against my being always in favour of the private corporations. The remarks of my hon. friend apply to every member of this parliament who may chance to differ from him, and I think more highly of this parliament than to suppose that hon. members are actuated by the unworthy motives which my hon. friend is so free in attributing to those who are not prepared to accept his views.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I wish to refer for a few moments to the argument of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, if his remarks may properly be designated as an argument. But before doing so I wish to say a word regarding the accuracy of a statement I made. If I understood the hon. gentleman correctly, he said it was the universal practice for express companies to collect and deliver their freight. Well, I venture to differ from him, and in doing so I referred to the custom, which I know from personal knowledge prevails in the section where I live. There the express companies neither collect nor deliver their freight. In reply to that statement the hon. minister questioned my knowledge and experience and wanted to know where I lived. I endeavoured to tell him that I live in a section which is an important feeder of the Canadian Pacific Railway. But the hon. gentleman would not allow me to give the information and seemed very adverse to obtaining it. Well, I say now emphatically—and I speak from knowledge quite as extensive as that which the hon. gentleman possesses, because I happen to be one of those who have handled for many years express companies freight in a certain locality—I say emphatically that it is not the custom of the express companies to collect or deliver freight. I know as well that in some towns or villages an exception may be found, but it is only an exception, and originally on the Canadian Pacific Railway, where I speak of, the express business was done by a private company, but that has been changed and that the private express company which did the freighting along that route was compelled to abandon it and the Canadian Pacific Railway took over the express business and have carried it on ever since. And in some of the larger towns and cities, I admit that they deliver the freight, but in the great bulk of the smaller places they neither collect nor deliver freight to-day. When therefore the Minister of Railways speaks of the universal custom of express companies which makes their business different from the transportation of freight by railways and justifies the refusal of the government to bring them under the board of railway commissioners, I say that he is simply putting up a man of straw for the purpose of knocking it down. The custom is not a universal one. It is not even a common one. The freight will lie there and the parties for whom it is intended may not become aware of the fact for days unless they send down to inquire about it. I speak from personal knowledge. I need only appeal to the members of this House; many of whom are in commercial life and doing business with the express and railway companies every week of the year, to have what I say verified as absolutely correct. In some of the larger places the express companies do collect and deliver the freight but in the great majority of smaller places they do not.

Mr. FINLAY. May I put the hon. gentleman a question? I live in a village of 1,200 inhabitants and I can tell the hon. gentleman that there they both deliver and collect our freight.

Mr. SPROULE. What question is the hon. gentleman attempting to put?

Mr. FINLAY. About express companies. You are stating what is not correct. I am willing to put up $50 and let you do the same, and we can telegraph to the head office of any company and ascertain which is correct.

Mr. SPROULE. Does the hon. member pretend to say that my statement is not correct?

Mr. FINLAY. I do.

Mr. SPROULE. I can tell the hon. gentleman that he is—but I will not say what was in my mind because it would probably be unparliamentary. I can tell him, however, if he is either a merchant or a man who uses the express companies or railways for the transportation of freight, that his knowledge is extremely limited.

Mr. FINLAY. I am a manufacturer and ship more goods over railways in one week than you do in a year. I ship by express every day and they collect the freight right along.

Mr. SPROULE. That may be the case and yet it does not refute the statement I have made. I am speaking of what I know. I have known for years, and can

verify what I state, that right along the Canadian Pacific Railway between Toronto and Owen Sound, in village after village along that road, the express companies neither deliver nor collect the freight. And if the hon. gentleman denies that, he is speaking without knowledge. The Minister of Railways says it is the universal custom in the east. Well, I did not say anything about east because I do not know what that is, but I do know what is the custom in the west because I have been using both railways and express companies sufficiently to enable me to know it. The hon. minister said that the railway companies would not carry freight beyond the ends of their roads but would exchange it with other roads, but that express companies will transport sometimes by stage and sometimes by rail and therefore you cannot bring them under the Railway Commission. Is it a fact that railway companies do not send freight beyond the ends of their lines? Not at all. It has been the custom of some of these companies in our country to send their freight on by boat and by stage 20 or 30 miles beyond their lines. Therefore there is no force in that argument. If the railway companies can be dealt with successfully by the Railway Commission I do not see any reason why the express companies cannot be controlled equally as well in the same manner.

The hon. member says that traffic governs, that conditions force them, that railway companies voluntarily reduce the rate to two cents per mile where traffic justifies it. I have never yet known such a case. I would like him to give me an instance where a railway company of their own voluntary motion and without pressure, reduced their rate for travel to two cents per mile. The hon. minister did not give us a single example, he made the bald statement. But to controvert that statement we have the fact that in the United States railway companies have been compelled to reduce their traffic rate to two cents a mile. It was done by compulsion of the state legislatures, over which railways have not sufficient control to prevent such legislation. They lobbied against it, they presented their arguments, but they did not succeed in convincing the legislature, or in dissuading it from passing a Bill to compel them to reduce their rates. Now they are working under that system, and find it is paying fairly well.

Mr. EMMERSON. If my hon. friend will pardon me—the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) stated that the Boston and Maine system made the reduction without any compulsion, they did it voluntarily.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Yes, but the hon. gentleman said that Ohio had done it voluntarily, when I immediately produced a document showing that the companies had bought it.

Mr. SPROULE. I refer to the two cent a mile rate on the railways of Michigan, where it was only done after the legislature of that state compelled it to be done. The same thing, I believe, took place in the state of New York, or some state through which a portion of the New York Central passes; and they were compelled to do it in several instances. There may be isolated cases where the railways have done it of their voluntary motion, but I say that is not the rule, and the two cent a mile rate is a result of compulsion.

Mr. EMMERSON. The Boston and Maine system is one of the largest in the United States.

Mr. SPROULE. The Boston and Maine may be one of them, I am not contradicting the minister in that regard. Now this Bill seeks to do two or three things. First, it seeks to put these express companies under the Railway Commission; second, it seeks to compel the railway companies to allow telephones to be put in their stations without being compelled to pay the railway companies therefor, as the law at present compels them; third, it seeks to introduce a two cent a mile rate. Now, with regard to the proposal to compel the railways to allow telephones to be put in their stations, I am pleased to believe that the amendment to the Railway Act, which the Minister of Justice said he intended to introduce, will accomplish it. I am sure this House and the country will be glad to know that he intends to make that amendment.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is in it now.

Mr. SPROULE. Well, I say that it then does away with the necessity of one clause of this Bill of the hon. member for South York, and I intend to direct my attention to that portion of it. Now, to-day, one of the important conveniences of a railway company is that it is a common carrier, that is the important work of a railway company. It is equally a common carrier when it is an express company, doing an express business over its own lines; it is a common carrier in the latter case just as much as when it is carrying ordinary freight. The man who is transporting freight in an ordinary freight car under the rules of the road, and who is also transporting freight over the same road, and perhaps in the same car, under authority of an express company that is owned by the railway company, controlled by the railway company, the freight being handled by the same company—I say the man who is doing that is doing the same work with two companies where in reality he ought to be doing it only with one. If the railway company is willing to allow itself to be under the control of a railway commission when it is transporting ordinary freight, it ought to be equally willing to allow an express company

to come under the same restrictions when it is transporting freight of the same character, by the same hands, freight drawn by the same engine, and carried over the same road. I do not see any difference.

See the convenience it would be to the shipper. To-day if shipping freight he sustains a loss when he wants to get redress he is obliged to go to two or more different tribunals. If he wishes to send that freight over the company's line as a common carrier, and any injustice is done him, he prosecutes his suit in the one way and before the one tribunal. If he sends a portion of the freight by express, because he desires to have it handled more quickly, and if an injustice is done him, he cannot prosecute his suit before the same tribunal and in the same way. Therefore he finds the present system complicated, annoying and disagreeable. So, I say that since the railway company handles the freight in both cases, both as an express agent and as an express company—because they are an express company themselves as well as freight agents—then I do not see any argument and never could see any argument why express companies should not be under the control of that Railway Commission as well as railway companies. To my mind it is no argument to say that because an express company handles freight a little differently from a railway company, though it is handled by the same company in both cases, and carried over the same road, I say the mere fact that it is handled in a little different way by the express company, is no argument why it should not be under the control of the Railway Commission as well as the railway company. The shipper who is constantly sending and receiving freight uses at the same time the same railway, the same men handle and carry both classes of freight; then why should he have to go to different tribunals to get redress?

One argument which was frequently presented to this House and to the Railway Committee years ago in favour of taking over the provincial roads and declaring them to be railways for the general advantage of Canada, was that you gave the shipper the advantage of prosecuting his suit under one law. Under the one system, if a man put his goods upon a provincial railway at Toronto, goods consigned to Halifax, and they were destroyed in the province of Québec, he was obliged to enter suit in a different place; whereas if the railway was declared to be for the general advantage of Canada he could prosecute his suit in any part of Canada, under the same law, under the same conditions, in his endeavour to get redress. The system that obtained was then declared to be very inconvenient. I remember the late Dalton McCarthy giving an illustration of the inconvenience. A lot of cattle were killed and the owner did not know how to get redress. I believe the cattle were shipped over a provincial line. How could he get redress? The suit was entered in one court, and he was told that was not the proper court. What court was he to go to? It was contended that in the interest of the shipper these railways ought to be declared railways for the general advantage of Canada, and then you could prosecute your claim in any court, no matter in what part of Canada the injury was sustained by the shipper. Now the very same principle applies to the transportation of goods when they are in the possession of express companies. You ought to be able to prosecute that suit in the one court for any portion of Canada; you ought to be able to go before the Railway Commission and get redress where injustice is done in the handling of that freight, in the charges on it by an express company as you can in the case of a railway company.

There is another feature that always seemed to be very important, owing to the fact that railway companies are of late acquiring express companies themselves, they have practically done away with the competition that formerly existed between the express and railway companies; you have no competition to-day. It is true that express companies usually charged more, but they were always bidding for more freight to be sent by express and very frequently would offer lower rates than usual to induce you to send a larger quantity of express than you were in the habit of sending. The railway companies were bidding against them for the same freight, and you had a healthy competition between the two that brought about the best results and the lowest rates for the shipper. That is all done away with to-day and we have no control over the rates, but if the express companies were placed under the Railway Commission, we might have some control, and a remedy where injustice was done. We desire to have the control and for that purpose it is desirable, in our judgment, to have these express companies placed under the Railway Commission. There is no longer the competition we used to have and therefore evils will creep in, and injustice will be done. I am in favour of this Bill. I could never see any good reason why the express companies should not be under the control of the Railway Commission the same as the other corporations.

With regard to the two cent rate I hold somewhat different views from the member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean). I believe that where a railway company is doing a good, paying business, we would be justified in compelling them to reduce their rate to two cents. But there are many portions of the country where they are not doing that business and it always seemed to me that the graduated scale imposed by the state of Michigan was a fair, proper and reasonable system. Under that system where the earnings are $3,000 per mile, the rate is two cents; where the earnings are

between $3,000 and $2,000 the railways may charge a little more and where the earnings are less than $2,000, they are allowed to charge three cents. I still think there should be a graduated tariff, and therefore I would not be prepared to go the whole length of this proposal and say their rates should be absolutely the two cent rate. But I think there are many portions of Canada where that rate ought to be given to-day and where people believe it would be a reasonable rate. The hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. MacPherson) spoke as if the people in this country were perfectly satisfied with the rates charged by the railway corporations. I can only tell him that was not the impression left on my mind when travelling in his country, and I do not think he is voicing the sentiment of his own constituents in saying that with regard to the ordinary passenger travel.

Mr. SAM. BARKER (Hamilton). I agree in a great measure with what has just been said by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). We have had this question up before and I think that what has just been said with reference to the express companies will be endorsed by most of this House. I live in a city and I know that within very recent times, within a very few years, in a city of over 50,000 people it was not the general rule to deliver the goods sent by express. It may be that in a village of 1,000 people a manufacturer who has a pretty large business may get his goods delivered regularly but the ordinary inhabitant of a city does not and I think this statement will be generally endorsed. I live not over three-fourths of a mile from the express office, and I have received notices by card and have had to go for express parcels sent me. As a rule in such places a line is drawn within which they deliver, but outside of that line you have to send for the goods, and I think you will find that in the smaller towns and villages that is the general rule. To say that a gentleman who is a manufacturer gets his goods delivered promptly is no test as to the experience of the general body of people.

Mr. FINLAY. I would like to inform the hon. gentleman that all the store keepers and business men in my town, which has a population of 1,200, receive prompt delivery.

Mr. BARKER. I just said that a manufacturer and large business man might receive it, but I am speaking of the ordinary person who receives goods by express. I am not a merchant or a manufacturer and I have received many parcels by express and not very long since I had to send for my parcels to the express office. I do not say that as a complaint against the express companies ; I am only stating what I know to be a fact. I agree with the principle that an express company, like a railway, telephone or telegraph company, having corporate powers and exercising the functions of a carrier, should, as to its tolls and the conduct of its business be under the supervision and control of the Board of Railway Commissioners. I do not doubt that a moment, but I do not approve of this Bill ; I do not quite see how it is possible to insert two or three lines in an Act like the Railway Act and thereby effectively apply that Act to some particular body or business.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Not two or three lines, only two or three words.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. But it is a principle that you adopt and settle the details in committee.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I will have occasion to point out to my hon. friend how this principle will work out.

Mr. BARKER. I have given some thought to this question and I think it is absolutely impossible to make the Railway Act applicable under such circumstances.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Hear, hear.

Mr. BARKER. And I have told the hon. member so before.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Hear, hear.

Mr. BARKER. With regard to the principle, I thoroughly agree with him and I think the Bill might be read as a recognition of the principle ; but I observe that another member has given notice of a Bill on this very subject, and I hope and believe that he has drawn a Bill that may be made applicable without altering the Railway Act. That is the system on which any person attempting to make a working Act for the express companies would proceed. The principle is the same in both cases, but one Bill will, I think, be a workable Bill and the other absolutely unworkable.

As regards the question of the two cents a mile passenger rate, I am quite in accord with the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). I think any person who has any knowledge of railway business will admit that it is absurd to try and apply the same rate per mile that is charged passengers carried in a thickly settled community, to all parts of the country. You can get in the state of New York a rate per mile that gives an enormous return to a railway company, but apply that rate to a sparsely settled country and the company would starve under it. Everybody recognizes that. I do not think I can appeal to a better witness on that point than the member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean). That hon. gentleman had a Bill of this character before the House in a previous session in which he sought to make the law of the land exactly what he proposes to-day, a compulsory rate of not more than two cents a mile. That Bill was referred to the Railway Committee and was discussed day after day there. Railway men and other men were brought to give evidence and make statements to the committee.

What was the result? The hon. gentleman was successful in his usual manner in drawing to his support hon. gentlemen on both sides of this House. Hon. gentlemen on this side of the House supported him in the committee; hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House supported him, and yet without consulting, as far as I know, one gentleman who thus supported him, he abandoned his two cent a mile Bill and adopted another system. He took up, without a word of consultation with his friends, the Michigan scale system, adapting the charge to the revenue, acknowledging the principle that everybody, I think, who knows anything about it approves of, that the rate must be governed almost entirely by the extent of the traffic. So, as I have said, when you take a country like the state of Ohio or the state of New York, where there is an enormous traffic, a rate may be a paying rate there, which, if applied to the northern parts of Ontario, would ruin the companies. The hon. gentleman saw that himself, and after discussing it in committee he sought to apply the Michigan scale. He now goes back to the two cents a mile rate. I cannot approve of that. I believe that everybody in this House and in this country will approve of the principle of the lowest possible paying rates. That is a principle we all can agree on, but here the hon. gentleman says that the rate in all parts of this country shall not be more than two cents a mile. I do not think that there is any business man who tries to consider the subject at all with fairness to the public and to the company who will say that there is no part of this country where two cents a mile would not be too little a charge to allow any margin of profit to the railway company. For that reason I do not approve of this part of the Bill. I shall be very glad to see the whole subject dealt with fairly but I think, considering the fact that we are paying a very large sum of money per annum for a Board of Railway Commissioners and that within two or three years we have given them power to deal with this question of rates in any way that may be just and equitable, we ought not now to interfere, and take this power out of their hands. At all events, I think that my hon. friend should have brought a large body of his constituents, or at least some of his enthusiastic supporters before the Railway Commissioners and shown that the rates should be lowered in particular sections of the country, or in the whole country. That has not been attempted. We are asked, after appointing a Board of Railway Commissioners, men who are admitted to be honest and fully capable, to take the work out of their hands and say that with all their experience, knowledge and facilities for gaining information we do not care what their opinion may be, they shall not allow more than two cents a mile. I cannot agree to that. I do not think the members of the House are justified in agreeing to it. As to the other feature of the Bill, I agree with the principle that express rates should be controlled by the government through the Railway Commission. The only difficulty I see as to the hon. gentleman's Bill is that he does not provide any machinery to apply it and I do hope that this session another hon. gentleman in this House will endeavour to present a Bill which will apply such machinery.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minter of Justice). Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure that it will be considered unnecessary for me to say anything in respect to the two cent a mile rate after what has just fallen from the lips of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker.) I think he has disposed of the Bill of the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) pretty effectively in so far as that point is concerned. Dealing with the question of the control of express charges, I think there is no doubt that it would be most desirable that we should either give to the Railway Commission jurisdiction in respect to the control of express charges or that we should arrange in some way to have that control exercised through some other channel. But, this is not a question that comes up to-day for the first time. My hon. friend from Hamilton will remember that when the Bill to consolidate the Railway Act was first introduced into this House in 1903 it was referred to a committee for the purpose of hearing any suggestions that might be made from the different interests in the country that would be affected by this legislation. Among the other bodies that appeared before the sub-committee at that time was the Toronto Board of Trade, and I can remember quite distinctly that they were represented by an eminent lawyer from the city of Hamilton, Mr. Lynch Staunton, who pressed for the consideration of this question in connection with the Railway Act that was then under consideration; that is to say, he was anxious, speaking in the interest of the Toronto Board of Trade, that we should endeavour to find some means to carry out what I think we all have in view—the control of express rates and charges. After considering the matter in the sub-committee the conclusion arrived at then was that it was practically impossible at that time to find machinery which would enable us to exercise that effective control which we ought to have over these express charges. Since that time the matter has been considered again and again, and we, up to the present, have not been able to find a solution for the difficulty, but that we ought to find a solution for it I agree and that we can find a solution for it I also believe. Let me suggest in order that the members of this House who are giving to this matter serious and honest consideration for the purpose of applying a remedy to the existing evil—not those who are here

simply for the purpose of making a little capital out of it—

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Hear, hear. The hon. gentleman is taking his medicine now.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Let me suggest to the consideration of those members of the House who have been giving and are willing to give some honest and serious consideration to the subject what the difficulties are. Let us take for instance, an express package that leaves Toronto, the point of destination being Charlottetown, P.E.I. This express package leaves Toronto either by the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Grand Trunk Railway, and reaches Montreal. At Montreal the package is placed in the possession of the Intercolonial Railway, let us say, or it is placed in possession of the Quebec Steamship Company to be carried by water. How are you going to deal with the charge for that express package after it reaches either of these two carriers? The Railway Commission have no control over the steamboat and they have no control over the Intercolonial Railway. How are you going to deal with it? That is one difficulty that ought to be considered.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Can it not be surmounted?

Mr. BARKER. It is a difficulty, but I think it can be surmounted.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I do not say that it cannot be surmounted; we want it to be surmounted, but I want some one to suggest a way to deal with it.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. That is what you are for.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I want some one to suggest a way to deal with it. In addition to that the express company does a large amount of business in the way of transmission of money. How are you going to deal with that?

Mr. BARKER. That is a very serious difficulty.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. What is going to be the remedy applied to the charges they make in connection with that branch of their business? In addition to that we all know that in large cities express companies do what I might call a domestic business.

Mr. BARKER. Does the hon. gentleman see any difficulty in applying the rules of the Board of Railway Commissioners to everything that the express company does except the carrying of money?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I will try to deal with it. I will say how far I think we can remedy the difficulty. You have in addition the domestic business that the express company does, that is, the business they do in large cities and towns in the way of receiving and delivering parcels.

Mr. FOSTER. Received in these towns and being delivered in them?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. How are you going to deal with that? You have no control over that sort of business. It is a mere cartage over which you cannot exercise any jurisdiction or control. Therefore, to be brief in connection with the matter, the point to which I would direct the consideration of this House would be whether or not we ought to consider the advisability of dealing with express charges only in so far as these express charges are connected with railway corporations which are under our jurisdiction and control. That is a suggestion that might well deserve consideration. How would the difficulty with respect to excessive express rates be met by this Bill which we are asked to accept? It is suggested that we should agree to amend section 3 of the Railway Act. I would ask my hon. friend from Hamilton and those who have given to this some serious consideration to bear with me for a moment while I let them see what it would mean. Section 3 says:

> This Act shall apply to all persons, companies and railways (other than government railways).

The difficulty occurs there immediately in respect to the Intercolonial Railway.

> Within the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada, and shall be incorporated and construed as one Act, with the Special Act, subject as herein provided.

Now, does not that section apply to express companies in so far as an express company is a 'company' within the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada? How much further does the amendment carry you? The member for South York suggests we should add:

> This Act shall apply to all persons, and express companies, companies and railways.

As a piece of model drafting nothing can be conceived superior to that.

> Express companies and companies.

What would be the effect of our adopting such legislation as that. Is it necessary for me to discuss this Bill any further?

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara). I come from a district where there is a great deal of express business done, and I am entirely in favour of bringing these express companies within the purview of some authority to control their rates. I am not in favour of this Bill in the way it is drawn, and I shall give my reasons. But, first, let me say a word as to the statement of the Minister of Railways and of his ally from East Peterboro (Mr. Finlay), in regard to express companies delivering and collecting freight from the people at their houses or offices. Although a much younger man than the member for East Peterborough, I would advise

him to travel a little, I would ask him to come to the Niagara district in May when the blossoms are on the peach trees, or in September when the trees are laden with fruit, and there he will see more express business done to the square mile than anywhere else in Canada. And if he can point out any places but Hamilton and St. Catharines, between Hamilton and the Niagara river, including the old historic town of Niagara-on-the-lake, the large village of Merritton, population 2,000 ; the thriving village of Grimsby, population 1,200 ; the beautiful little village of Beamsville, population 1,000 if the hon. gentleman will point out a single place except the large city of Hamilton and the smaller city of St. Catharines where any collecting or delivering is done by the express companies, with their own wagons, I will get some good natured fruit grower better off than I am to present him with some peaches to keep him in a good state of health and his blood in better order, so that he will not make such rash statements. We have allowed the hon. gentleman (Mr. Finlay) to tell us that we do not know what we are talking about on this question, but I know the province of Ontario well and I assert here as a fact that the member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) was absolutely right when he said, that outside of the very large towns and cities there is no such custom among the express companies as to deliver and collect freight by their wagons.

I am opposed to this Bill, and why ? It is because in my humble opinion it will accomplish nothing, because it simply lays down an academic proposition without providing a remedy, and because it will simply made confusion worse confounded. I have had occasion in this House to find fault with certain matters being referred to the Railway Commission instead of being dealt with by the House, but there were reasons why the Railway Commission was appointed ; and perhaps the chief reason was that the Commission might control the rates charged by railway companies for the transportation of freight, and to regulate the interchange of traffic between themselves. The express companies are closely allied with the railway companies, and there should be some authority to control their rates just as the railways are sought to be controlled —the railways are not controlled as much as we want them to be, but we have hope that the Commission will accomplish more in that direction in the future. I agree with what has been said by the member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) and by the Minister of Justice, that some remedy ought to be applied in the case of the express companies. I want a remedy applied, I believe the Railway Commission the proper tribunal to deal with the matter, and to that extent I am in favour of the Bill introduced by my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean). But as that Bill is now drawn it would simply introduce confusion and not provide a remedy. I understand that the hon. gentleman from Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn) is to introduce a practical Bill, to the drafting of which he has given great care and attention, and which will deal in an effective way with the control of rates charged by express companies. Knowing that my hon. friend (Mr. Alcorn) is to introduce such practical legislation which I believe will accomplish good, I feel justified in voting against this Bill because I will get more effective legislation from the proposal of the hon. gentleman from Prince Edward. I did vote for the Bill of my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) in the session of 1903 in the absence of any better legislation, and as I felt we would be able to amend it in committee. But, having looked into it more carefully since, I am bound to say that if we adopted it we would have to amend the Railway Act in 100 or more clauses in order to make this proposal workable. In the interests of the fruit shippers of the Niagara district I am anxious that express companies should be controlled, but I cannot vote for this Bill for the reason that it would not bring about that proper control which we desire. I shall have pleasure, however, in supporting the Bill to be introduced by my hon. friend from Prince Edward.

Two years ago I voted against the proposal of the hon. gentleman from York (Mr. Maclean) for a two cent rate. I shall be obliged to vote in that way again, and for this reason if for no other : While we want the lowest passenger rates we can get, we want to ensure that the man who is entitled to low rate shall get it. It is the duty of the Railway Commission to declare what is a fair rate both for freight and passengers in all parts of this country. Supposing the people west of Winnipeg (because of the long distance between the stations and the scarcity of travel, should fairly be called upon to pay two and a half or three cents a mile, and supposing that the people in the populous Niagara district where the stations are only a few miles apart were entitled to even a lower rate than two cents a mile, I want to have it so that they will be enabled to get what they are entitled to in this respect.

When they do that much more travelling every week or every month, I think they are entitled to a correspondingly lower rate. The Railway Commission should have the power to fix a one-and-a-half-cent or two-cent rate, if they chose, for a certain part of Ontario, and a different rate for another part. But this Bill, if passed, would not permit a higher rate than two cents anywhere, which in my humble opinion would prevent the railways giving a lower rate than two cents in some districts where they might otherwise do so. If the Commission should be of opinion that in the Niagara district or in some other part of

Ontario the rate should be a lower rate than two cents a mile, they could not insist upon railways giving that lower rate because they could not allow them to charge more than two cents a mile in some other districts where the conditions would justify a higher rate. The question of what the rate should be in any particular section of the country can best be adjusted by the Railway Commission, and I think that body ought to be allowed a free hand to fix the rate. If we passed this legislation, the railways could nowhere charge more than two cents a mile, and that would indirectly prevent them from giving a lower rate in some parts of the country where they might otherwise be disposed to do so, and therefore the people in those parts would be paying more than they would be entitled to pay, and the whole net result would be different from what ought to be accomplished by legislation of this kind. Then, what about the freight rates? If we so act as to compel the Railway Commission to fix a maximum passenger rate which will not enable the railway company to earn a decent dividend, what then? Although I am sometimes accused of being too hard on the corporations, I want it to be understood that I do not expect any corporation to be made to work for nothing. What I have claimed has been that they are unfair to the people; but I do not want the people to be unfair to them. I want to render to Caesar those things that belong to Caesar, and when a railway company is not able to pay proper wages to its employees, or to pay damages to people whom it injures, or to carry on its business in a proper way, because its passenger rates, have been drastically reduced to a point that will not enable it to pay a reasonable dividend, what is the result? The result is that the freight rates will go up, and who pays the freight rates? the farmers, and others whom I am endeavouring to represent in this House. The result would be that the people who now pay the great bulk of the taxes of this country, would be paying heavier freight rates in order that the people in the cities and towns, who travel the most, and most of whom are better able to pay the passenger rates than the farmers, could travel around at reduced rates. In short, the railway company would have to place an additional burden on the farmers in order to lessen the burden on the few travelling people of the cities and towns. For these reasons I am disposed to vote against the Bill.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough). There seems to be a disposition on the part of some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House to doubt the statement of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals that in the small towns in eastern Canada the express companies both receive and deliver goods. I would like to say that the statement of the minister is entirely correct, in my experience. I live in a small town of 5,000 inhabitants, and I think for the last fifteen years the express companies have both collected and delivered express parcels in that town. This is true of New Glasgow, Sydney, North Sydney, Westville, Truro, Amherst, Spring Hill, and every town and village of any size in the province of Nova Scotia. I believe it is also true of the province of New Brunswick and the province of Prince Edward Island, and I am told that it is true to a very large extent of the province of Quebec. I have no doubt that it is also true to a great extent of the province of Ontario. It may be that there are some country districts in that province where they are a little slow, and they do not do it; but in the province from which I come, they would not tolerate such a system for a moment.

Mr. R. BLAIN (Peel). I am in favour of the Bill as it proposes to enact such legislation as will bring the express companies under the control of the Railway Commission. In the consideration of this question we must keep in view this fact, that a very large quantity of goods are now being carried by express which in the earlier days were carried by freight. For instance, the farmers within a area of ten, twenty or fifty miles of every large city in Canada—this is the case around the city of Toronto—ship in express packages many products, such as butter, eggs, cream and milk, which fifteen years ago were sent by freight or taken in wagon, this means that the farmer is a larger contributor to the express companies and a smaller contributor to the freight of the railways. As this is the trend of trade in this country, I think it is very important that when the Railway Commission has proven itself such a success in the regulation of freight rates, it should have an opportunity of regulating and controlling express rates as well. It is almost impossible for us to separate the carrying of freight from the carrying of express parcels because one train carries both kinds of parcels, and it is rather difficult for us to say that in one case the Railway Commission shall have the right to regulate the rates while in the other case it shall not have that right. I wish to read the statement of Sir Thomas Shaughnessy which has been referred to by my hon. friend from South York:

> It is my opinion that the railroads are making altogether too much opposition to the proposed regulation. It seems to me that the people are entitled to regulate rates. It is, therefore, only a question as to the best method of securing that end.

I shall not weary the House by reading the balance of the statement, but it shows that after two years experience in Canada

of the Railway Commission regulating freight rates, not only are the people being satisfied but the corporations are also contented. If that be the case, I cannot understand why it would not be in the interest of the people that the Railway Commission should also control the charges paid express companies. Important bodies in this country have urged the government to bring these companies under the control of the Railway Board. Only a few days ago the Fruit Growers Association, which met in this city, sent a deputation to wait upon the government and urged the government to adopt this policy. Canada is rapidly becoming a great fruit growing country. In the early days it was thought that we had too cold a climate ever to become large fruit producers. To-day, however, we are not only growing fruit for home consumption but are also exporting it in large quantities, and the time has arrived when the government should see that legislation is adopted to put the express companies under the control of our Railway Commission. Such a move would be in the interests of the whole people.

Mr. E. D. SMITH (Wentworth). I intended to speak at some length on this subject, but as my arguments have been anticipated by one member after another, I shall be very brief. My hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) has just quoted Sir Thos. Shaughnessy as stating in public that he is well satisfied with the Railway Commission which has control over the railways of this country. That being the case, one would naturally suppose that the express companies should also be well satisfied to be put in the same position as the railways. As regards the reasons which would compel me to vote against a two cent rate on the railways, my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) has anticipated my argument so fully that he has dispensed me from stating it. We had the Minister of Justice arguing that because the Intercolonial Railway is not under the Railway Commission, the express business on that railroad could not well come under that board. But I would point out that the express business on the Intercolonial Railway is not carried on by the government but by the Canadian and Dominion Express companies. That being the case, there is no reason why these companies should not come under the Railway Commission and let the Railway Commission control their rates just as well as they might control the rates charged by express companies doing business on the Grand Trunk Railway and Canadian Pacific Railway. The Minister of Railways and Canals argued that because express companies operated upon stage routes and steamboat lines, the Railway Commission could not control their rates.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend perhaps misapprehended me. I said that would add to the difficulties.

Mr. BLAIN.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. No doubt it would, but that is no reason why these difficulties might not be overcome. The Railway Commission has control of the rates charged on railways, both passenger and freight rates, and as the conditions are extremely different in different parts of the country, there are just as many difficulties to overcome in this connection as there would be in the case of express companies, and yet the commission is supposed to be equal to the task of equalizing these rates in the interest of justice. The placing of express companies under a railway commission, which would have authority to investigate and ascertain whether or not they are making excessive profits, seems to me the only way in which one could arrive at a satisfactory conclusion as to whether really these companies are charging excessive rates or not. It is easy to say that they are charging excessive rates ; but if we appeal to the managers of these companies, we shall find them pointing out that in spite of the most economical management, the companies are not making more than a legitimate profit of six per cent. Whether that be the case or not, we are unable to tell, and the only way to find out would be to have these companies put under some commission with power to investigate. These companies being public carriers, the public have the right to demand that they shall not charge exorbitant rates ; but apart altogether from the question of rates, there are many things which this commission might regulate. For instance the rates upon fruit from the Niagara district to the Northwest are higher by Toronto and North Bay than they are by Smith's Falls, although the latter route is 300 or 400 miles longer. The reason given is that in the latter case the fruit is carried by the Dominion Express Company alone, while in the former it is carried by two companies, so that although the distance in the latter case is shorter, the rates charged must be higher. That argument is incontrovertible so long as the second express company—that is the one carrying the goods from Toronto to North Bay, not the one originating the freight or delivering at destination—has the right to charge a fixed rate. That rate is fixed at 50 cents a hundred pounds. If the Railway Commission could remedy such a grievance which handicaps very largely the fruit trade in the Niagara district and other parts of Canada, it would be doing good work in the public interest. In the northwest we have to meet the competition of fruit from the United States; and if the rates were made more reasonable, our Canadian fruit would no doubt command a monopoly in that market. It does not stand to reason that even although the goods are carried by two companies, the rates should be higher by Toronto and North Bay than they are by Smith's Falls over a longer route. On the contrary the rates in the former case should be less. This is just one

instance in which a railway commission could do us great service apart altogether from the general lowering of rates. There can be no doubt also that higher rates are charged in some cases from one point to another than they are in other cases between other points equally distant. This also could be regulated by the commission, and thus prevent injustice being inflicted on one section of the country as compared with another. However as regards express rates in general, the fruit growers believe that they are excessive but have no means of proving it. A commission with power to investigate would be able to ascertain whether these rates are really excessive or not. This is a matter extremely important to the fruit growers of Ontario. We have our markets in the Northwest and the maritime provinces for our fruit; and if the express charges were cut in two we would be able to drive out the California fruit, and these express companies, instead of taking up one car of freight to the Northwest every other day, might be able to take perhaps four or five up there every day. We believe that the markets in the Northwest will consume all the fruit we are growing now, and very much more, and at good prices if we can get what we consider fair rates. But without this law we have no means of securing lower rates; therefore it seems to me the principle of the Bill the hon. member has introduced is a good one. Whether it is workable or not, whether or not it has been brought in in the right manner, it seems to me the principle of the Bill is undoubtedly correct; and if it is not workable, I presume it can be remedied. Therefore I should take great pleasure in voting for it when the opportunity occurs that we can place upon the statute-book a law that is workable.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I can well afford to put up—

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member cannot speak again.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I have a right.

Mr. SPEAKER. I do not think so, there is no right of reply on a motion for the adoption of an Order of the Day. The question is upon a motion for the second reading of Bill (No. 9).

Mr. H. LENNOX (South Simcoe). It may be that almost everything that needs to be said on this question has been said, but that does not relieve members from the necessity of defining their position in regard to this matter. Now, the Bill consists of three sections, two of which have been frequently referred to, and one of which, the second section, has not been referred to to any extent. The second section proposes to amend section 193 of the Railway Act of 1903, which is the section dealing with the right of telephone companies to have their instruments in railway stations, and it puts that matter under the control of the Railway Commission. This provides that the compensation to be exacted for that privilege is to be a reasonable compensation, and it uses these words :

> And such compensation shall be limited to the direct and immediate local damages actually suffered by reason of such construction, operation and maintenance by the railway company at such stations or premises, and not from any cause, matter or business extending beyond the same.

With that proposition I entirely agree. Whether the section is happily worded or not, it expresses very fairly what would be right in that connection. If that section stood alone I should think it was in a very fair state to be sent to the committee for the purpose of enabling the committee to deal with the principle, and to see if we could put the law in better condition than it is to-day. Now, I find that after leaving that section I am confronted with a very serious difficulty. Taking section one of the Bill introduced by the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean), it provides for three additional words in section three of the Railway Act. The Railway Act is composed of upwards of three hundred sections. By that Act we constituted a new court hitherto unknown in Canada, and probably unknown in any country, giving it very large powers, and very ample control over the railways. Unfortunately it does not include the Intercolonial. I think it should have included the Intercolonial, and if conditions remain as they are I hope it will soon include the Intercolonial. In constituting that new court we defined their powers, and in defining the procedure we have referred to railway companies and to matters relating to railway companies more than a hundred times. There are probably nearly a hundred sections which deal with the procedure of that court alone; and it is impossible to suppose that by the mere introduction of three words it would bring about the remedy which we on this side of the House desire. I think I speak for the majority on this side of the House when I say that a great number, at all events, of the gentlemen on this side wish to see the express companies brought under the control of the Railway Commission. Now, I am glad to hear, because it paves the way for the easy success of the Bill which is about to be introduced by the hon. member for Prince Edward County (Mr. Alcorn)—I am glad to hear the Minister of Justice expressing similar views. Therefore I feel that it would be absurd to pass legislation of the nature proposed by the first section of the Act introduced by my hon. friend from South York, because we would be making an exhibition of ourselves before the country, which, whether we regard ourselves as lawyers or laymen, would not be complimentary to us as parliamentarians. The clause as proposed to be amended would read :

This Act shall apply to all persons, and express companies, companies and railways (other than government railways), within the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada, and shall be incorporated and construed as one Act with the Special Act, subject as herein provided.

Now, any one who follows that out will see that he is confronted in that section alone with innumerable difficulties, not only by reason of the exception of government railways, but by other matters such as the Special Act, and so on, referring to railways alone. But that is not the main difficulty in the matter, because if it only consisted in remodelling the third section of the Railway Act we could set to work and do it. But we would find that as soon as a person applied for a remedy under this Act against an express company, the Railway Commission, at the very inception of the transaction, would find that it was impossible for them to take the matter up. I stated when this matter came up before, introduced by the hon. member for South York, that I was in favour of the proposition. I regret to say that sometimes these matters are not fairly represented to the public. I regret to notice in a paper which is usually fair to this House—I won't mention the newspaper—I noticed not very long ago that it attacked certain members : for instance, it attacked the leader of the opposition, and read him out as being one of those who were opposed to putting express companies under the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission. I say that was unfair or dishonest; it was unfair if it was accidentally said, and if it was intentionally done, it was dishonest.

What are the facts, Mr. Speaker? The fact is that when this was introduced my hon. friend was confronted with some technical difficulty and not only did the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) rise and smooth the way for the Bill but he expressly stated that the reason he would not support the legislation was because it was not a practical measure and could not be worked out; but so far as the principle of the Bill—I should not say the principle of the Bill, for there is practically no Bill—so far as the principle of putting the express companies under the control and management of the Railway Commission was concerned, he was heartily in accord with it, and that he hoped legislation would be introduced. And I think he intimated too, that if legislation was not introduced from some other source it would emanate from himself or from this side of the House in order to put this matter clearly and properly under the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission. That promise has been implemented I am glad to say, as the promises of the Conservative party are invariably redeemed, and we have had upon the order paper for several days a notice that the member for Prince Edward county (Mr. Alcorn) is introducing a Bill and I have had the advantage of reading it, although it was not requisite that I should see that Bill in order that I should have absolute faith that when it is introduced in the House it will be found to be a workable measure and in itself carry all the provisions necessary to the efficient working of this scheme which is so manifestly in the interests of the country. Therefore I congratulate the member for South York (Mr. Maclean) that although I and many members of the House cannot support his measure he will not be disappointed but will have the satisfaction of seeing an efficient measure become law at this session. If I did not know that this other measure was about to be introduced by the member for Prince Edward county (Mr. Alcorn) I would be disposed, notwithstanding the formidable objections that surround this first section with the amendment introduced by the member for South York (Mr Maclean) to vote for it. And why? Because I think the government have had time to introduce legislation. Two years ago when this matter was brought up before, the argument was advanced that we had just passed the Railway Act and that we should get it into working order. A sufficient length of time has elapsed for us to expect the government to bring forward a measure dealing with this matter and therefore I say if it had not been that another member on this side of the House is bringing forward a measure that will be workable, although I do not think that the present proposition is workable, I would vote for it to go into committee where we could in time, perhaps, hammer it into shape.

As to the two cent a mile rate. I could probably adopt the argument that was used by the member for Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) but I want to define my own position. When this qeustion was before introduced, by the member for South York (Mr. Maclean) I voted for it ; I admit with no very great enthusiasm, but I did so because I knew a large portion of the farmers in Ontario were in favour of the proposition that the rates on railways should be reduced. I voted for it as the best proposition on the matter that was then before the House, but at that time we had this safeguard that we were not introducing legislation that would certainly close up certain of our minor railways. We had a graded system, a system by which until the earnings of the railway should reach a certain point the two cent law would not apply. But now we have the bald proposition, a much more formidable proposition, that in every case the railways shall be confined to the two cents a mile rate. I am prepared to adopt the argument set forward by the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule). I believe it is a reasonable way of looking at this matter, and I believe that if we adopted a two cents rate all round we

would be shutting up some of the smaller railways in the portions of the country which can least afford to be deprived of them, that is the very rural and sparsely settled portions of the country. A railway running branches into these remote regions would say: This thing does not pay, and we will abandon this railway. This has been done in times past and so we would probably be doing the very worst stroke of business we could to those who can least afford to lose the services of a railway. If the member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) had advocated the proposition of two years ago I would vote for it again, as I voted for it then. I believe that a proper control of the railways in regard to rates is not only advisable but necessary in this country, and that if we find that the Railway Commission is not controlling the rates, both freight and passenger in the interest of the people of Canada, it will be the duty of parliament to see that effective measures are brought about, which will lead to the proper control of the railway company in that regard. But it must not be overlooked that there are only three sources from which a railway can get revenue, the carrying of mails, and the carriage of freight and of passengers. Now if you pull the blanket too much one way you shorten it at the other end, and if you press the railways too closely upon the question of passenger rates, the inevitable result is that the rates must go up. It is not a sufficiently formidable proposition to have prevented me from voting for a graded system such as was introduced by the hon. member two years ago, but it is a proposition that has to be borne in mind when we are confronted by the bald proposition of a two cent a mile rate over every railway in Canada. Then we are set thinking as to the effect upon the farming interests all over the country. We must recollect that the home market is the valuable market for the people of Canada and if you reduce the passenger rates to the lowest possible grade the railway company go to the Railway Commission and say: We have to meet fixed charges upon the railway, we have to meet our interest account and our running expenses and we only get so much from the passenger rates; therefore our freight rates must go up. And who pays the freight rates but the farmer, who sends out his produce to the market and brings back to his home the different commodities which he has to use including his agricultural implements? When we come to deal with this proposition, either directly by statute or through the Railway Commission, it is a matter that we must be very careful about and we must be careful that we do not, instead of bringing greater advantages to the rural communities, the farmers of this country, work to their disadvantage.

I therefore say that I am fully in accord with the second section of the Bill. The first section I regard as unworkable, and in addition to that we have a measure coming before us at once that I believe will carry out efficiently and well the object of putting the express companies under the control of the Railway Commission, and the last section I could not vote for, under any conditions, in the form in which it appears.

Mr. F. R. LALOR (Haldimand). I desire to explain my position briefly upon the measure now before the House. I have listened very attentively to the arguments presented by members on both sides of the House in reference to the measure.

Here, at last, it would seem, that a measure has been introduced upon which, almost unanimously both sides of the House might agree. But, a great many members of the House have to-night vied with each other in explaining why it is that they are opposed to this Bill. They state that the principle of the Bill is all right, that they are in favour of the control of freight rates, that they are in favour of the two cent rate for passenger traffic upon the railway and being in favour of the principle of the Bill they find some excuse for opposing the measure. I think it is quite natural that the lawyers who are in the House—and they seem to predominate—should find fault with a Bill that is introduced by a layman. They seem to think that the Bill has not been drawn properly, and that there are mistakes and errors as to legal phrases in connection with this measure. Well, if that is all there is in the opposition to this measure why not let these legal gentlemen introduce amendments to this Bill that will correct the mistakes that are contained in it? That would be very easily done indeed, and I think such an excuse as that for opposing this measure cannot be justified before the electors of this country, because I believe that the farmers and people generally are in favour of the Railway Commission controlling express rates. They control freight rates and why should not the same jurisdiction be given to them over express rates that is given to them over frieght rates? They can just as easily control one feature of the traffic upon a railway as the other, and therefore I believe that we should place express rates under the control of the Railway Commission. We have no competition practically in this country in regard to express rates. We have to accept whatever rates the express company may name regardless of how high those rates are. The fruit grower, the merchant, the farmer and the manufacturer alike must pay whatever express rates the company may ask and in towns which are fortunate enough to have only one railway line there is an agreement between the express companies by which

there will be no competition whatever and the result is that we have to pay whatever rate the company asks. The hon. member for East Peterborough (Mr. Findlay) has told us that the companies collect and deliver express parcels, but let me tell the hon. member for Peterborough that this is a matter of enterprise on the part of the express agent in each particular locality. It is not part of the regulations of the express company that the express packages should be collected or delivered, but if the express agent is an enterprising gentleman as he is in the town in which I live, then it is a matter of business with him if he collects the express in that town and also delivers it in order that he may encourage the express business and make his commission upon it. In other towns where the express agent is less enterprising the express packages are not collected.

Mr. FINLAY. It was not Peterborough at all that I referred to but the little village of Norwood.

Mr. LALOR. The hon. gentleman will pardon my mistake, but that does not make any difference whatever, I thought it was from Peterborough that the hon. gentleman came.

Mr. FINLAY. No.

Mr. LALOR. However, that does not alter my argument in the least. There is probably an enterprising express agent in the hon. gentleman's town who collects the express matter, but the express company does not require him to do it. I believe that express rates are altogether too high. I am a large manufacturer in the town in which I live and a great deal of my product goes by express. I am in the knitting business and a large portion of my stuff goes to all parts of the country by express. I cover the entire country from the Atlantic to the Pacific with travellers and I send express parcels to British Columbia and we have to pay altogether too much in express rates. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Macpherson) who spoke to-night as representing a British Columbia constituency, I do not believe gets very much by express or he would not express himself as being satisfied with the express rates.

Mr. MACPHERSON. Does the hon. gentleman suggest that I said anything about the express companies?

Mr. LALOR. I understood the hon. gentleman so.

Mr. MACPHERSON. I assure the hon. gentleman that I did not mention them at all.

Mr. LALOR. I accept the explanation of the hon. gentleman, but I understood him otherwise. In reference to passenger rates I firmly believe that the railway companies make a very great mistake indeed in the high passenger rates they charge. I believe that if the passenger rates were reduced to two cents a mile as they are in almost all portions of the United States there would be twice as much travel upon the railways as there is now and the railway companies would make more money than they do to-day with the high passenger rates they charge. You know what it is when there is an excursion. When the Toronto fair is going on enormous crowds of people travel to the fair largely because passenger rates are reduced. The people are able to travel much more freely and if the railway companies would generally adopt a lower passenger rate I believe there would be twice as much travel as there is now and that the railway companies would derive more revenue than they do at the present time. We have heard many excuses. The excuse is made—and I must say that I have heard that excuse brought forward before—that if we reduce passenger rates freight rates will go up. That is all nonsense. It is a farfetched argument against this Bill. There is nothing in it whatever. Freight rates are under the control of the Railway Commission and the railways are charging now all they can possibly manage to charge for freight and if they were able to charge any more they would do so. So, the argument that if we were to lower passenger rates freight rates would be increased is nonsensical, ridculous argument and the farmers of this country will not accept any such argument as that. I know that the people of the constituency which I have the honour to represent in this House want a two cent railway rate. They are in favour of it and so far as I can use my voice in assisting in bringing about a two cent rate I am prepared to do it, because I believe it is in the interest of the farmers of the country as well as in the interest of the railways. I, therefore, without desiring to delay the House to any great extent upon this measure, want to say that in the interest of the county I represent and in the interest particularly of the farmers of that country I propose to support the Bill introduced by the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean).

Mr. GEO. O. ALCORN (Prince Edward). Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to make any extended remarks, but merely to state a few points which, to my mind, are reasons why this Bill should not now be read the second time. The first section, we are told by the hon. member (Mr. W. F. Maclean) who introduced the Bill, deals, or attempts to deal with the subject of placing express companies under the control of the board of Railway Commissioners. Having given the subject some attention I have been entirely unable to appreciate the method by which it is expected that this first sec-

tion shall accomplish that object. Its meaning as applied to the Railway Act is extremely difficult to discover; in fact, I have not been able to make out that it has any appreciable meaning whatever.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Did you find any principle in it?

Mr. ALCORN. No person doubts the propriety of the principle of placing express companies under the Railway Commission. I have not heard a single gentleman speak here to-night or a person express an opinion outside of this Chamber against the propriety of accomplishing that end, but it seems to me that this first section absolutely and entirely fails in that object. The hon. member who introduces the Bill has not made the faintest attempt to elucidate how he hopes to accomplish that end by the section which he has placed in the Bill for that purpose. As has been intimated and as hon. gentlemen will perceive from the order paper I have given notice of a Bill which I hope to introduce in a few days and in which I have attempted some what fully to deal with this entire subject. I therefore think it would be at least convenient if not expedient, that I should be given an opportunity to place my Bill before the House before the second reading of this Bill takes place. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) tells us that the second section of his Bill deals with the entrance of the telephone companies to railway stations. That entire subject is fully covered by the Bill introduced by the Minister of Railways to-day and so that clause is wholly unnecessary. As to the third section of the Bill which calls for a two cent rate on railways; it has always seemed to me that the same agitators who are now asking for a two cent rate, would, if it were granted, be later on asking for a one and a half cent rate or a one cent rate. A great many of the gentlemen who attempt to discuss this subject on the platforms of the country, do so without fully appreciating the merits of the subject. At all events, the conditions to-day being absolutely the same as they were two years ago when this subject was fully thrashed out in the House, it would appear to me that the House is not going to stultify itself by reversing its judgment of two years ago, the facts being the same now as they were then.

Mr. J. D. REID (Grenville). The Minister of Railways stated that express companies are not subsidized, but as railway companies are subsidized and as express companies are part and parcel of them, it would seem to me that the question is not quite so clear in that respect. The statement of the Minister of Justice that these express companies are operating on steamers as well as railways, makes it more difficult to bring them under the Railway Commission. I am in favour of the principle of controlling the rates charged by express companies, but after hearing the opinions expressed by able men on both sides of the House I believe that the Bill before us is not drawn in proper form to accomplish that. In view of the fact that the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn) is to introduce a well considered Bill on this very subject, I think we are wasting time to-night and that it would be better to wait until the Bill of my hon. friend (Mr. Alcorn) comes down when the whole question can be more intelligently discussed. I beg to move that the debate be adjourned.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I now have an opportunity to reply to the various statements that have been made to-night, and I can well afford to bear with the criticisms that have been heaped upon me. I am strengthened in my position by the remark of an old Yorkshire farrier who had to handle an old mare that did not take her medicine, and so he said : 'There is nothing like putting on the twitch.' The government have had the twitch put upon them and until the twitch is put upon them we will get no progressive legislation in this parliament. To-day the Minister of Justice (was forced to accept three principles in respect to telephone management which he denounced me for proposing some years ago. To-day the hon. gentleman laid down this principle : that any public franchise owned by a private corporation should be regulated by the government. If he can apply that principle to telephone companies why cannot he find a way to apply it to express companies ? I have been criticised all round here to-night by very able gentlemen, and I was a little surprised to see the splendid support the Minister of Justice has on this side of the House. One would think that all his followers were here and that he had none on his own side. I take the criticism of gentlemen around me, and I say that as a private member I had a right to propound a principle to the House, no matter in what form I put it. I could have moved a resolution saying : Resolved that in the opinion of this House the tolls of express companies should be regulated by the Railway Commission; or, as I have done, I could have asserted the bold statement in a clause of a Bill. I knew that difficulties were in the way, but I knew also that I had the right to put a principle before the House, and that if it were adopted we could go into committee and perfect it. What have we a Minister of Justice for, what have we a well manned law department for; why do we pay them large salaries, why have we all these law clerks, why do we go into committee, why have we a Minister of Railways and a Department of Railways; if it is not that these gentlemen would sit down with private members in committee and perfect the legislation which is introduced. I was in the right, and the hon. gentleman from Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn) who has lectured me

to-night and told us he has a perfect Bill—well, we will see whether his Bill is perfect or not when it gets before the House. Hon. gentlemen around me here to-night have criticised the wording of my Bill and have taken this means of shirking their responsibility. It is not the duty of a private member to draft a perfect Bill. But, I have had my experience of that. I hired a high priced draftsman to draft me a Bill dealing with the telephone question and all the thanks I got for it was that I was sent to a special committee and that special committee did their best to block the measure and talk it out. And the men who talked it out, where are they to-day? They have gone into a certain retirement. One went on the bench and now I see he has gone another step forward. After I presented my Bill, and after I spent a large sum of money out of my own pocket to get a perfect Bill I was hung up in a special committee. No matter what you do in this House, if you assert a principle beneficial to the community, some one will find a way to block you. But, if you stick to a good principle and keep the twitch on the nose of those who oppose you, you will at last bring them up to the mark. I challenge this House to say that the principle is not right that express tolls should be regulated and controlled. No one can dispute it. All these gentlemen around here say they are in favour of it, and yet on both sides they want to kick this Bill out of the House. And who are the people that are asking for this legislation? It is the farmers of this country who are deeply interested in the question, and who have appealed to us time and time again, and yet to-night we see members who say they represent the farming community, opposing the best interests of the farmer.

They have all got something to say here to-night in favour of the farmer, but they say double as much in favour of the express companies. The Minister of Justice, in his own pettifogging way, gets up and talks about the difficulties in the way; he says there are lions in the path. He says the express business is handled partly by rail and partly by water; and his friend from Hamilton, an ex-solicitor of a railway and with a large experience in fighting the public, says, how are you going to handle the money packages? What I want this House to decide is, how are you going to handle the ninety-five per cent of the express business which is done on the lines of one company. That is what the farmers, the fruit growers and others want to have settled; and they do not want such pettifogging reasons against action by this House as have been presented here to-night and on other occasions. I am surprised to hear hon. gentlemen admit the principle, and then, as it were, read the Riot Act to me on the ground that my Bill is not properly drafted. My principle is right, and if your principle is right, you can soon get your words right. I would have expected hon. gentlemen who admitted the principle of the Bill to have sat down with me in the committee and helped me to put it into proper shape; but instead of that they have all joined together to shy rocks at the yellow dog. All right, gentlemen; I am prepared to take care of myself and my principles, and have them embodied in legislation, and the criticisms that have been passed on my Bill to-night may amount to very little. I want to come again to this question of the regulation of railway rates, as to which we have had such a fine lot of disclaimers to-night. Hon. gentlemen are are all in favour of a reduction of passenger rates, but they are afraid the poor farmer is going to have his freight rates put up. It is the poor farmer who wants to have reduced passenger rates. The farmer in the Northwest cannot come out of that country unless he pays four cents a mile. Is that fair to the farmer? Do you know that from the day that railways began to run in this country there has not been a change in the passenger rates? Freight rates have been cut into and reduced half a dozen times, but the passenger rates have not been changed. Surely the people who pay passenger rates are entitled to some consideration; but when that is proposed, these gentlemen get up and weep for the poor farmer whose freight rates are to be put up on him. It is the farmer of the United States who wants reduced passenger rates, and I am going to read the facts which prove this, and set at naught all these bogus arguments which have been put forth to-night. The Minister of Justice may boast that he has a splendid following in this House, because when he puts up his finger both sides of the House rise and do his bidding. I congratulate him. In the old days when a man had one side of the House with him he was considered to be doing pretty well; but now we have reached a new stage. I think the Prime Minister had better make way for this Goliath from Quebec, who commands the support of both sides of the House in vindicating the cause of the railways in this country.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, dear!

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The hon. gentleman says, 'oh, dear.' He does not like his new leader, although he has been in service only five minutes. With regard to the two-cent rate I am going to read from the New York 'Herald' a despatch written on March 4, by its special commissioner in Chicago, and it will show the House and the country what the people of the United States think of this much-abused principle that is going to ruin the railway companies and cause higher rates to be put upon the farmers:

The railroads of every state east of the Mississippi river are face to face with threatened reductions in passenger fares to a two cent a mile basis. That it will come in the near

future seems almost beyond question. It is recognized by the railroads that nothing can be done to stop the progress of the agitation.

The example of Ohio is becoming contagious, and quick action is demanded and is expected in several states as soon as their new legislatures shall convene. In Indiana the two cent fare is almost a campaign issue, for the legislators who will be elected next fall will, as a rule, be tacitly, if not openly, committed to a two cent measure.

The action of Charles S. Mellen, president of the New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad, in reducing fares on several divisions and in announcing that he proposes speedily to make similar reductions over the entire system is expected to do more to advance the two cent fare cause than any other one thing.

Still another important factor is the electric line. Almost everywhere has the trolley invaded the territory of the steam road and fares on electric lines never exceed two cents. More and more have the steam roads been compelled to confine themselves to through business, leaving the local traffic to the competing trolley.

Seeing the tremendous stimulus that has been given to travel by the lower fares of the trolley and by the special steam road rates, many passenger men really do not view the two cent era as an unmixed evil. They honestly believe that a reduction would have two effects—stemming trolley line competition and creating a tremendous flow of new business. This accounts for the failure of the railroads of Ohio to attack the legality of the new law in the courts. They wish first to see what effect it will have on their earnings, and many of them do not expect the trial to prove disastrous.

Michigan took the initiative in the reduction of passenger fares, but the law there is a graded one, depending upon the earnings of the railroads. The fares permitted to be charged range from four cents on some roads in the upper peninsula to two cents on the main lines in the lower state.

This law has resulted in giving the people of Michigan a two cent fare on over seven hundred miles of main lines and a two and one-half cent rate on four hundred miles of road. The operation of the law has proved eminently satisfactory to the people of the state, and so far as can be learned has not affected adversely the revenues of the railroads.

In the state of New York fully ten Bills have been introduced looking to a reduction from three or two cents in passenger fares. One of the Bills introduced provides for a one and one-half cent rate, and the provisions of all the pending Bills are generally applicable to all railroads in the state.

In Massachusetts, Connecticut and Rhode Island, it is likely that the legislatures will take no action in view of the voluntary reductions by President Mellen of the New Haven road. These reductions now give the people of Western Massachusetts and of a large portion of Connecticut a flat rate of two cents a mile.

Mr. Mellen has also notified his directors that he proposes to make a similar reduction on the entire Old Colony division, which covers the eastern and the southwestern portion of Massachusetts and part of Rhode Island. At present the rates of the New Haven main line between Boston and New York are slightly in excess of two cents a mile, but it is Mr. Mellen's expressed purpose to have a uniform two cent rate on all lines owned by the comapny. The Boston and Albany and the Boston and Maine roads will undoubtedly be compelled by the force of competition to follow Mr. Mellen's lead.

Governor Henly, of Indiana, has determined that his next legislature, whether it be a special or a regular session, shall pass a two cent law that shall apply uniformly to all lines within the state. Sentiment in the state is strong, because of the fact that a great deal of the through business is done on a two cent rate, whereas the citizens of the state are compelled to pay three cents.

The state of Iowa is also moving rapidly toward a two cent fare action. Governor Cummins recommended compulsory legislation for a family mileage book to be sold at two cents flat. In connection with this there is a Bill pending for the abolition of passes to all candidates for office, delegates to conventions, members of political committees and public officials, except notaries.

In Wisconsin the Secretary of State has presented a complaint to the Railroad Commission that he is compelled to pay three cents a mile when riding on Wisconsin railroads, and that this is an excessive fare. The commission is what is termed a 'strong commission,' having power over rates, and, as the temper of the people of the state is toward rate reduction there is little doubt that the railroads there are facing a two cent fare.

Had the Governor's call permitted it, a two cent Bill would have been rushed through the Pennsylvania legislature during the last session. There is not the least doubt that such a measure will be introduced at the next session next January.

In Virginia a Bill has been introduced requiring two cent fares, and it will probably be passed.

In Illinois the State Commission recently reported in favour of a reduction to two cents, but action was postponed pending further investigation by the committee.

Was there ever such evidence of the desire of the people to have a two cent per mile fare prevail in the United States, and the people are getting that rate in nearly every instance through the direct action of the legislatures and by the action of the farmers themselves who travel on these roads? I would like to hear the hon. gentlemen get up and protest that our farmers are willing to pay three cents and four cents per mile and do not want a lower rate and that it is the duty of their representatives to see that the law I am advocating should not be put on the statute-book. One after another these gentlemen have declared themselves in favour of the principle, but they say my measure must be voted down because it is not couched in such language as will satisfy the lawyers. Well, I think I have made out a case why this Bill should go forward. Why should my vindication of the principle, as it has been vindicated here to-night, be set aside because of the promise of an hon. gentleman, let him be as learned in the law and as experienced in legal terms as you please, that he will deal with the matter in some other phraseology? Are we going to vote down this principle, which every one ad-

mits, because of the promise of some one to express it in better shape? How can such conduct as that be justified? It is pettyfogging of the cheapest kind. I present the issue as a principle and ask the House to pass upon it. Why cannot the Solicitor General, who has a great deal of legal acumen, not sit down with us and prepare a Bill once we adopt the principle? We have had the Minister of Justice forced to admit the principle here to-night, but he did this only after he had got some light from the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker). He is learning his railway law at the feet of that hon. gentleman. And after the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) stated that the express rates should be regulated by the Railway Commission, we had the Minister of Justice adopting that view, but declaring that he cannot find terms in which to express it. That, Sir, is simply the subterfuge of a pettyfogging lawyer. If the hon. minister is in favour of the principle, it is his duty to find the terms in which to give it expression. I leave the issue between myself and the members of this House. I have cast no reflection on any body.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, no.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. No; I brought in my Bill and supported it as well as I could. And once that Bill has been presented and its principles admitted, I cannot see why it should be rejected because its phraseology does not meet with the approval of some hon. gentleman. If the principle be accepted, it is the duty of the House to go on with the measure and alter the phraseology to suit its views. There is no argument in the remark, which we hear made so frequently, that because a man happens not to be a lawyer he cannot be a parliamentarian. I have given some time and study in order to fit myself to discharge the duties of parliamentary life, and I have not found that in the old land a man is hounded down because he does not happen to be a lawyer and has not given expression to a principle which the House approves in phraseology that would suit the legal mind. In the British parliament the whole gang of lawyers do not turn on a man in the interests of the corporations, but they respect a man who presents a principle and when that principle is adopted the members of parliament leave it to the lawyers, who can be hired, to draft a Bill that will embody and settle the principle. But here in this instance everybody says he is in favour of the principle which I advocate, and yet is prepared to kick it out of the House. Well, they can do that, but they will have to settle with the people.

Mr. A. BRODER (Dundas). I wish to say a few words as a layman who does not agree with the other layman. The hon. gentleman who has just spoken has told us that he was stoned as the yellow dog. Well, the yellow dog gnaws his own bone. There is no doubt about that. Let me say that if the hon. gentleman who represents South York (Mr. Maclean) were really sincere in this matter, he had every opportunity to give us some convincing proof of his sincerity. We have had for some years a Railway Commission authorized to deal with passenger rates, and yet this hon. gentleman has made no effort to bring that question before the tribunal established by law to deal with such matters. If that tribunal had refused to deal with the matter, there would then be some justification for the hon. member bringing in his measure. It seems, however, that while he is anxious to bring the question of the express charges under that commission, he is not anxious to submit to it this question of passenger rates. He has made no attempt to bring the passenger rates under the control of the Railway Commission and let that commission determine whether they would be justified in reducing the rates. The hon. gentleman is like the Irishman who complained of a grievance; but when an English public man said to him we can remedy that, the Irishman replied: I do not want a remedy; I want to keep my grievance. Well, what the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) wants is a grievance, and he would be very much disappointed if by any chance it should be taken from him. He reminds me very much of what another man said—a much greater man than I. When a certain lady wanted him to change his religion, he looked over the document she presented to him and said: I cannot do it; there is too much to swallow and not enough to eat. That is about where we are in this matter—too much to swallow and not enough to eat. I believe in putting the express companies under the commission. I believe in putting them where the passenger rates are. Our friend, however, will not trust the commission with the passenger rates, but is anxious to trust them with the express companies. That is scarcely fair. There is no class of people more interested in the railways being successfully and properly managed than the farmer. I do not believe in creating circles in the country, and saying that within certain zones you shall charge certain passenger rates and within other zones you shall charge other rates. I believe we should have a flat rate for the whole country so far as passenger rates are concerned. The question should be dealt with in that broad, comprehensive way which would give the people a flat rate, but that rate should not be forced on a railway unless the conditions justify it. We have large railways running almost clear across this country, largely under the control of one company, and for that reason there should be a flat rate over the whole length of that road, and that rate should be a rea-

sonable one to suit the conditions and the earning power of that road and the difficulties with which it has to contend.

We must look this thing in the face. It is not an agitation we want, it is a remedy. My hon. friend wants an agitation, I want a remedy. The railways no doubt can economize in directions that would not affect the people generally. For instance, they might cut off the large salaries that are paid to their leading officers, and perhaps the Minister of Railways could take a hint in this direction and apply it to his road. We have established a Railway Commission which has jurisdiction in these matters. Doubtless these things could be brought about step by step in the general interests of the country. Our hon. friend here from South York wants to make the railways the yellow dog in this country, he is throwing stones at them every day in the year except Sunday. And what for? Not for a remedy but for an agitation. I say that if he is sincere he will go to the Railway Commission before he comes back to another session of this House, and see if that Railway Commission won't take up this matter and look into it from a business standpoint, and in view of the conditions that confront railways in this country. Now in regard to his Bill I am only a layman but I have a little common sense, and I have not used it all, I have got some left. But when I look at his Bill what do I find? He says he is striking out the second section of that Act, and any man of common sense need not be a lawyer to see that if he strikes out that particular clause in order to harmonize the rest of the Bill with it, he will have to change fifty or sixty other clauses. That is why I oppose his Bill. Now I say that if he wanted to deal with this matter in a common sense way, he has not done so. He has a lot of common sense, but he has not used much of it. He could bring in a Bill to put the express companies under the control of the Railway Commission, dealing with express companies but not dealing with the Railway Commission, and then he would be dealing with it in a common sense way. He would have the horse on the right end of the cart, it is on the other end now. I will vote against the Bill until he gets it into proper shape. There is no use tinkering with statutes. It is hard enough now to interpret them, and if we do what he wants us to do it would be still harder. For these reasons I intend to vote against this Bill, but I will vote for a Bill that will put express companies under the control of the Railway Commission.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin). I believe a fair definition of demagogism is a man who engages in wild politics. If I were a demagogue I would attend this parliament probably one day in a week, and every day I came I would introduce a fad of some description, and publish it in my paper all over this country. If I found I had some supporters of that fad in this House, I would at least give them some credit for their support. I would not look for an opportunity of turning on the friends who had always supported me. Now, Sir, I am not a man of that kind. A few years ago I introduced a Bill in this House dealing with the Michigan Central Railway so far as it runs in this country, simply asking for certain legislation affecting that and an other company. A Bill was introduced by the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on that occasion, one section of which read as follows:

> The tolls charged in any standard passenger tariff shall not exceed the following, namely: for all companies the gross earnings of whose passenger trains, as reported to the minister, under the provisions of section 304 of this Act, equalled or exceeded the sum of $3,000 for each mile of road operated by the said company, two cents per mile; and for all companies the earnings of whose passenger trains, reported as aforesaid, were over $2,000 and less than $3,000 per mile of the road operated by the said company, two and one-half cents per mile; and for all companies whose earnings, reported as aforesaid, were less than $2,000 per mile of road operated by the said company, three cents per mile.

Now my hon. friend from South York on that occasion endeavoured to tack on to the Michigan Central legislation this clause I have read. Sir, I opposed it then, but I said I would support any legislation proposing to amend the Railway Act of Canada and applying that principle as general legislation. But I opposed that legislation, applying only to one American railway passing through, this country. Well, Sir, for taking what I believed to be a fair and manly stand on that occasion, I was attacked in my constituency as having opposed a two cent rate. I defended my conduct in respect to my position about a two cent rate, and as a result I was elected, notwithstanding the hostility raised against me by friends of the hon. member for South York. Now was not that a fair proposition, an honest proposition? What does the hon. gentleman want? He comes here and asks this parliament to amend the Railway Act so as to compel every railway company in Canada to carry passengers for two cents a mile. My hon. friend who just preceded me (Mr. Broder) asked this House to apply common sense to the proposed legislation. Let us apply common sense to the proposal. Every hon. gentleman knows that there are a large number of railway companies in Canada, some large and some small. Now is it reasonable to suppose that the small railway companies which have the greatest difficulty now to exist, could stand the imposition by parliament of a two cent rate per mile on their passenger traffic? I say absolutely, no. There is nothing in the history of railway legislation in the

world that would support such a contention. So I say, if we are to apply common sense to this proposition, when we are asked to impose a graded scale to railways in this country whose rates are so much and whose income is so much, and when we are asked to apply a two cent rate to all of them I say it is impracticable, and we would not be doing our duty to impose it on the small companies as well as on the large ones.

Sir, I have advocated before that the express companies should be put under the Board of Railway Commissioners. But, when you consider the proposition of the hon. member for South York, it does not require a legal mind to perceive that you would require to change a great many different sections in this Act in order to make his Act workable. What have we before us ? We have a proposition introduced by the Minister of Railways, we have a proposition to be introduced by the member for Prince Edward county (Mr. Alcorn). I have no hesitation in saying that I am in favour of the position, so far as I understand it, of the Minister of Railways, I am in favour of the position of the hon. member for Prince Edward ; I prefer either of their propositions to that of the hon. member for South York.

Sir, I am not the slave of the member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) ; I am entirely independent of the member for South York. I stated before and I state again that I care neither for the member for South York nor his paper. I am not going to stultify myself or my opinions in this House for the member for South York or any other man. I come here to express them and I am going to express them, and I am going to express them in what I believe to be my own common sense way, and every other hon. gentleman in this House has a perfect right to express his opinion in his own way and that is no reason why we should receive personal abuse, simply because we differ from this man who has already denounced previous supporters of his. Why ? Because he wants to be the great Goliath of the Conservative party. There was a time in the history of the Conservative party of this country when the member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) wrote to his friend that he was about to become leader of the great Conservative party.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Oh, where is all that ?

Mr. INGRAM. The time has come now when he has not even a follower instead of a party, and I do not know a man who deserves to have fewer followers than that same member.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Hear, hear.

Mr. INGRAM. I have in a few words explained exactly where I stand on the telephone amendment, the express amendment and on the two cents rate ; I have expressed myself honestly, openly, fearlessly and above board, and I can say to the member for South York that when he chooses to consult members in this House who are friendly to him and chooses to show and suggest to other members of this House any proposed legislation he will find members on both sides prepared to assist in any legislation that may be in the interest of this country. None of us have a cinch on all the great ideas ; we have to depend a little on each other for support in this House, and I can say to the member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) that he has to take another tack, a different tack to what he has been pursuing for some time past, if he proposes to get any reasonable support in this House.

Motion (Mr. J. D. Reid) agreed to, and debate adjourned.

Mr. FITZPATRICK moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Could we have an intimation of the business for to-morrow in case we reach government business ?

Mr. PATERSON. If the business of private members be finished at an early hour we will go into supply ; we can take the balance of the Indian Affairs, Inland Revenue and Penitentiaries.

Mr. FOSTER. In the order named ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, in the order named.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, March 29, 1906.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS.

On certain petitions being presented:

Mr. SPEAKER. I would call the attention of the House to the fact that these petitions are late and that the consent of the House will be requisite.

PRIVATE BILLS--EXTENSION OF TIME.

Mr. GEORGE D. GRANT (North Ontario) moved :

That in accordance with the recommendation contained in the fourth report of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders, the time for receiving petitions on private Bills be extended to Thursday the 12th of April next,

and that the time for presenting private Bills be extended to Thursday the 19th of April next.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 63) to incorporate the National Fire Insurance Company of Canada—Mr. Zimmerman.

Bill (No. 64) respecting the Atlantic, Quebec, and Western Railway Company—Mr. Gauvreau.

Bill (No. 65) respecting the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company—Mr. Bureau.

INDIAN ACT—AMENDMENT.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 66) to amend the Indian Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. MONK. The object of this Bill is to amend the section of the Indian Act which regulates fines and punishment. In the province of Quebec and no doubt elsewhere, there are certain Indian Reserves, where the residents—although they belong to the band and although they are Indians under the interpretation section of the Act—lead exactly the same lives as white men and have nothing in their appearance to indicate that they have Indian blood; they are half breeds to all intents and purposes. These residents of the reserve come from Caughnawaga to the large manufacturing town of Lachine which is on the opposite bank of the river; they work in the factories there and they sometimes purchase intoxicating liquors and violate section 69 of the Indian Act. The merchants who sell liquor in Lachine and Montreal, although they take every possible precaution to prevent the sale of intoxicants to those who reside on the reserve, yet, these vendors of intoxicants although acting in perfect good faith and anxious to prevent a violation of the Act, are often deceived by the purchaser who has nothing in his appearance to indicate that he is an Indian. As a matter of fact he is only a technical Indian, if I may use that expression, and it seems unfair that under such circumstances the innocent seller of liquor should be subject to the heavy fines provided by the Indian Act.

These cases occur sometimes, and, as I will show when the Bill is read the second time, they have attracted the attention of the magistrates in Montreal, and the opinion has been expressed that the Act should be amended. That is the object of the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

BONUSED IMMIGRATION FROM EUROPE.

Mr. AMES asked :

1. What are the amounts that have been paid by the government to the North Atlantic Trading Company during each fiscal year or half year between July 1, 1901, and 31st December, 1905 ?

2. Upon how many settlers during each fiscal year or half year of this period have bonuses been paid to the said company ?

3. How much additional has been paid to the said company during each such period in respect of advertising, literature, exchange, &c.?

4. Of the settlers in respect of whom, prior to the 31st December, 1905, bonuses have been paid to the North Atlantic Trading Company by the government, how many during each year or half year came from, (a) Holland ; (b) Denmark ; (c) Russia ; (d) Germany ; (e) Austro-Hungary ; (f) Luxemburg ; (g) Norway; (h) Sweden ; (i) Finland ; (j) Switzerland, respectively ? How many from other countries ? How many came from (aa) Galicia ; (bb) Bukowinia, and (cc) Poland ?

5. What other countries beside those above mentioned have been by the Minister of the Interior, added to the agreement since the 28th November, 1904, and how many came from each country added during each such period ?

6. Of the settlers upon whom bonuses have been paid, how many in each such period belonged to the agricultural class, and how many to the domestic servant class, and how many to other and what classes ?

7. During each of the last three fiscal years, and during the six months ending 31st December, 1905, how many immigrants reached Canada from each of the following countries : (a) Holland, (b) Denmark, (c) Russia, (d) Germany, (e) Austro-Hungary, (f) Luxemburg, (g) Norway, (h) Sweden, (i) Finland, (j) Switzerland ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. The total amounts paid the North Atlantic Trading Company for bonuses were as follows :

	1901-1902	$33,482 66
	1902-1903	34,553 33
	1903-1904	38,933 33
	1904-1905	77,842 33
	1905-1906 ½ year	56,287 86
2.	1901-1902	8,977 00
	1902-1903	13,036 00
	1903-1904	12,319 00
	1904-1905	12,387 00
	1905-1906 first half year. (Payment not yet made for this period).	
3.	1901-1902	$2,433 34
	1902-1903	Nothing
	1903-1904	198 13
	1904-1905	9,365 38
	1905-1906 ½ year	3,488 39

4. Number of settlers on whom bonus was paid to the North Atlantic Trading Company.

NUMBER of settlers on whom bonus was paid to the North Atlantic Trading Company.

—	1901-02.	1902-03.	1903-04.	1904-05.	6 Months, 1905-06.
(a) Holland	2	38	80	153	Amount for this period not yet paid.
(b) Denmark	54	107	202	241	
(c) Russia	1,168	1,948	756	1,350	
(d) Germany	766	1,181	2,394	1,523	
(e) Austro-Hungary	5,811	7,121	6,225	5,997	
(f) Luxemburg	*	*	*	*	
(g) Norway	207	749	798	828	
(h) Sweden	407	1,296	1,533	1,250	
(i) Finland	60	252	244	278	
(j) Switzerland	4	37		84	
Russian, Polish, Austrian and German Hebrews	17	1		512	
Austrian, German and Russian Poles	25	49	87	166	
Mennonites	48				
Roumania, Moldavia, Belgium, France, Italy, Bulgaria and Servia	408	257			
Totals	8,977	13,036	12,319	12,387	

* Included with Germany *(d)*.

Included in the above, bonus was allowed each year upon 5,000 persons from (aa) Galicia, (bb) Bukowinia and (cc) Poland. In each period given the number of agriculturists and domestic servants exceeded this number, but according to the terms of the contract, payment was limited to 5,000.

5. None.

6. Of the settlers upon whom bonuses have been paid all belonged either to the agricultural class or the domestic servant class. The bonus on both classes being the same, the numbers have not been kept separate in departmental statements.

7. TOTAL ARRIVALS FOR CANADA.

—	Fiscal year 1902-03.	Fiscal year 1903-04.	Fiscal year 1904-05.	6 months of fiscal year 1905-06.	Totals.
(a) Holland	223	169	281	72	745
(b) Denmark	308	417	461	169	1,355
(c) Russia	5,505	1,955	1,887	934	10,281
(d) Germany	1,887	2,985	2,759	727	8,358
(e) Austro-Hungary	13,095	11,137	10,089	1,426	35,747
(f) Luxemburg	*	*	*	*	*
(g) Norway	1,746	1,239	1,397	455	4,837
(h) Sweden	2,477	2,151	1,847	764	7,239
(i) Finland	1,734	845	1,323	454	4,356
(j) Switzerland	73	128	150	46	397
Totals	27,048	21,026	20,194	5,047	73,315
Russian, Polish, Austrian and German Hebrews	2,066	3,727	7,715	2,876	16,384
Austrian, German and Russian Poles	274	669	745	232	1,920
Mennonites	38	11			49
Grand totals	29,426	25,433	28,654	8,155	91,668

* Included in *(d)*.

PACIFIC AND ATLANTIC RAILWAY AND WHITE FISH ISLAND.

Mr. BOYCE—by Mr. Cockshutt—asked :

1. Is the Pacific and Atlantic Railway a railway declared to be for the general benefit of Canada ? If so, when was it so declared ?
2. Is White Fish island, in St. Mary's river, Ontario, entirely owned by Canada ?
3. If not, what portion is owned by Ontario ?
4. Is such portion, if any, of the island as is owned by the Ontario government included in the plans allowed by the government for the expropriation of the island by railway companies ? (See 'Hansard' of 1906, 200, 201 and 202.)
5. Is the island Indian land ? If so, what arrangements have been made with the Indians living thereon, and have they been consulted with regard to the expropriation ? If so, when, and did they assent to the allowance of the plans ?
6. Is the northerly part of the island, containing what is known as the Ryan-Heaney water power, covered by the plans filed and allowed ? If so, by which company is that portion expropriated ?

Hon. HENRY R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). The officers of the department have not been able to find any Act declaring the Pacific and Atlantic Railway to be a railway for the general benefit of Canada. White Fish island was an Indian Reserve and administered by the Dominion government. Five acres of land have been purchased on the main land and houses erected thereon for the accommodation of the few Indians who reside on the island. As the land was taken for railway purposes, the Indians were not consulted. The northerly part of the island on which are constructed the dams in connection with the Ryan-Heaney water power, is covered by the plans filed and allowed and this portions of the island was patented to the Ontario Hudson Bay and Western Railway Company.

SPRING GARDEN ROAD, HALIFAX.

Mr. FOWLER—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. What disposition, if any, has the government made of the property fronting on Spring Garden road, in the city of Halifax, upon which the old drill shed is or was situated ?
2. What is the area of the said property, and what is its frontage on Spring Garden road, and what is its depth ?
3. If the government has disposed of the said property by lease or other conveyance, for what term, at what rental, and to whom was the lease or conveyance made, and on what date ?
4. Has the government been in occupation of the said property or any part thereof, or has it made any use thereof, since the lease or other disposal as above mentioned ?
5. If the government has received in consideration of the said property any other property in the city of Halifax, where is such property situate, what is its area, and from whom was it acquired, and on what date ?
6. What use, if any, has the government made of the last mentioned property, so acquired in exchange or otherwise, and how long has it used the said property ?
7. Has the government any information as to the price paid for such last mentioned property by the person who conveyed it or caused it to be conveyed to the government ?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia). An arrangement was made in 1902 to exchange the old Halifax drill shed property for a property situated nearer to the new armouries but the proposed exchange was not carried out. The drill shed property has been continuously and exclusively in use and controlled by the ordnance branch of the Militia Department and is being so used at present.

TRENT CANAL.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES—by Mr. Sproule—asked :

1. What is the nature of the arrangements entered into between the governments of Canada and Ontario in regard to the control of the waters tributary to the Trent canal ?
2. When were the arrangements completed ?
3. Will the government lay upon the table of the House copies of the correspondence and orders in council upon this subject ?
4. What is the intention of the government in regard to developing the storage of waters in this connection ?
5. What works will be undertaken this year ?
6. Does the Ontario government retain control of the water powers ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. All provincial government control of certain specified tributary waters, lakes and streams, has been transferred to the Dominion which is to have the right to maintain existing dams, or to construct new ones, all present rights of owners or lessees of timber lands or of lumbermen under existing statutes relating to the use of rivers and streams are guaranteed, and also the present legal or statutory rights of owners and lessees in water powers derived from these lakes and streams.
2. On the 16th February, 1906, by the passage of a Dominion order in council accepting the terms of a provincial order of the 23rd of July, 1905.
3. Yes.
4. This is a matter for future consideration.
5. The necessary works of repairs and maintenance.
6. No.

ALFRED BARIL.

Mr. LEONARD asked :

1. Has the Department of Marine and Fisheries an employee named Alfred Baril in its employ at Sorel ?
2. If so, what is his employment and what is his salary ?
3. Did the department grant him a leave of absence during the month of February last ?

4. If so, what was the extent of that leave of absence and what were the apparent reasons therefor ?

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

1. Yes.
2. Accountant, $1,500.
3. Yes.
4. Fifteen days. Annual holiday.

L. L. GALLIGHER.

Mr. URIAH WILSON asked :

1. What was the date of dismissal of L. L. Galligher from the position of postmaster at Wilton, Ontario ?
2. How many postmasters have since been appointed at Wilton, what are their names, dates of appointment, and dates and causes of retirement ?
3. By whom were these postmasters, respectively, recommended ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Postmaster General) :

1. The 30th November, 1903.
2. Three persons have since been appointed to the postmastership of Wilton—Mr. C. A. Neilson, who was appointed on the 30th November, 1903, and who died on the 8th February, 1906—Mr. William C. Bullock, who was appointed on the 6th March, 1906, but was unable to accept the office, as he was removing from Wilton, and Mr. Guy Simmons, who was appointed on the 22nd March, 1906.
3. These appointments were in each case made on a memorandum from the Postmaster General directing the appointment. There is nothing on file in the department showing by whom Mr. C. A. Neilson was recommended. Mr. William C. Bullock was recommended by Mr. M. F. Parrott, of Wilton, and Mr. Guy Simmons was recommended by Mr. M. F. Parrott, and also by Mr. W. A. Martin and Mr. W. H. Reynolds.

MICHEL CAMPEAU.

Mr. WM. JACKSON asked :

1. Is Michel Campeau employed in the Post Office Department at Montreal ?
2. If so, in what capacity and at what salary?
3. Is his employment permanent or temporary ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Postmaster General.) No.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND WINTER COMMUNICATION.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked :

What is the total yearly expenditure by the government for maintaining communication between the mainland of Canada and Prince Edward Island for the years between 1900 and 1905, inclusive ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). The amount expended for the fiscal years between 1899-1900 and 1904-5 inclusive is $742,972.89.

Mr. LEONARD.

ROCK HILL POSTMASTER.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

1. Who is postmaster at Rock Hill post office ?
2. Upon whose request was said office opened?
3. What were the receipts of the same for the past year ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Postmaster General).

1. D. A. Campbell.
2. Upon application of Mr. William Robinson and a petition of residents of the locality, accompanied by nomination of Mr. Robinson as postmaster, made by the late Mr. N. Clarke Wallace, M.P.
3. Revenue for the year ending 30th June, 1905, $17.95.

DUTY ON JACKS.

Mr. WM. JACKSON asked :

What, if any, is the duty on jacks imported for breeding purposes ?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). Twenty per cent ad valorem.

TRENT CANAL.

Mr. McCOLL—by Mr. Ralph Smith—asked :

1. What is the depth of the eastern or southern section of the Trent canal, that is, the portion from Rice lake to Lake Ontario ?
2. Has the government decided that the depth of said portion of said canal is to be 8 feet 4 inches above the lock sills ?
3. If the depth is to be 8 feet 4 inches above the lock sills, what will be the total depth in canal cuttings, and river and lake channels ?
4. Upon what depth will the engineer who had charge of the surveys of the different proposed outlets of said canal, make his report and estimate of the cost ?
5. What is to be the width of said canal ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. It has not been definitely settled.
2. No.
3. About an average of 9 feet 6 inches.
4. Upon a depth of 8 feet 4 inches on lock sills; also for a depth of 6 feet on lock sills.
5. Fifty feet at base of prism with side slopes of 2 on 1 will be the general sections.

INSURANCE COMMISSION—APPOINTMENT OF MR. LANGMUIR.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont). Before the Orders of the Day are called I would like to ask the government whether the fact that one of the members of the commission appointed to investigate certain matters with regard to insurance companies was a trustee of one of the United States companies was within the knowledge of the government when they appointed that gentleman ?

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK. (Minister of Justice). Subsequent to his ap-

pointment, Mr. Langmuir discovered that he was one of the trustees of one of the companies. He had forgotten about the matter, having become trustee in connection with a loan company with which he was connected. The matter was considered by the Finance Department, but it was thought that the fact that Mr. Langmuir had acted in that capacity for the insurance company in question did not disqualify him for the position. Mr. Langmuir, at the time, wished to resign.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I presumed that there was an explanation of this kind, but thought it would be better to have it made public.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I am glad to have the opportunity to make the statement.

LIEUTENANT GOVERNORSHIP OF NOVA SCOTIA—APPOINTMENT OF MR. D. C. FRASER.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would also like to know whether the government have any answer to make to an inquiry respecting the conditions upon which the present lieutenant governor of Nova Scotia accepted his appointment. A statement has been made in the public press as follows :

> Relief loomed in sight in the person of Judge Fraser, and as a compromise candidate Judge Fraser was finally accepted, but only with the stipulation that he should hold the lieutenant governorship for a second term, in the event of the Liberal party retaining power. Judge Fraser's conditions were accepted, and his appointment went through at yesterday afternoon's cabinet meeting.

I observe that, in another place, an inquiry with regard to this matter elicited considerable warmth but not much information. Possibly we may obtain from the present leader of the House, the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) less warmth but more information on this occasion.

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). I do not know that I have anything to say on the subject. The authority quoted by the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) is a newspaper article. I do not know that I have even read it——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have just read it.

Mr. PATERSON. Perhaps, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) does not feel satisfied with the answer I give, he will put the question in another form. I have nothing further to say on the subject than that I accept what the hon. gentleman has stated—that such a report as he has referred to has appeared in the press.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And, I suppose silence indicates assent.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. leader of the opposition was not in his place yesterday when I wished to refer to a matter to which he had called attention. He had asked me the day before to bring down from the Department of the Secretary of State a return with regard to the returns that had been moved for during the last session of parliament. I do not suppose it is necessary to have a formal motion for the bringing down of this return.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No, merely bring it down for information.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman also asked for the Japanese treaty. I understand from the Secretary of State, that the treaty has not been received. Word has been received that the treaty has been signed, but the treaty itself has not arrived.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is not the treaty only that we asked for, but all documents connected with it, including correspondence. I gave the hon. gentleman the reference to the page in 'Hansard' where I had set out in detail what I wanted.

Mr. PATERSON. I thought it convenient to bring down all at once. Of course, if the hon. gentleman would like any of the documents earlier, I can renew the request.

Another hon. gentleman called attention to the Eastern Supply Company. I did not take a full note of the point, but the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman) is in his place and will deal with it.

Another hon. member called attention to the fact that a return supplied in accordance with an order of the House made last year was only a partial return, and did not cover all the information he wanted. I brought the matter to the attention of the Secretary of State, and I understand that he has written to the librarians of parliament and the Clerk of the House of Commons whose reports were not submitted, and asked them to furnish the information as soon as possible.

With regard to the temporary employees of the Department of Public Works, which was the only other matter referred to, I think the Minister of Public Works took a note of that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) to the fact to the return that he has been good enough to bring down, while it is very useful, covers only one year, and not two as I desired it should. The return seems to cover very completely the year 1905 but it does not touch the year 1904. If he will ask the Department of the Secretary of State to give us a precisely similar return for the year 1904, everything I have asked for will be supplied.

Mr. PATERSON. I will do that. The hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) wants the information for 1904. He does not want an account of the returns called for this session ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). I would like to ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries why he has not that return ready which he promised the other day ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I am sorry to inform the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) that although I gave instructions for the preparation of the return it is not yet ready.

Mr. FOSTER. I would also like to call the attention of the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) to the fact that a return moved for in 1904 by Mr. Tolton, amended by Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and agreed to by the House, has not been answered even up to the present time. This motion is for a return showing how many official or private cars have been constructed, purchased or acquired for the government since 1896 ; the purpose for which each such car was purchased ; whether any, and what members of the government respectively, and to any, and what departments of the government respectively— together with a number of other important items of information which I need not read. There seems to be no good reason why what was agreed to and passed by the House could not have been placed before parliament between that time and this. I wish the Minister of Railways and Canals would have that return completed and brought down. And if he would, by way of paying a little penalty, furnish the information down to the present time, it would save putting another notice of motion on the paper.

I would also like to ask—and I ask it in the interest of pure science—whether we have yet received a copy of the order in council making that contract with the celebrated Hatfield ? I think the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) has had time to think over that.

Mr. PATERSON. Is that the rainmaker ?

Mr. FOSTER. The same.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not know whether we have a copy of that contract—in fact, I do not know whether there is such a contract in existence or not. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) read a report of it from a newspaper, but does he understand that there is such a document in existence.

Mr. FOSTER. Surely, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) belongs to the Know-Nothing Society. I imagine it is his business to know, and he ought to give the House the information, if the House wishes it. Is not that right ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN.

Mr. PATERSON. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) says he knows that there is a contract and says he wishes it brought down, of course, it will be my duty to see to it.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I think I will have to ask the minister to ascertain if there is such a contract, and if there is, to bring it down.

Mr. PATERSON. But if it should turn out that there was no such contract, my hon. friend would have been guilty of taking up the time of the House in talking about something that had no existence.

Mr. FOSTER. Not any more than my hon. friend.

Mr. EMMERSON. In reply to my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), I may say that I was not aware there was a single return asked from the Department of Railways and Canals that has not been furnished. I remember the fact that there was a return referred to, but I was not aware that it had not been laid on the table. I will make inquiry.

Mr. FOSTER. June 20, 1904.

EASTERN RAILWAY SUPPLY ASSOCIATION.

Mr. SAM. BARKER (Hamilton). Before the Orders of the Day are called I wish to ask the Minister of Railways and Canals when he will have the return as to the Eastern Railway Supply Association which he promised two weeks ago?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). I was not present, I think, when reference was made to that matter, but my hon. friend the Minister of Customs called my attention to it I think this morning or yesterday evening. I inquired of the deputy minister, and he said that he was waiting for copies of some of the papers from Moncton. There were some questions to be answered with respect to the Eastern Railway Supply Company. The papers in connection with the whole matter are not voluminous. I think my hon. friend will find in the end that somebody is misleading him again, as occurred not many sessions ago. I hope to have the papers at once, because the transactions with that company have been so limited that there certainly could not have been very extensive correspondence or contracts.

Mr. BARKER. I may remind the hon. minister that when I asked the question the reason he gave for not answering it was that the papers were voluminous, and he would prefer to bring them down on a motion for a return.

Mr. EMMERSON. They might be too voluminous for a question, and not be very voluminous for a return.

CASE OF FRED COCHRANE.

Mr. H. A. WARD (Durham). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to bring to the attention of the government certain facts which, immediately they are known, I am confident the minister in charge of such matters will take prompt steps to investigate and to apply the necessary remedy. About nine years ago a man named Fred Cochrane left his home in the township of Manvers, the home of his relative, Mr. George Price, and went to Vancouver. After spending about four years there he drifted over to Japan, where he was last heard from. My information thus far comes from Mr. Price himself, but my subsequent information concerning him is derived from letters from different parties interested who have got their information from the public press. It appears that during the late stages of the war between Russia and Japan a man named Fred Cochrane, who is believed to be the identical man of whom I speak, was, with two others named Grant and Finnie, on a fishing expedition in a small craft in the waters adjacent to Japan. While returning to the Japan Sea they were fired upon by the Russian cruiser 'Gromoboi,' their craft was sunk and these three men were taken prisoners. According to the reports, Grant and Finnie were subsequently released, but Cochrane was held, and is still held, as I am informed and believe, a prisoner by the Russian government, ostensibly as an American citizen. I believe that these statements are true, according to the public press, and for this reason also that the relatives of this man Cochrane in my county have had no word whatever from him since the late stages of the war, and they are quite convinced that the young man who went away nine years ago is the person in captivity whose release I am anxious to secure. As I said at the beginning, I am confident that the Minister of Justice, in the absence of the Secretary of State from this House, will take the necessary steps to relieve the anxiety of the relatives of this young man, and I have no doubt that when the British government finds out that a citizen of Canada and a British subject is held in captivity by the Russian government, the promptest possible steps will be taken to procure his release.

Hon. Chas. FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). The attention of the home authorities will be drawn to what my hon. friend has said. I will report my hon. friend's speech to the Secretary of State and call his attention to it to-morrow.

MASTERS AND MATES OF SHIPS.

House in committee on Bill (No. 7) to amend the Act respecting certificates to masters and mates of ships.—Mr. Lancaster.

On section 1,

Mr. LANCASTER. Since we were in committee on this Bill last week, I have recast the Bill to meet the objections that I understood were raised to it. I have handed to several gentlemen in the House who were taking part in the discussion, and to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, a redraft of that section 1 as I now propose to ask the committee to pass it. It reads as follows:

> The section substituted for section 3 of the Act respecting certificates to masters and mates of ships, chapter 73 of the revised statutes, by section 4 of chapter 42 of the statutes of 1894, is amended by striking out the words 'or for persons domiciled in Canada for at least three years' in the second and third lines of said section.

That is the amendment that I understood the minister wished to be made to that section. It dispenses with the amendment of the Masters' and Mates' Association so far as it provides that the examination shall be made under oath. It enacts simply that if a man is a British subject he is qualified without having resided three years in Canada.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I would have been ready to consider this Bill at this time were it not that I am in receipt this morning of a letter from the Dominion Marine Association. I intended to show it to my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) before the Bill came up, but unfortunately I had not time to do so. It is dated March 20:

> Sir,—I have the honour, on behalf of this association, to make the request that an opportunity be afforded to the association to express its views upon Mr. Lancaster's Bill respecting the certificates of masters and mates before it is reported by committee to the House. We had the privilege last year of notice and appointment and hearing in connection with the Bill regarding marine engineers, and it is the same opportunity in connection with the present Bill that is desired now. I trust it will be possible for you to issue instructions which will permit our request being granted.
>
> I have the honour to be, sir,
>
> Your obedient servant,
>
> (Sgd.) FRANCIS KING,
>
> Secretary-Treasurer.

Of course, I have no right to issue instructions but in view of the request of this body, which, I understand, is a very important one, it would perhaps be only fair that we should give it an opportunity to be heard and I was therefore going to suggest that this Bill be referred to a special committee in order to give this association the opportunity which it seeks. If my hon. friend does not object I will move that the committee rise and we will agree as to the members of the special committee.

Mr. LANCASTER. Of course, if the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries feels that

he ought to take that course, I am in the hands of the House and of the government, and I would not strenuously object, only there is this about referring a Bill like this to a special committee and it is that it would perhaps not come down to the House in time to be passed, another year might go by and this grievance which is recognized by the House as a serious one would not be remedied. I think, if the hon. minister would not mind, I would make this counter suggestion that he should see what these representations are from the Marine Association and probably next week we could determine whether we should listen to them or not. The hon. minister could tell the House what their objections are. I know that they want a free hand in the employment of these men so that their interests are against the interests of the masters and mates. When last the Bill was up I got letters to that effect and so did other people. The answer to that is that we must protect our Canadian masters and mates ; we must give them a monopoly of these jobs on our Canadian boats. The Marine Association naturally want to have as free and open a market as they can and it is to their interests that they shall be enabled to employ aliens as well as British subjects. But if that is the only objection I think this House will agree with me that it should not be listened to. I quite concede that there may be some other suggestions made to the minister. I do not know but what they may have some other good objection to the Bill and there may be some object in ascertaining what that objection is. But I do urge upon the minister, that, if the effect of sending this Bill to a special committee is going to be to so delay it that it cannot be reported back to this House in time to be passed this session, it not being a government measure, the days being taken for government business as we naturally expect they will before long, particularly when we are to have a short session, he ought not to put us in that position. The Bill was admitted, the last time we were in committee, to be a proper Bill in principle. The Marine Association have had plenty of time before now to register any objection and I do submit to this committee, Mr. Chairman, that they ought to have given us more details of their objections than those contained in the letter which the hon. minister has just read. They want to be heard upon this Bill. We are not, as members of this House, going to do anything wrong or unjust to the Marine Association. We know what their objections will be. We know that they would be benefited by having a Bill like this not passed in the sense that they would have a free market to draw their employees from, whereas they will, if this Bill passes, be compelled to employ British subjects. I do not see that they should be heard in the sense that they ought to complain in the public interests in regard to that, and I would therefore ask the hon. minister to reconsider that suggestion and see if we cannot deal with this Bill in such a way that it will become law this session.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps it would satisfy my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) if the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) would undertake to give my hon. friend an opportunity of having the Bill discussed in the House.

Mr. LANCASTER. Put it on the government orders.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It makes no difference where as long as an opportunity is afforded.

Mr. BRODEUR. In view of the request which is made by this association which, as I understand, is a very important association, it would be very hard to refuse a hearing. This is an important matter and I think my hon. friend will be pretty well advised in agreeing to the appointment of a committee. We might perhaps agree as to the personnel of that committee to-day.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What does the hon. minister say as to my suggestion ? It is right that the association should be heard, but it is right also that my hon. friend should be heard. He wants an opportunity of discussing it in the House after the committee has reported. That course has been taken sometimes. The government have sent Bills of this kind to committee upon such an undertaking.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am going to present a Bill this year in regard to the Act relating to masters and mates, so that we will have an opportunity to discuss the matter on the Bill which I introduce. I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again and that the Bill be referred afterwards to a committee.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Am I correct in understanding the hon. minister to say that he will give to my hon. friend, after the committee reports, an opportunity to discuss the subject in this House ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Certainly.

Progress reported.

RAILWAY ACT 1903, AMENDMENT.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 8) in further amendment of the Railway Act, 1903. He said : Mr. Speaker, I find it my duty to again this session to bring before the House this Bill which is designed to obtain some relief from the conditions that the people are suffering from at the present time and have suffered from for some time in regard to this matter of

level crossings in thickly peopled parts of cities, towns and villages in so far as damage is caused by railway companies. Last session a Bill to enact this legislation was introduced by me, was discussed in this House on the second reading, was sent to the Railway Committee, was discussed there, voted upon, rejected by a majority of the committee, came back to the House on a report advising that it be not passed and was discussed again in the House on that report. This year I am introducing a Bill to accomplish the same object, to carry out the same principle of protection to the people, but I have worded it differently, from the one which was dealt with last year, so as, if possible, to get around the objections that were made to the Bill. I believe that I have succeeded in the way I have worded it this year in getting over all objections which were made to the Bill except the objection that the Railway Commission and not the people of Canada as represented in this House ought to deal with this question. The law has been gone over and over again in this House and I will not trouble to go into any detail about it, but the section of the statute which I am amending does not give to the people any protection at those crossings which are contemplated by this Bill unless an order is obtained from the Railway Commission for that protection and the position of affairs is to-day that the people have no protection in regard to any of these dangerous crossings in the thickly peopled portions of cities, towns and villages where trains cross on the rail level—no protection whatever no matter how fast the trains may be running unless the village or the municipality or somebody has obtained from the Railway Commission a special order in regard to each particular crossing. The issue is this : Should we in this House pass legislation to create a general law for a limited class of cases of which there are numbers all over the country, or should we leave these numerous crossings absolutely without any protection until a special application is made to the Railway Commission in regard to each one of them ? Last year I had before the House a Bill under which the railways were bound to furnish either watchmen or gates.

The year before, I thought I was letting them down as easily as I could in the interests of the people, when I said that they must have watchmen. The year before last when I used the word 'protection' in the sense of watchmen, I was told in the Railway Committee that I was limiting the protection, because there was better protection than watchmen, and it was suggested that the wording should be 'watchmen or gates.' Last year I tried to comply with that idea, but it was objected then that there was some other protection besides watchmen or gates, and that if I said they should provide reasonable 'protection' that was all that was required. Well, in the Bill this year I have suggested the simple word 'protection' according to the suggestion made to me last year. The result of this wording would be, that if on the trial of a case for damages the judge found on the evidence that there was reasonable protection the company would not be liable, and if he found that there was not reasonable protection the company would be liable. I have been forced into the position of proposing in general terms that there must be some protection. If it is now contended that the word 'protection' is too general, and that I should specify the kind of protection, then I say that the House has little respect for the opinion expressed by it and by the Railway Committee for the two last sessions, that I should use the language to be now found in this Bill. It comes now fairly and squarely before the House to decide whether or not we are going to enact a general law to protect people on these level crossings in well settled portions of cities, towns and villages where trains run faster than ten miles an hour. Let not any hon. gentleman imagine that this is a new law which I am trying to enforce on the railways. Since 1857 we have had such an enactment—an enactment to the same effect though not in perhaps the precise words—and it is only within the last few years it has been discovered that it amounts to nothing. About three years ago, in the case of Mackay and the Grand Trunk Railway, the Supreme Court decided that notwithstanding the language of the statute the plenary power to order protection was left in the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. It was a surprise to the profession, it was a surprise to the railway companies who got that decision in their favour. I am told, that so much of a surprise was it to the railway companies, that when the people interested determined to see that Mackay should get justice and threatened to take the case to the Privy Council, the railways paid his claim rather than run the risk of the Privy Council reversing that decision. And why did they do that ? It is because as that decision stands to day, unless we can beat it by an Act of parliament, it is quoted against every one who is injured at a level crossing under anything like the similar circumstances, and all the judges in the land other than the judges of the Supreme Court are bound by that decision which has not been reversed by the Privy Council. From 1857 until 1903 it was always the law that the railway should provide protection at level crossings, or, that the speed should not be more than six miles an hour, but in 1903 the present Act was passed and that allowed a speed of ten miles an hour in thickly peopled portions of cities, towns and villages ; the intention of parliament being that the railways should protect the crossings. But such

is the language of that section, that when you apply the decision of Mackay in the Grand Trunk Railway, it simply means that the railways have to protect these crossings only if the Railway Commissioners have granted an order especially requiring protection. I want it to be distinctly understood by the House that unless we amend the Act in the direction I have suggested it would be far better to repeal that section, because it amounts to nothing, and it simply misleads people into believing that they have rights which they do not possess.

The section of the present Act reads :

> No train shall pass in or through any thickly peopled portion of any city, town or village, at a speed greater than ten miles an hour, unless the track is fenced or properly protected in the manner prescribed by this Act, or unless permission is given by some regulation or order of the board. The board may limit such speed in any case to any rate which it deems expedient.

I propose to add to that section these words :

> But wherever in any such portion of a city, town or village, a railway crosses a highway at rail-level, the said speed of ten miles an hour shall in no event be exceeded unless the company provides protection at such crossing for persons using the highway against approaching trains.

The effect of this is that the onus would be on the railway companies to get from the Board of Railway Commissioners a certificate that the protection they have at a particular crossing is good and sufficient, and if they did not do that, the court would hold that they had not afforded proper protection. Is that too much to ask of the railway companies of this country in view of the rights and privileges which we give them. The result of my Bill would be that in an action for damages they would be obliged to show that the Railway Commission had approved of the protection at the crossing where the accident took place, or otherwise the court on the evidence would be entitled to award damages. If my Bill does not pass, then in every town, village and city in this Dominion wherever a highway is crossed by a railway at rail level, there will be no protection to the people and they can be killed and injured by trains running at fifty or sixty miles an hour without the railway company being obliged to pay compensation in damages, unless indeed some one makes up his mind to have a lawsuit with a railway company before the damage occurs and get a decision from the Railway Commission that he was entitled to certain protection at that crossing which was not afforded by the railway.

Now, who should be at all this expense and trouble? Can the ordinary citizen afford it? Is it fair that he should be subject to it? Who is entitled prima facie to the use of the highways? Surely His Majesty's liege subjects. But out of goodness, I might almost say charity, to the railways when they are building, and in order to promote the development of the country at as little expense as possible, they have been granted permission to cross the highways on the level—to make use free of charge of the people's highways to which they have acquired no title, and for the keeping up of which they contribute nothing. Is it unfair that they should be compelled to go to a reasonable expense to safeguard the lives and property of the people whose highways they are using for the purpose of carrying their goods and passengers? I believe that the hon. members of this House will, on reflection, come to the conclusion that the proposition is not unreasonable.

Now, I am not wedded to the words of this Bill. I am not sure that the language which I have used is the best to carry out my intention. It is the best that I can think of. I am trying to provide a remedy for what I consider to be a serious grievance. If any member will suggest language different from what I have used which will ensure the protection of the people at these crossings without compelling them to bring each particular case before the Railway Commission, I am quite willing to adopt it. I am quite willing to withdraw this Bill if any hon. gentleman can show me that there is any protection for the people without it. But I am here because I am absolutely convinced that the people are not protected under the law at present, as the statutes are construed, unless we pass some amendment such as this. In England, under the common law, the people have the rights which I am asking for in this country. We have in Canada a very peculiar state of railroad law. There is no common law liability in these cases of negligence by a railroad to-day. The Supreme Court has decided that a railway company is not liable for negligence unless you can put your finger on some section of a Dominion statute which it has transgressed. In other words, unless something has escaped our notice which ought to be made an act of negligence on the part of a railroad company, it is not liable How did the law work out in the McKay case? At the risk of wearying the House, let me briefly point out. In that case Mr. Justice MacMahon, who is known as one of the safest and wisest, if not the safest and wisest, of the trial judges we have in Ontario, who not only knows the law, but has a large fund of common sense to back it up, said in his charge to the jury that he did not see that a railway company was in any different position from a man travelling on the highway. He said : If one farmer is driving down a concession line, and another on a side line, the one travelling on the concession line is not to gallop his horses at full speed across the side road taking chances of no one meeting

him. If he does, he is liable under the common law, and the same thing ought to apply to a railway company; and when we say by statute that it shall not do this and the other thing, we do not mean to say that it may do everything else. No reasonable man would take that position. We mean to say that besides what it is not permitted to do under the common law, it shall not do the other things specificed by statute. But Mr. Justice MacMahon was overruled by the Supreme Court, with one judge dissenting, and the decision of that court is now the law, and we are bound to submit to it unless we change it in this House. If there is no such thing as common law liability in Canada, we must meet the case by adding another enactment to the statute law regarding railways. In the Supreme Court decision, Mr. Justice Davies, who gave the decision of the court, points out that in England the law is different. This is his language :

> In a thickly settled country like Great Britain, parliament has thought fit explicitly to provide that wherever a railroad crosses a highway on a level it shall maintain good and sufficient gates across the road on each side of the railway and employ proper persons to open and shut them.

What is the common law all over England, I am asking, should be made the law with reference to the thickly peopled portions of cities, towns and villages in Canada and I submit that that is a reason why some Bill of this kind should be enacted. Another objection to the law as it stands is the uncertainty which it involves. In the city in which I live there is a street called Geneva street and another called Niagara street, which are about the ordinary distance apart of blocks in cities, that is, about one-eighth of a mile, and they both lead in from the thickly settled and fertile township of Niagara to the heart of the city at the market place. There is an order from the Railway Committee of the Privy Council, the predecessor of the Railway Commission, requiring protection to be furnished at Niagara street, and there is a watchman there, but at Geneva street there is no protection. A farmer, knowing that he is stopped at Niagara street if a train passes, is apt to suppose that the same will be the case at Geneva street, and if he is not stopped there, he is likely to suppose that it is safe to go on, and a train comes along at the rate of forty miles an hour and comes into contact with him. He may not be killed or injured, but if such a sad state of affairs does occur, there is no remedy against the railway company. A child going to school, or anybody, old or young, using sidewalks, and seeing no gate down and no watchman at this crossing to stop them, would naturally suppose that everything was right. In this way you cause people to think they are safe when they are absolutely unsafe, by the uncertainty that exists through one street being protected by order of the board, while another is not.

They know they are heading for the market or church or whatever place they particularly intend to reach and they get into trouble because of the uncertainty. Such should not be the case. I submit that the common sense of this House ought to convince us that we should make some general law requiring greater protection at all these places which are in the class I have mentioned.

One of the chief arguments against this Bill in the railway committee has always been that the Board of Railway Commissioners is just as well able to attend to this matter as we are, that no two cases are alike, and that therefore a special decision is required with regard to each crossing. But I humbly submit that the Railway Commission could only deal with the matter in the way I am proposing to deal with it, and I do not think that its judgment is any better than the judgment of the 214 members of this parliament. No one, in his lucid intervals, expects that the Railway Commissioners are going to visit every one of the thousands of level crossings and make a special decision with regard to each. What they would do would be to group together a lot of cases and deal with them in the way I am asking this House to deal with them. They would simply make a general law applicable to all cases of especially dangerous nature, whose dangerous nature parliament has recognized ever since 1857, and I am asking parliament to continue recognizing that danger and make some effort to lessen it or obviate it altogether.

There is another objection to the Railway Commission dealing with this matter. As Judge Sedgewick said in the Supreme Court, when he was agreeing with the conclusion to which Sir Louis Davies had come, but had written a judgment of his own, this power in the commission to give orders includes the power to rescind orders. The Commissioners could not only make orders with regard to crossing but could revoke them. That being so, our citizens should not be put in the position of being protected in our public streets to-day and the week following be divested of that protection because the order requiring it was rescinded. Everybody would not have notice of the application to rescind. Possibly it may be said that the Railway Commission would not rescind any order without giving notice of its intention to somebody, but it would not give notice to every one of the inhabitants of a city, yet every one is entitled to be protected, and the uncertainty which Judge Sedgewick pointed out is another reason for parliament dealing with this matter and not leaving it to be dealt with by the Commission. It should

not be a matter that could be repealed, rescinded and reversed every once in a while as the Commission might see fit. We have reached that condition when our railways should be compelled, in the thickly inhabited portions of our cities, towns and villages, to build their roads over the highways or under them and abolish level crossings, or to at least be compelled to put some adequate protection at these crossings.

The first section of my Bill of last year I have divided into two sections in my Bill this year, because several hon. gentlemen last year objected to vote for the Bill as I had drawn it on the ground that the section required two things. They were willing to grant one but not the other. This section I have therefore divided into two, and in the first I simply ask parliament now to strike out the word 'or' and insert the word 'and' so that the people will be entitled not only to have the track properly fenced but also to have it properly protected. The decision in the Mackay case was that if a railway company fenced the track against the adjoining owners it had nothing whatever to do with the protection of the people on the highway. In such a case, the companies may run their trains as fast as they like and they would not be liable because they were only required to do either the one thing or the other. Although the eminent counsel who appeared before the railway committee last year for the railway companies tried to make us believe that we should leave 'or' and not change it to 'and', I have the stenographers report here of what was said in that committee, and I find that the counsel took that back and admitted that the word should be 'and'. Let me read from the report :

Mr. LANCASTER. Does Mr. Chrysler contend that we should not have both ? Does he contend that if we get the fencing we do not need any protection on the highway ?

Mr. CHRYSLER. You get both.

Mr. LANCASTER. We do not get both if you leave the word 'or.' We want both, and therefore we should have the word 'and.'

Mr. CHRYSLER. That is a small matter. however, I wish to get at the principal point involved.

But my hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Cochrane) with his well known common sense did not think it was a small matter. And he said :

It is not so small a matter.

Then the hon. member for York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) said :

He conceded it.

And Mr. Chrysler replied

If the committee think it better to change 'or' to 'and,' I do not care. It does not matter.

So that neither the government nor any gentleman in this House need to be afraid of earning the undying hatred of the railway corporations if they now change the word 'or' to 'and' since Mr. Chrysler has said it did not matter and he did not care. I submit therefore that the House should go into committee and pass the first section of the Bill, and it ought to do so irrespective of the fact that Mr. Chrysler said in the end that he had no objection to the change.

Mr. Chrysler contended that this Bill should be thrown out and the law left as it is and everybody be free to invoke the Railway Commission because that commission was competent to deal with every case. But cases were referred to in which the Railway Commission, although appealed to, had not taken any action. Referring to one of these cases, Mr. Talbot said :

Mr. Wright says that no action has been taken.

A voice. What about the Almonte case ?

Mr. Chrysler. I cannot answer as to that. Of course the Board of Railway Commissioners were overwhelmed with work.

That is another reason why parliament should pass a law. Mr. Chrysler gave as a reason why the dangerous crossing in Almonte was never attended to that the commission was overwhelmed with work. I believe that to be the case. I believe that the Commission is doing the best it can, and that Commission has been appointed more specially to deal with certain matters that become more particularly within its purvieu than does the protection of railway crossings. If the Commission had nothing to do with regard to the much vexed questions of interchange of traffic, freight and passenger rates, and compelling one railway to allow facilities to others, it might have time to attend to the regulation of level crossings which are dangerous to the public. But the Commission is overwhelmed with work and is not able to deal with this matter.

How many level crossings have the Railway Commission dealt with since they were appointed ? I know of none in the province of Ontario, except in the city of Toronto and the city of St. Thomas. There are several gentlemen from Toronto here, and I leave it to them to say whether one-quarter of the level crossings in Toronto which ought to be attended to have received attention. We know that the Railway Commission have many very, very serious disputes between the railway companies themselves to settle—disputes between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian Northern, between the Grand Trunk Railway and the James Bay, and so on. It would be nothing less than insulting to ask the commission to drop or postpone these very weighty matters to give their attention to the question of level crossings. Therefore, we ought certainly to do this work. We ought to bring in legislation that will cover a principle that will work out in the redress of these grievances and

the removal of these dangers to which the public are exposed. I have only to make the statement to be certain of the concurrence of every hon. member—the statement that the loss of life and personal injuries due to these level crossings are increasing every year. Trains are running faster every year. And there is no reason why the companies should not run their trains at any rate they choose. If the public demand fast travel, I do not object to the railway company meeting the demand because it pays. It is done because it pays, and the public demand for it makes it profitable. But if they are making such profits, the companies can afford to provide protection at these crossings. This will be a step in the direction of abolishing level crossings. I shall be glad when there is no such thing as a level crossing in the country. But we must walk before we can run ; and until we are in a position to abolish level crossings, let us make sure that these crossings are protected as well as possible.

As I have just said, I shall be thankful indeed for suggestions from the government or from any member of this House for the improvement of this Bill. I have done my humble best in the legislation I have drawn; but I do urge this House to assist me to make such a measure as will be satisfactory to the people, such a measure as will have the effect of affording protection to the public. I therefore move the second reading of the Bill, and trust that when we get into committee upon it, our joint wisdom will direct such a wording of the measure as will satisfactorily redress the grievances in this matter that undoubtedly exist to-day.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). I always listen with pleasure to my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) when he brings in his annual Bill with reference to the matter under discussion. I certainly have great sympathy with him in the object he has in view. I may go even further than does the hon. gentleman so far as sympathy is concerned. He seems to be quite—I was going to say agonized, but that might be too strong a word—he is quite concerned about the position of affairs in cities, towns and villages. My own observation is that rural districts are quite as much at the mercy of modern travelling conveniences as are the more densely populated sections. The hon. gentleman shakes his head. It is true that the dangers are greater in a town or city because there are more people. But on the other hand, in towns and cities, as a rule, the people are more alert ; They know what to expect. But the accidents of which we read in the public press, often serious, heart-rending accidents, as a rule, occur in the rural sections.

The section of the Railway Act which my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) would amend is section 227. There is no doubt that it is very properly designed to protect the people in the more thickly populated districts. There is no section of the Railway Act which provides for any protection at railway crossings in the country districts, except as to the whistling of trains and the ringing of bells. But this section 227 seeks to protect people in cities, towns and villages. Yet, as I have said the greater number of accidents occur in the country sections. We ought to give as much attention as may be necessary to the thickly settled portions of the country, but, we should not forget the rural sections.

Now, this matter has been dealt with at previous sessions, it has come under my personal observation from time to time. I had hoped to find time and opportunity to think out a section that would result in affording greater protection to life and property, while, at the same time not unduly hampering the transportation interest of the country. For I am not concerned—at least, not deeply concerned—about railway corporations : I want to see them get fair play so far as that accorded is consistent with the public interest. But I am concerned in the proper operation of railways in the interest of the general public. While life is dear, while life is sacred and must be so considered, and while property rights must be recognized, yet at the same time, we must have regard to the advancing necessites of our own modern civilization.

To that end any members of parliament who seek to enact legislation in the direction which my hon. friend is travelling, and has been consistently travelling since I have had the honour of meeting him in this House, will have my assistance, having regard to all these other interests. I certainly would be glad to follow along with him and assist if I could possibly do so. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that personally I have had in mind the improvement of this section. I have not been able to go into it personally, but I would like to see it done. My suggestion is that this Bill be given a second reading and then be referred to the Railway Committee where these matters can be better attended to than they can be in Committee of the Whole. In the Railway Committee the whole subject involved in this section can be considered and discussed, not merely in an academic way, not merely with a view of stating something for effect, not here but elsewhere, but with the sincere aim of protecting the travelling public and their interests. It is easy sometimes to frame a section intended to accomplish something, but it is quite a different thing to acomplish that which you are aiming at. I am sincerely desirous that every effort should be made in that direction, and I will certainly promise my assistance to that committee in creating a clause that will accomplish all that my hon. friend has in view, or that other hon. members have in view, having regard to the public interests

and the interests of transportation and railway operation. It would be idle for us here in an academic way to declaim against the dangers of the operations of railways, to declaim against corporations doing this or that. Those of us who indulge in that kind of declamation must realize down in our inner conscience that there is much to be considered on both sides; that we must recognize modern conditions and we must recognize what these conditions demand. We are all anxious to secure trade in this country; we are all anxious to have modern travelling accommodation; we all demand it; we are always anxious to annihilate distances so far as we can, and this can only be accomplished by the speed of passenger trains. Now, all these things must be taken into consideration, and I am sure a committee of the whole House could not fairly and fully consider all these matters as they deserve and frame a section that would meet every interest. I want to say to my hon. friend that I am sincere in my expression of a desire to co-operate with him in attaining the desired end. I will certainly not oppose his motion, but I would ask my hon. friend to consent to the Bill being read the second time and referred to the Railway Committee with the object of securing the object which my hon. friend has so sedulously striven to secure during the past two or three sessions.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Minister of Railways has spoken of the object of this Bill in a very sympathetic way, and indeed he has made reference to the possible necessity of legislation of this kind extending to rural districts. I do not know whether I would quite concur in the reason advanced by my hon. friend, because he seems to base it on the supposed incapacity of the people in towns and villages to dodge as expertly as city people when they see a railway train approaching.

Mr. EMMERSON. They are expecting it; the others are not.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, the difficulty in legislation of the present time has been pointed out. The Supreme Court of Canada has concluded that the words 'unless the track is fenced in the manner prescribed by this Act,' in section 259 of the former Railway Act, do not necessitate any protection whatever on the highway, and the judgment of that court in effect affirms the view that if a railway company fences its tracks up to the highway and turns that fence into a cattle guard in a proper and reasonable manner, then it can run its trains at any rate of speed it may deem proper 'through any thickly peopled portion of any city, town or village. Obviously that does not give very much protection. Probably there might be some distinction made between the words of that statute and the words of the present Act, section 227 to which the hon. gentleman has referred. I will not dwell upon the necessity of legislation. The Minister of Railways has not only admitted the necessity of legislation, but he has expressed strong sympathy with the object of my hon. friend from Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster). It is only necessary therefore, to consider his proposal. His proposal is that this Bill should be referred to the Railway Committee. Now, the Railway Committee consists of 194 members, or practically the whole House. It is a committee so unwieldy that it is practically impossible to deal with a measure of this kind in any effective manner. The only course would be to appoint a small sub-committee, which should report to the Railway Committee, and that committee in turn to this House. It does not seem to me that is a wise course to pursue. Any one who has made a study of the methods which are pursued in the British House of Commons will remember that the best work in that House is performed by committees consisting of not more than seven members. That principle has been acted upon in this parliament many times ; during the present session the Minister of Justice has proposed a committee of five members for a certain important Bill, and at my suggestion the committee was increased to seven. Might I suggest to the Minister of Railways that in place of sending this Bill to a committee of 194, the Railway Committee, he should send it to a smaller committee which could do some effective and efficient work upon it ? It seems only reasonable that those who are interested in the operation of railways should have notice of the proposed measure and should have an opportunity of urging before a committee of this House any objections or suggestions which they may desire to present in regard to the features of this Bill. All I suggest is that the committee should not be the Railway Committee, but should be a small committee, a committee from whom one might expect a reasonable amount of attention and a reasonable amount of work.

As my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals has very well pointed out, there are a great many considerations to be taken into account in dealing with a subject of this kind. People throughout the country demand fast railway trains ; they demand express trains. The running of these trains at a high rate of speed across highways on the level must necessarily be attended with very great danger to the travelling public. There are considerations on one side; there are considerations upon the other. In the end the consideration of the safety of human life must prevail, in my opinion. I would, therefore, suggest to the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals that his proposal might perhaps be modified in that way and that we should send this Bill not

to the Railway Committee, but to a smaller committee of this House.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton). I merely wish to say a few words upon this question. I noticed that my hon. friend from Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) referred to the Mackay case which happened in my own riding, in the town of Forest and I can assure the House that the people of that district are very anxious that some remedy shall be given to the town of Forest. They have at the present time trains rushing through the town at a very rapid pace. The accident to which my hon. friend has referred happened at a place where there are obstructions to the view on either side of the track and the people who were crossing at the time did not observe the approaching train. These obstructions are not likely to be removed and I believe this is a crossing that deserves the attention of the Railway Commission. I am very glad indeed to see the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) take the interest he does in this question and I sincerely hope that before the session closes some measure will be placed upon the statute-book dealing with level crossings and giving the people sufficient protection for life while crossing railways at these points.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). Mr. Speaker, I may say that the suggestion which has been made by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) is one that I should welcome in so far as the government is concerned because we realize that this is an exceedingly important measure which ought to receive the most careful consideration that we can give to it. From my own personal experience I am of the opinion that more serious and effective consideration would be given to this measure by a small committee such as that to which he has referred. I would suggest to my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) in this connection that when he provides for this committee he should take into account two things: first, the terms in which his amendment is drawn. My hon. friend in his amendment suggests that the company shall provide protection at level crossings. He does not mention the character of the protection nor does he make any provision as to the authority which is to decide what is to be proper protection. I apprehend that my hon. friend might adopt a suggestion to the effect that this protection ought to be sufficient to satisfy the Board of Railway Commissioners. The desirability of referring this matter to a select committee is quite apparent when we come to realize that this legislation, if passed, would affect, on the Canadian Pacific Railway, over 805 crossings and on the Grand Trunk over 781 crossings. That was established last year when this, or a similar measure, was up for consideration before the Railway Committee and it was then stated that protection at each of these level crossings, such as it was intended to provide by the Bill of last year, would involve an expenditure at each crossing of something like $1,000. That means that we would be putting on these companies an expenditure of $160,000 a year.

Mr. LANCASTER. That was for watchmen and gates.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes. Of course, my hon. friend says it was then for watchmen and gates; now, it is for adequate protection which may come higher.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You might use that good definite word.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Quite so, if my hon. friend will allow us to make use of it under the circumstances. The Bill is one, which, I think, commends itself to the consideration of the House and in so far as the government is concerned my hon. friend the Minister of Railways will be glad to co-operate in so far as he can to make this legislation effective. I think I must lose no time in introducing the measure it was my intention to suggest to my hon. friend the Minister of Railways because it is quite apparent that our very industrious friends on the other side are going to monopolize all the amendments that I intend to ask for.

Mr. G. H. McINTYRE (South Perth). Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of discussing the matter but having heard the discussion upon it last year, having given my adhesion to the views of the hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) and having voted for this Bill on the third reading, it is with very great pleasure indeed that I see now the attitude of the government towards it. I am pleased indeed with the remarks that have fallen from my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) and I congratulate the hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara on the favourable outlook there is for a fair and proper measure to be carried for the purpose he has in view.

Mr. EMMERSON. With the indulgence of the House I would supplement what I have already said. I would like to suggest—perhaps we could speak of that privately—that there might be taken into consideration at the same time any dangerous crossings whether in cities, towns or villages, or in rural sections.

Mr. LANCASTER. I agree.

Mr. EMMERSON. There are a great many dangerous crossings in the rural districts arising from snow fences, cuttings, &c., and I venture to say that as far as the

Intercolonial Railway is concerned and as far as eastern Canada is concerned the larger number of accidents occur far from settled sections where the highway crosses the railway near a deep cutting or where there has been constructed a snow fence. That matter should not be overlooked.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. EMMERSON. I move that this Bill be referred to a select committee of seven members to be hereafter named.

Motion agreed to.

JUDGES OF PROVINCIAL COURTS.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe) moved second reading of Bill (No. 13) respecting the judges of provincial courts. He said: I briefly explained the object of this Bill when it was first read. Its intent is to carry out the principle enunciated a year ago by the Minister of Justice and by other ministers when we passed the Act to increase the salaries of judges. It was then pointed out as an excuse for certain abuses which had existed that the judges had been inadequately paid, and amongst other abuses brought to the notice of parliament was the practice of judges in many instances engaging in work outside their judicial duties, and notably taking part in arbitrations which may be described as of a private character. There is a feeling growing in the country—it is a feeling that will have to be voiced in legislation before very long—that perhaps even in matters relating to government questions, some legislation will have to be adopted or some practice will have to be established which will limit and lessen the number of cases in which judges may act as arbitrators. This Bill, however, deals only with the narrower phase of the question, in reference to judges acting as arbitrators between man and man, or between individuals and companies, or between companies, whereby these judges carry on a system of private arbitration business for gain, and in the course of that, exciting perhaps in themselves a certain interest in favour of one party or the other who may ultimately come before them in the course of the discharge of their judicial functions. Last session the government announced their policy on this matter distinctly and there was embodied in the Act, section 7, chap. 31, 1895, these words:

> No judge mentioned in this Act shall either directly or indirectly, as director or manager of any corporation, or firm, or in any other manner whatever for himself or others, engage in any action or business other than his judicial duties; but every such judge shall devote himself exclusively to such judicial duties.

It was pointed out by several members of the House that while that was a desirable change it did not go far enough. Although the conclusion of the section is pretty general, still perhaps it was limited to the words which had gone before. The Minister of Justice treating the matter in the way he desired to see it, and in the way the members of the House desired to see it, used this language: ('Hansard' 1905, p. 9743):

> This amendment to the Act respecting judges will operate as a clear notice that judges are not to be employed in connection with commissions, except where it is important in the public interest they should be so employed. I think the less a judge has to do with matters which are not clearly within the scope of his judicial duties, the better for himself and the dignity of the bench. Of that I am absolutely convinced. I would even go so far as to say that I entertain grave doubts as to the constitutionality of such appointments.

The Minister of Justice clearly says that he desires it shall be a notice to the judges as to what shall be expected from them, and had the matter rested there it would have been satisfactory. But unfortunately we find that the judges have not refrained from engaging in these arbitrations, and something has to be done, not only by way of notice but I think by way of legislation in order that we shall have a cessation of this abuse.

I do not want it to be understood that I regard the judiciary of Canada as other than a body of men of the highest honour; men whom we should look up to; men whom we should have the greatest respect for; but it seems that the judges look upon it that so long as parliament does not clearly express its opinion by statutory enactment, they may honourably pursue the course they have hitherto been pursuing. Some force is lent to that view by the fact that if we turn to the Supreme and Exchequer Court Act we find a more stringent provision in regard to the judges of the Exchequer and Supreme Courts, than we find in any Act relating to the provincial courts. Probably the judges may find some additional justification for what they have been doing in the language that was used by the right hon. the Prime Minister last session. I have pointed out that the language of the Minister of Justice is clear notice to the judges that hereafter they are not to engage in these arbitration matters, but the subsequent utterance of the Prime Minister is not so definite, and it may be considered as an intimation that he intends there should be a wider scope. The right hon. gentleman said, ('Hansard page 9752):

> This is a very important subject. For my part I agree altogether with the motion that judges should confine themselves to their judicial duties, but is it the intention of parliament—I never understood so—to prevent judges from going into cases which are of a semi-judicial character? For instance my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald) has referred to arbitrations between the Dominion and the provinces. The judges are specially well qualified to act in arbitrations between the Dominion and the pro-

vinces or between the provinces themselves, and I think no one would object to that. The judges have also been called upon to act as arbitrators between workmen and their employees on the occasions of strikes, and as that is in effect a judicial matter to determine, I do not think judges should be prevented from so acting.

As to that last sentence I would have my doubts.

But what parliament intends and what we are all agreed to is that judges should not be allowed to participate in any kind of business which is of a commercial character; they should not be directors of insurance companies or banks or such. But as regards anything which partakes of a judicial character, I do not think any one has the intention of preventing the judges from acting.

Taking these words of the right hon. gentleman:

But what parliament intends and what we are all agreed to is that judges should not be allowed to participate in any kind of business which is of a commercial character.

That sentence, I am afraid, was calculated to mislead the judges and to afford them a justification, because they must have some justification, for engaging in arbitrations contrary to the language of the Minister of Justice a year ago, and to what I understand was clearly the policy of parliament, namely, that the judges were not to engage in these arbitrations. This is not only the policy of this branch of the legislature, but it may be said, I think, to be the policy of the Senate as well. In 1903 a Bill was introduced by the Hon. Senator Ferguson upon this question, but having much wider application than the Bill which I have introduced; and although it did not pass the Senate at that time, owing to the fact that it was said to have certain political bearings, the Gamey investigation being then under way, or perhaps only recently concluded, yet from the expressions of the hon. senators who spoke on that occasion we may gather that the consensus of opinion of the Upper House was that the time for making a provision that the judges should not engage in extra judicial work had arrived—that judges should not thereafter engage in extra judicial work, even in regard to those large matters referred to by the right honourable gentleman who leads this House. But, for the reason that it appeared to have a political bearing at that time, the Bill was dropped. Now, it is not enough to say that the judges are not influenced by the fact that they are engaged by one party or another, say by a large corporation. I venture to say, regarding judges in the same light as other high-minded and honourable men, yet that we must concede, using the words in no offensive sense, that the paymasters are the masters of those employed. I use that expression as a concise expression, and with the greatest possible respect for the judiciary of Canada, and I am not travelling far out of the record of what has transpired in the past, because we have expressions on this subject by a very high authority. You will remember that when the Act was introduced into the Ontario legislature to provide for an addition to the salaries of the judges of $1,000, it was seriously objected to by the Dominion parliament, many prominent members of which pointed out that there was a design in the British North America Act to have the sole control of judges vested in this House, and that to allow the Ontario legislature to contribute any part of the salaries of the judges would be to place the judges under the influence and control, in a certain sense, of the local legislature, which was undesirable. That Act came before the Minister of Justice of that day, and was disallowed. It was placed on a somewhat different basis afterwards, and Sir John Macdonald, being ill at the time, the Act went through without question, but was subsequently questioned by Sir Alexander Campbell and I believe by other Ministers of Justice who succeeded him. A similar case occurred in British Columbia, and Mr. Fournier, who was Minister of Justice at the time that case came before parliament, pointed out how undesirable it was that the local legislature should in any way have power to reward or to influence the judges, and said: 'all of which is incompatible with the faithful and unbiassed discharge by the county court judges of their judicial functions.' Then, it has been well recognized in the past that even where the reward to a judge does not flow from an entirely private source, such as an individual or a corporation, such as a railway company or insurance company, but flows from what might be called a quasi-judicial source, it is undesirable. The legal gentlemen in the House will remember the discussions that frequently have arisen with reference to the payment of judges by fees. Not to go into elaborate quotations, I will just quote a line or two from an eminent judge of Nova Scotia on that question—the Hon. James Macdonald, who says: 'The principle of paying judges by fees was long ago found to be a vicious system, calculated to interfere with the independence of the bench.' Now, if the payment of judges in part by the local legislatures is to be regarded as improper and unwise, and if the payment of judges by fees, even when the provision is made by statute, is to be regarded as a vicious system, I submit that the payment of judges by railway companies and other large corporations—aye, and the payment of judges by individuals who may have to come before them in the course of litigation—is very much more against the true interests of justice than the cases I have referred to. What is the reason? The reason is that it is supposed to sap to some extent the independence of the bench,—

not consciously, not intentionally, not because the judges are not honourable men—but because of the almost inevitable suspicion that it creates in the mind of the public. If we could concede in this House, with our more intimate knowledge of the judges, that we were perfectly satisfied that in no case could it possibly in the remotest degree influence the judgment of a judge, yet we must bear in mind that there is still an equally important question, and that is, that the public should have that high regard for the judges that in no instance will they ever have the slightest or faintest suspicion that everything is not what we could desire in regard to the judiciary of Canada. For a long series of years the judges of Canada had earned a reputation which was so high, so free from suspicion of any kind, that we pointed with the greatest pride to them. I am not one of those who say that if you get down to the base of the whole matter, we might not, as regards the fact, point to our judges with equal pride to-day; but knowing that the judges have not perhaps before been too generously rewarded for their judicial duties, and that because of political exigencies from time to time, they have been called upon to travel out of what are purely their judicial functions, and undertake extra judicial work from time to time, I say that we have not in the minds of the great mass of the people to-day that feeling of respect and confidence in our judiciary which was so noticeable in the past and which is so essential to the well being of Canada. A very eminent authority, Mr. J. S. Ewart, speaking at Winnipeg on the occasion of the appointment of a judge, said that the courts of justice stand between society and anarchy; and I believe that among the institutions which stand at the base of society and among the elements which make up the welfare of the people, there is none so important as the judiciary. The lives, the properties, the liberties of the people are in their keeping. Not only that but the efficient carrying on of the affairs of Canada, the place our country fills in the eyes of other countries, is largely dependent on the position occupied by the judiciary. Look at it in any way you like, there is a great objection to judges engaging in private arbitrations. Take for instance the case of Conmee and the Canadian Pacific Railway, in which a judge—and a very hon. and distinguished ornament of the bench and bar he was—acted as one of the arbitrators. But because it happened that the railway company suggested to him, while the arbitration was in progress, that he should take a position in the employ of the company, an application was made to have the proceedings set aside, and they were set aside. Why? Not because the learned judge had done anything improper or was guilty intentionally of any wrong but because he was acting as arbitrator, and a judge deciding a case must be absolutely above suspicion. I might cite other instances, but it must be patent to every one that when we have judges engaging in these arbitrations and more particularly presiding in cases affecting political questions, the people are apt to lose that confidence in the judiciary which otherwise they would have.

There is another view to be taken. Not long ago we had an outcry in the province of Ontario about justice being delayed owing to the lack of a sufficient number of judges. Is it not therefore in the nature of an outrage that when we have had to concur in the creation of an entirely new court, thus adding largely to the expense which has to be paid by the Dominion, our judges should engage in these private arbitrations and add to their judicial salaries the emoluments derived from these matters which do not properly come within their duties. It is certainly unfair to the country that this condition of things should continue and it is also unfair to the judges themselves, take them as a whole. Take the instance of two county court judges, each drawing $3,000 a year. There is no doubt that these two judges were appointed because it was assumed and argued that they would be called on to do $6,000 worth of work. But if we find that one of them—and it is liable to be the senior judge—gives up one-third of his time to arbitration proceedings, the country is not getting the full value of his salary. The country is only getting two thirds of his services and the other third is given to private matters. But this throws on the junior judge the additional labour, and the result is that one judge is paid considerably more than he earns and the other only gets a certain percentage of what he earns. But that is not all. The senior judge probably gets for his services not less than $2,000 worth of fees from this private source of income, so that for eight months work which he does for the country he receives in all $6,000, while the junior receives only $3,000 for the full year's work. And the matter does not even end there, because the senior judge has certain emoluments, in Ontario at all events, in the shape of circuit fees and so forth which the other does not get.

Hon. gentlemen have had their attention drawn to these matters and no doubt have been considering them in many aspects to which I do not propose to refer, but I would like briefly to refer to another view. And that is this. Whilst we are allowing our judges to engage in these arbitrations for their private gain, we are maintaining in Ontario a far greater number of county judges than we need. This phase of the matter has been discussed on several occasions and it is said that this House can apply no remedy. Well in one sense I venture to say that that is hardly the case. I notice that in the discussion last year the right hon. the leader of the government said that attorney general after attorney general had

tried in his own province—the province of Quebec—and had failed. Well, I am not familar with the conditions in the province of Quebec and shall not do more than simply refer to them. But take the province of Ontario, where the county court judge represent a very large item. There is no obstacle in the way to a reform there which cannot be easily overcome. Speaking of all the provinces, a very easy remedy was suggested last year, and that was that when a province came asking for new terms, one of the conditions should be a final settlement of this matter.

Speaking of Ontario, in 1895 the legislature of that province passed an Act providing that where there were two judges in a county and one retired or died, the vacancy should not be filled unless the population of the county exceeded 80,000. That was a time when the politics of Ontario were not so good in the interests of the county as they are now ; and when the control of affairs in the Dominion was in the hands of men in whom I have much greater faith than I have in the present administration. At that time the Reform element held power in Ontario and a Conservative government held power in the Dominion and had the authority to appoint the judges. The Reform government in Ontario provided that when vacancies occurred, unless the population exceeded 80,000, there should be no appointment. On April 7, 1896, while the same condition of things prevailed, that statute was re-enacted with no material change. But in the succeeding year after there had been a change in the government of the Dominion we find a complete change in this statute. They did not see fit to actually repeal the law—that would probably have been too glaring. They sought their object by a pious fraud, which, I think, will be regarded by the House as most ingenuous, whatever may be said of its honesty and straightforwardness. These gentlemen provided that, nothwithstanding that we were to have the number of judges reduced and the extra judge eliminated in all cases in which there was not a population of over 80,000, yet if the commission by which a judge was appointed said that there were more than 80,000, that should be conclusive evidence of the fact. Here are the words :

> Or, if any such commission, which may be hereafter issued states or recites that the population of such county or union of counties exceeds 80,000, the fact so stated shall be conclusively assumed and shall not be controverted.

So we have this state of things—that the Ontario legislature, as far back as 1895, determined that we had too many county judges in Ontario and provided a means by which the number should tend to decrease and then nullified their own provision by the one I have just read. Now, I think from what I know of the condition of things that exist in Ontario, that it is not too much to hold that, if any representations are made to the government of that province, that this statute should be repealed, and that so far as the government of Ontario is concerned there will be no difficulty about the point. And what would be the result? Now, let me speak of the other provinces as against Ontario. If Ontario had its fair number of judges, according to the basis of calculation of only one judge for each county less than 80,000, instead of having 68 we should have fewer than 34. The population of Ontario is less than 2,168,000. Divide that by 80,000, as a maximum number for each judge, and the number of judges would be a fraction under 28. But, even at 34, you would reduce the number of judges in Ontario by half. I say I speak to the other provinces, and I ask is it fair that Ontario should be drawing out of the Dominion exchequer more than double the money it is entitled to in this matter of county judges? And, speaking for the province of Ontario, and I ask is it wise that you should have this number of judges—more than double the number actually necessary for the efficient discharge of the duties? These men must become rusty and inefficient through having no judicial functions to discharge. I do not wish to weary the House. But I think we must recognize that it is a matter of great moment to the people. I have faith that the government will apply themselves to this question. I have that faith upon their utterances of a year ago. But whether they deal with this matter properly or not, the people of the country generally are well aware of the condition of things. They have had their attention more or less directed to it, and I think that sooner or later the government—any government that may be in power at Ottawa—will find that, if not by statute, then by a change of policy. a new course will have to be adopted. Judges must not be taken from their proper sphere and away from the proper discharge of their judicial duties and placed on these commissions, particularly commissions that are of a political nature. I can very well speak under this head of those commissions that are of a political character, because the effect of putting the judges upon these commissions is to deprive the country of the services for which these men are permanently engaged. But I would not deal with that phase of the question. I have another Bill coming up, and I am not sure that when this Bill goes into committee I may not ask the indulgence of hon. members to make it even wider than it is. I might, perhaps, refer to the article in the Canada Law Journal, volumn 39, page 420, dealing with this question of extra-judicial functions being discharged by the judges. Also at page 540 of the same volume, where Mr. Ewart

is dealing with this question in addressing Judge Perdue, I think it was. I would also refer to the discussion in the Senate—Senate Debates for 1903, pages 398 and 680, where Senator Alexander and others collect a vast amount of useful information. The subject in its broadest aspect has been fully discussed in Great Britain. I might be permitted to refer to the very eloquent passage of Lord Randolph Churchill's address when he was protesting against the appointment of judges on the Parnell commission. He said:

It is submitted that it is in the highest degree unwise and, indeed, unlawful to take the judges of the land out of their proper sphere of duty, and to mix them up in political conflict. In this case, whichever way they decide, they will be the object of political criticism and animadversion. Whatever their decision, speaking roughly, half the country will applaud, the other half condemn, their action ; their conduct during the trial in its minutest particulars, every ruling as to evidence, every chance expression, every question put by them, will be keenly watched, canvassed, criticised, censured or praised. Were judges in England ever placed in such a position before ? Will any judge emerge from this inquiry the same for all judicial purposes, moral weight and influence as he went into it ? Have you a right to expose your judges to such an ordeal ?

Now, if that is true in reference to a quasi political investigation, it does not lack truth in cases where judges are engaged in arbitrations affecting vast interests of railways and other large corporations. There is no engine of such political power in Canada to-day as the great railway corporations. We have had one great railway company in the past, we have other giant railway companies coming forward. We have enormous railway interests in Canada at present, interests which reach from ocean to ocean. Now if what I have just read with regard to conditions in England is true of conditions in this country, is it wise for us to allow judges to have relations with these companies in discharging arbitration duties in the manner I have referred to ? This Bill provides :

Except at the instance and on behalf of the Crown, or for the determination of actions or suits or questions arising in actions and suits as provided for by the statutes or statutory rules of any province, no judge mentioned in this Act shall become, or act in the capacity of a referee, arbitrator, or umpire, or valuator or assessor of damages or compensation upon or for the determination of any question, dispute or matter in difference of any kind whatsoever but the provisions of this subsection shall not apply to prevent any judge from proceeding with and completing any reference or abitration upon which he has actually entered before the 15th day of March, 1906.

The other section provides for getting certain necessary information in order that we may know more as to what is required with regard to judges in future than we possess at the present time. I think that is made clearly necessary by the statement of the Minister of Justice yesterday that certain information that was asked for could not be given because it had not been collected.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I would ask the hon. member whether he considers this parliament competent to enact the last clause ?

Mr. LENNOX. Before replying to the hon. member, I will read the last clause :

Every judge mentioned in this Act shall keep, or cause to be kept by an officer of the court over which he presides, and accessible to such judge, a record of all judicial acts and duties performed by him as such judge, including all actions, suits and proceedings, whether civil or criminal, had or taken, or coming before him, and the disposal thereof, and shall, on or before the 1st day of March, 1907, and annually thereafter, or oftener if required by the Minister of Justice, upon forms and schedules furnished, upon application, by the Department of Justice, make and transmit to the Department of Justice a return or report, certified by the judge, setting forth the judicial acts and duties performed by such judge since the passing of this Act, or since the date of his last return, as the case may be.

Now my hon. friend (Mr. A. K. Maclean) asked me if I consider it within the competence of this House to enact this Bill. Of course I feel I am not by any means a high authority ; but I may say that this question of assigning to judges of provincial courts extra duties has already been determined upon by a Canadian court, and has been carried to the Privy Council of England where it was determinated that we have power to assign extra duties to judges of provincial courts. I move that the Bill be now read the second time.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). Mr. Speaker, the Act which it is intended by this Bill to amend by the addition of two subsections reads as follows :

No judge mentioned in this Act shall, either directly or indirectly, as director or manager of any corporation, company, or firm, or in any other manner whatever, for himself or others, engage in any occupation or business other than his judicial duties, but every such judge shall devote himself exclusively to such judicial duties.

This section provides that no judge shall in any way whatever engage in any occupation or business other than his judicial duties but that he shall devote himself exclusively to such judicial duties. My opinion is that the amendment which is proposed would have the effect, notwithstanding its form, of enabling judges to do those things which are mentioned in that section

and which, in my judgment, they are precluded from doing under the Act as we now have it. I have, up to the present, construed the Act that we passed last session very strictly and once or twice judges have applied to me to know whether or not on a true construction of the statute it would be permissible for them to act as arbitrators in disputes between private parties. The answer that I invariably have given to them is that it is not competent for them to do so and to-night I regret that I am obliged to deliberately say that the judges of this country have not observed the law passed by parliament and that they certainly have not given that example of obedience to the law which we are entitled to expect of them.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Would the hon. minister say how many have not ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I am going to deal with that matter. Some time ago a question was put to me by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) in respect to violations of the Act passed last session. I gave an answer at that time which substantially was to the same effect as what I have just said and I took occasion of that question and of that answer to prepare a circular letter to the judges in which circular letter I inclosed the question and answer as it had been put in the House so that they must have their attention directed to the opinion of parliament in respect to those who are violating the law. I have not yet received answers to all of the circulars that were sent out. I wish now to say to my hon. friend, the promoter of this Bill, that when these answers are received it is my intention to introduce, myself, in parliament a Bill for the purpose of giving effective sanction to the legislation of last session, and if my hon. friend would allow me a suggestion I would ask him to allow his Bill to remain in abeyance until the Bill that I have referred to has been introduced so that we may together prepare such legislation as will give effective sanction to the will of this parliament.

Mr. LENNOX. It appears to me that that is a very fair proposition of the Minister of Justice and I shall very readily accede to it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Let the second reading go. We accept the principle.

Mr. MONK. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Justice—I have not had myself, any opportunity of looking into the matter —if he has been able to ascertain to what extent in England the judges are allowed or it is customary for them to fulfil other functions than their judicial functions either in taking part in teaching, in the educational role, or in being interested as directors in commercial and financial companies. Does the custom exist in England ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I am not able to say in respect to teaching what the practice is among the judges in England, but one judge, who, I may say, is one of the most flagrant violators of our Act, thought to justify himself in respect to his conduct under our Act by sending a list of judges in England who act as directors of companies. I know nothing, as to what the practice is there beyond what I have learned from this judge. However, I will say that I care very little about it because as far as we are concerned we are dealing with our own law.

Mr. A. A. STOCKTON (St. John City and County). I agree with what has been said by my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick). I think that when a gentleman accepts a judicial appointment he should make up his mind to attend to his judicial duties and discontinue all commercial business. When it was proposed last session, not by the Minister of Justice but by a member of the House, to put a clause in the Bill attaching a penalty to the violation of the law the Minister of Justice at that time, and I thought very fairly, thought it would not look well to put such a clause in the Bill as he said we must fairly assume that a gentleman who was appointed by the government to administer the law would obey the law. But, if that has not happened I feel satisfied that from the promise that has been made by the Minister of Justice there will be such an amendment of the law as will avoid the difficulty in future.

Mr. MONK. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice if I understood him as expressing the opinion that judges engaged, for instance, in universities, were debarred under last year's law from continuing their course of lectures. I ask the question because I remember that the matter was discussed in the province of Quebec and that one of the learned judges who occupies a chair in law in Laval University expressed an opinion which was published in the 'Herald' that the law of last year did not debar judges from occupying chairs in the universities. There seems to be very good ground for the opinion which he expressed at that time. Did I properly understand the hon. Minister of Justice to say that the law of last year excludes also the teaching in universities ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, I would be disposed, myself, to think, and I was acting upon that supposition, that those who are engaged in the teaching of law in connection with our universities would not come within the law of last session. I think that must fairly be considered as in line with the performance of their professional work and I expressed that opinion, I think, last session when the Act was passed.

Mr. STOCKTON. That question arose when the Bill was going through last year

and the Minister of Justice expressed the opinion that he has expressed to-night.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have not the statute of last session before me and I do not know how it affects those judges who hold positions of trusts such as executors and trustees. Perhaps it contains a distinct or definite statement on that point.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Let me draw my hon. friend's attention to this: In our province there are judges who are in receipt of very large incomes derived from the administration of large estates and who give a large share of their time to the duties to be performed in connection with the administration of those estates—such large share of the time that in the opinion of some members of the bar they do not and cannot perform their judicial work as the result of the time they give to these private duties.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of course, I do not know anything about the particular circumstances to which my hon. friend the Minister of Justice alludes but I should think, that, not so much in the interest of the judges as in the interest perhaps of those they represent, there must be some question as to how far we should go in respect to positions of trust assumed before any such statute was in operation. That is merely a suggestion. There may be circumstances which would make it desirable that the law should be restricted in that regard. In some instances in my own province, even before this statute came into force, I know that gentlemen who had held positions as directors of banks and other large corporations, thought it desirable in the public interest that they should resign these offices immediately upon appointment to the bench. I think it is the best course, independent of any statutory prohibition. The suggestion of the Minister of Justice, that the further discussion upon this Bill should be postponed, until the government measure is introduced, is a fair one and one which ought to be accepted at once.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We shall adopt the principle of the Bill first by giving it a second reading.

Mr. MONK. I would be curious to know from the Minister of Justice if the judges in the province of Quebec are greater sinners than the judges of the other provinces in failing to carry out strictly what was intended when we passed that law last year. I do not think there is justification for the Minister of Justice stating that some of our judges make considerable sums out of the administration of estates. It is possible that in Montreal and Quebec some of the judges, by reason of family connection and otherwise, are placed in positions of trust from which they derive some income, but I do not think the remuneration in any case is very large. If the government intends drafting a new law, I would submit for consideration the point as to how far that legislation should be made drastic. I suppose the intention of parliament is that a judge should not become a director of a bank or financial institution, but is it the intention to go so far as to say that a judge shall not act as executor, even if he does receive some remuneration. That would be going very far, because there are cases in which the testator either through family connection, or because of great confidence in a man occupying the position of a judge, may wish to name him as executor of his estate and provide some reasonable indemnity. I do not believe there is any country in the world where a judge would be obliged, in a case of that kind, to refuse the execution of a trust. That is why I refer to the custom that prevails in England. No judiciary occupies such a high position as the judiciary of England, and under institutions of a similar character I think we may fairly look to the custom that prevails there, and which has not in any degree shorn the bench of the respect which attaches to it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I should like to draw the attention of my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) to this fact: that while in the province of Quebec our judges are perhaps no greater sinners against the law than they are elsewhere, yet, the offences are largely limited to the provinces of Quebec and Ontario. There are several judges in the province of Ontario——

Mr. MONK. There are sinners in Ontario!

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There are some.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. One turned up at a meeting of insurance directors the other day.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There are some in Ontario, but the number of offenders is greater in proportion in the province of Quebec. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) knows of cases in the city of Montreal where members of the judiciary occupying prominent positions in the province, act on boards of insurance companies and as bank directors; and have continued to act notwithstanding the law of last session. My hon. friend not only knows that, but he knows that in connection with large estates there are judges who if they do not seek the position of executors allow themselves at all events to be sought after. Need I mention the Masson estate, need I mention the Rodier estate, need I mention the O'Brien estate, and a dozen others I have in my mind at the present time?

Mr. MONK. The hon. minister does not mean to say that the income derived from these estates by the judges is a very considerable one?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) must know very well what is going on in the province of Quebec. During the last session of the legislature, application was made to increase by a very large amount the revenue of one of the executors who happened at the same time to be a judge, on the ground that he was obliged to give so much of his time to the administration of this estate. With respect to what is done in England, I say that so far as we are concerned it is usually quite right for us to look to England for our example in matters of this sort. I quite understand that the judiciary in England occupy a very high position, and I know also that the judiciary of this country occupy a very high position. It is not my intention at the present time, nor at any other time, to say anything derogatory of the judiciary of Canada. But we are dealing now with this fact: that we have passed a law which was intended to regulate the conduct of judges, and I say deliberately that the least this parliament has the right to expect is that that law shall be obeyed by the judges.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou). At first blush looking at this Bill. I thought my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) had not excepted from the provisions of section 2 certain classes of matters which in my judgment it was quite within the province of judges to deal with, but on closer examination I see that that class of cases is provided for. I agree fully with the Minister of Justice that this House should lay down definitely and clearly the policy that judges should not be permitted to act in the capacity of executors or trustees. Every one who is familiar with legal matters will realize, that no more delicate task can be placed upon the judiciary than to determine on a technical breach of trust by a trustee, and no more unpleasant duty could be thrust upon the brethren of a judge who had acted in that capacity than to determine as to whether or not a breach of trust had been committed by him. It appears to me that section 7 of the Act of last year laid down the principle very clearly, and it is to be regretted that the Minister of Justice finds it necessary to come here this year and ask parliament to declare more definitely, that judges should refrain from engaging in matters such as the management of companies or the management of estates, which to a certain extent must interfere with the impartial performance of their duties. I would like to say to my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) that I think clause 3 of his Bill deals with a situation which ought to be left to the provincial legislature. In Nova Scotia we have a system under which the prothonotaries of the various courts throughout the province report to the government the cases which are dealt with, their character, and all the information which my hon. friend proposes to get by this section. It seems to me that this matter comes more naturally within the purview of provincial legislation than it does within our sphere in this parliament. The object which my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) desires to attain must, I am sure, have been obtained in the various provinces by legislation of this character. That, however, is a matter which will be dealt with more fully when the Bill gets into committee.

Mr. LENNOX. Mr. Speaker, if I may be allowed the indulgence of replying to what the hon. gentleman has just said, it may be that there is some reason for considering it; but as I have accepted the suggestion of the Minister of Justice, and I am quite sure that the government desire to secure this information, I am quite willing to leave it at that for the present.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the second time.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. ARCHIBALD CAMPBELL (C. York) moved second reading of Bill (No. 14) to amend the Weights and Measures Act. He said: The object of this Bill is to remove a grievance that has grown up in the province of Ontario, and more particularly in the neighbourhood of the city of Toronto. It has been the custom there for many years that all the milk sent to the city of Toronto has been sold by the farmers by the can. From the best information I can obtain, there are between 2,000 and 3,000 cans sent into the city every day. These cans were supposed to hold eight gallons, the farmers getting a certain price for that quantity; but in later years, for some reason or other, the cans have varied very much in size; and now, I think I am safe in saying there are no cans delivered in Toronto holding less than eight and a half or nine gallons, while the farmer continues to be paid at the rate of eight gallons to the can. The result is that there has grown up a great grievance among the people on this subject. They have petitioned this House very strongly for the passage of such a measure as I have had the honour of introducing. It will remove that grievance by fixing the legal standard of quantity, so that when milk is sold by the can, everybody will know that a can means eight gallons, and half a can four gallons. The Bill does not interfere with the present cans, hundreds of which are in use, because it makes no difference what quantity a can holds, whether three or four or seven or nine gallons, the farmer who sells the milk will be paid for exactly what he delivers, and the dealer will get all he pays for. For instance, a man who delivers a can of milk holding only seven gallons, gets paid for only seven-eighths of a can; if he

delivers a can holding nine gallons, he will be paid for one can and one-eighth; and so on. A clause provides for the inspection of the cans. In case of dispute between the producer and the dealer in regard to the size of a can, it may be taken to an inspector of weights and measures, who will determine the quantity it holds, and stamp its capacity on the can. So that the Bill will remove a great grievance in the province of Ontario. I do not suppose it will affect matters in the province of Quebec or other provinces, where I understand milk is sold largely by the gallon. The Bill also provides that the Governor in Council may make a tariff of fees for the inspection of the cans, but that the fee shall not exceed one and a half cents a gallon. I had the honour the other day of presenting a petition from over six hundred ratepayers and producers in Centre York, South York, and North York, and also the counties of Peel and Halton. All the counties around Toronto are interested in this Bill, and I hope it will receive the favourable consideration of the House, as I am sure it will remove a great grievance which has existed for some time and is gradually growing worse.

Mr. R. BLAIN (Peel). I am in accord with the principle of the Bill. I think that some remedy should be found to meet the long standing grievance of the farmers who supply a large quantity of milk to the city of Toronto and other places in the province of Ontario. This is an old Bill of my hon. friend's; he has introduced it before.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Only once before.

Mr. BLAIN. The way my hon. friend has been referring to it I thought it was more than that. However, I may say that his attention was drawn to the fact that his Bill was not very well worded, and I was in hopes that this year he would have changed its phraseology to make it meet the wishes of a larger number of the members of this House. However, that is a minor matter which can be made right in Committee of the Whole. I think my hon. friend has fairly pointed out the grievance that exists among the farmers, particularly in his own county and other counties in the neighbourhood of the city of Toronto. The reason milk is sold by the can is that it seems to be the most convenient way both for the milk producer and the dealer. One reason why the cans are made larger than eight gallons is that they may be sufficiently large to avoid the loss of milk in transit. Still another reason is that the cans that are sent every day to and from the city by express suffer considerable damage, the sides being pressed in, and thus the capacity of the cans is reduced. For these reasons the cans are made to hold more than eight gallons in order to protect the dealer in the city. But I think that is not quite fair to the farmers. I think he should have the right to supply eight gallons of milk as a can.

It is only fair to the farmer that when he sells a can of milk supposed to contain eight gallons that can should contain eight gallons and no more. Let the dealer make his can hold more if he wishes and make the contract in the way I have pointed out; but when milk is bought and sold as it is at present, the law should be so changed that the farmer would be compelled to put in his can eight gallons and the dealer would have the right to make his can as large as he wishes within any reasonable size. There is a very strong complaint made by the farmers in the county I represent. Large quantities of milk are sent not only on express trains, but in wagons, and the farmers complain that the dealers refuse to accept the cans unless they are filled up. And as the hon. member for York (Mr. Maclean) has pointed out, the can in many instances hold considerably more than eight and a half gallons, yet they will not be accepted unless they are filled to the top and the farmers are only paid for the eight gallons. This matter should receive more careful consideration at the hands of the government. It is probably a little unfortunate from our standpoint that it only applies in Ontario and in very few points in that province, because the milk business is not very extensive except in and around the cities. But it is of sufficient importance to receive the attention of the government and no time should be lost in getting this long-standing grievance removed. I hope the hon. gentleman's Bill will receive that fair and just treatment the importance of the question deserves. This side of the House will give the hon. gentleman every support in perfecting this legislation in order that this grievance may be removed.

Mr. J. BARR (Dufferin). I am very much pleased that my hon. friend from York (Mr. Campbell) has introduced this Bill. It is intended to remove a grievance which is felt by the farmers throughout the length and breadth of the county. Continual friction has existed between the sellers and purchasers of milk, and it is well known that as a rule the farmer gets the worst of it. It is well known that advantage is taken of them and that when the milk is delivered the purchasers complain that the full amount is not supplied. What guarantee have the farmers if the cans are not stamped ? I submit that if the can should be in any way damaged that doesn't affect the quantity of milk in them very much, and if so the deficiency can be easily remedied. But you can easily see the difficulty which arises in shipping milk to Toronto when there is continual friction between the two parties. I think the Bill has been pretty carefully

drawn, but there is one thing I do not see provided, and that is who shall pay for the inspection? I do not think that the burden should be thrown upon the farmers. The expense should at least be divided. When my hon. friend explained his Bill I did not catch how the expense in connection with the stamping of the cans would be defrayed. I do not think it would be just to make the farmers pay the whole of it, and I hope that provision has been made in the Bill to meet this difficulty. The intention of the promoter is no doubt a good one, and when the Bill comes before a committee we will have time there to discuss it more fully and see that it carries out the object we all desire.

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue). I greatly regret that I was not present when the mover of this Bill explained its provisions, but having given the matter some attention I am prepared to say that I believe he is moving in the right direction. It is absolutely necessary that some provision should be made for a standard measure for the delivery of milk by the farmers, and the department is ready to assist the hon. gentleman in that direction. I am advised, however, that in some respects the Bill does not meet the view of our officials who have to do with the inspection of weights and measures. But if my hon. friend will permit the Bill to go before the Committee on Agriculture, the department will assist him in having it so framed that it will meet the approval of the department and we shall see that it is enforced when made law. One of the amendments I would suggest would be that a standard gallon should be maintained rather than a standard can. I am advised that throughout the country there are various vessels used for the conveyance of milk. For instance, in the province of Quebec, the five-gallon can is the one generally used. In New Brunswick it is the two-gallon can. Therefore, to provide that only an eight gallon or a four-gallon can be used would do injustice to those portions of the country which use other measures of capacity. I would suggest that this Bill go before the Committee on Agriculture, as that is the committee best equipped for the discussion of matters of this kind, and there we will try to put it in such a shape that it will be acceptable to the House and the department will see that the law is enforced.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). The difficulty is this, that the dealer in the cities supplies the cans and he knows that the farmer, in order to have his milk good and fresh and avoid its being churned must fill his can. All the business is done on the basis of eight gallons to the can, but the dealer is constantly increasing the size, and as the farmer has to fill it up, he is really delivering eight and a half or nine gallons and only getting paid for eight gallons. I would suggest that we should make a standard can eight gallons and have the cans inspected and stamped. I know that in Montreal the milk is sold in much smaller cans, but in Toronto it all comes in these eight gallon cans because those are found the handiest for lifting from the wagon to the car and from the car to the wagon. All the farmer asks is that the law should be so framed that while the standard may be fixed at eight gallons, if the cans are made larger by the dealer, the farmer should be paid for the milk he actually supplies. All I say is, let us make the experiment. This question has been up for ten years and we have made no headway. The farmers want the evils removed, and the best way is to try the experiment; if it does not succeed we can repeal the law. It will not interfere with the custom of trade in other places, but it will improve the conditions of the trade about Toronto.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara). I would quite agree with the principle declared by the hon. member in moving the Bill, but I am inclined to think that section 2 goes a good deal further than he intends it to go. I understand him to wish to legislate with regard to the trade in milk shipped in cans. But section 2 would affect the trade in milk that is delivered from the wagon, and would compel a vendor of that kind to carry his milk in a can of a particular size. I do not see any necessity for that, and I suppose the hon. gentleman does not mean to go so far. If the milk is to be sold by the quart or pint to the householder, it does not matter what may be the size of the receptacle in which it is carried to the door. I am not on the agricultural committee, so shall not have an opportunity to deal with the matter when it comes before that committee. I would suggest that section 2 be made to read 'milk cans referred to in section 1' or otherwise amended to cover the point. In its present form it will work hardship in the way I have suggested.

Mr. CAMILLE PICHE (Monteal, St. Mary's). If the statement of the hon. member for East York is true—and I do not doubt that it is—the case is a special one, and it seems hardly worth while to make a general statute with a view to reaching a particular case in the neighbourhood of Toronto. The real reason for passing the law would be that in the district near Toronto cans are provided by dealers and not by the producers. I do not see any need for this legislation when the difficulty can be remedied by the producer himself furnishing the cans, as is done in Montreal and many other places. The difficulty, as explained is that the dealer sends larger and larger cans, to get them filled by the producer. But if the producer himself would furnish the cans, he could make them of the regular measure.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. It might be a good thing for Quebec if we made the law so that it would be easy to get the dealer to supply the cans.

Mr. M. AVERY (Frontenac). To make a law providing that a can must have a capacity of eight gallons, would not be fair to those already having cans. As has just been suggested, the producer, if he wishes, can furnish his own cans. There might be a special reason why some would want a larger can than is provided for by this Bill.

Mr. A. A. WRIGHT (South Renfrew). As to the producer furnishing the cans, we have had some experience in that kind of thing, and I will tell you how it has worked. The men who buy the milk have the whole thing in their own hands. They do not want the vendor to furnish his own cans, because they know that if he does they are not going to get a larger can than they ought to have. So, when the dealer goes to the man who sells the milk, he tells him that he must use the cans furnished him or they will not handle the milk. A farmer who has gone to the expense of getting a first-class dairy herd started, cannot change his farming to another line of work. If the farmer thinks he will send in his milk and sell to some one else, he finds that nobody will buy it. As a rule, there are no cheese factories near the large cities, so the farmer has no opportunity to find a market there. Therefore, he has to sell to these buyers or have the milk left on his hands. There is no injustice done under the Bill. The buyer pays only for what he gets. This matter of inspecting the cans and making a standard is just the same as making a standard fruit package. Nobody will be injured and everybody will be benefited because all will know what they are getting.

Mr. G. W. FOWLER (King's, N.B.). The gentlemen from Ontario are bringing a very serious indictment against the dealers near Toronto in saying that these men want to get nine gallons when they only pay for eight gallons. It seems hard to believe that there can be such men in business in Toronto. There is a large milk business in the province from which I come. The dealers supply the cans, but there is no difficulty, because the farmer gets paid for the exact amount of milk he furnishes. We have always been led to believe that Toronto was a good city—a good and righteous city. And yet it appears that in that city there are men such as the hon. member for South York—the hon. members for both Yorks—would have us believe. Montreal is always held up as having a very black character as compared with Toronto. There is none of this difficulty in Montreal, yet we have the testimony of a gentleman from Toronto that we must change the law of the whole Dominion because there are dishonest dealers in Toronto the good. For my part, I propose, to vote against the Bill.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). I do not know whether the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) has had his attention directed to the view expressed by his predecessor whose observations seem to be cogent. He said he could not understand whether this Bill was intended to create a new standard of measure, and that if it did not the department had nothing to do with it. He confessed himself a little unable to understand it. I confess I do not exactly apprehend the import of the Bill. —It says :—

> When milk is sold by the can, the can shall be considered as equivalent to eight gallons, and the half can to four gallons.

It then goes on to deal with matters of inspection and verification of cans. Would it not do to say that if milk is sold by the can, the vendor must deliver eight gallons. That is what is intended, I understand. But, apparently, you propose to create a new standard of measure unknown to the law at the present time. I would commend to the attention of the Minister of the Inland Revenue, the observations of his predecessor in 1903, which he will find in 'Hansard' of that year at page 2340. He seems to have given the subject a good deal of consideration. The member for East Toronto (Mr. Kemp) who is not now in his place, urged certain objections to the Bill at that time, which objections he was making, I believe, from the standpoint of persons interested in this trade. If there is any grievance, and I have no doubt there is a grievance which has been alluded to by the hon. member for Centre York (Mr. Campbell), it is undoubtedly right to have the grievance redressed in this House, if legislation is necessary. If it were not for what the hon. gentleman states, I would have thought it was a matter that might regulate itself by the course of trade, a little precaution in the way of carrying on the business. It was pointed ou in 1903 that if these cans became indented in any way in the course of transit to and fro, then, under the present provisions of the Weights and Measures Act, they can no longer be used. because there is an express provision in the Inland Revenue Act relating to weights and measures which was quoted in that debate, and which is as follows :

> No measure the capacity of which the sides or bottoms are indented battered or knocked out of regular form will be admitted to verication.

It will be impossible, it seems to me, to carry on the business of transmitting these milk cans every day in the year without their very soon coming within the prohibition of this statute. If I rightly understand the object of my hon. friend from York, it is to make sure that when, in the course of trade, you sell so many cans of milk, you shall get so much milk, that fifty cans of milk, for instance, should contain 400 gal-

lons and no more. Well, it seems to me you should be able to accomplish that object without creating a new standard of measure, as apparently is the intention of the second clause of this Bill. However, if the Bill is going to the Committee on Agriculture, I suppose all these matters will receive due consideration.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I have no objections to referring the Bill to the Committee on Agriculture. I might point out to the House that this is not the first time that legislation of this kind has been passed. A few years ago there was quite an agitation in and around the city of Montreal as to the sale of potatoes. By the Weights and Measures Act, potatoes are sixty pounds to the bushel. But our friends in the city of Montreal said that potatoes were sold by the bag in that city, and they brought forward a Bill here to provide for the weight of a bag of potatoes. That Bill was passed in 1901, chapter 26, entitled 'An Act respecting the packing and sale of certain staple commodities.' That Act provides that in the province of Quebec where potatoes are sold or offered for sale by the bag, the bag should contain at least eighty pounds. Now what difference is there between that Act and the Bill I have the honour to introduce ?

Mr. PICHE. There is a great difference, because that Act applied only to Quebec. If the hon. member will specify that his Bill should apply to Toronto we will not complain.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I have no objections whatever to making it apply to the province of Ontario. But I do not see where it affects adversely the province of Quebec or any other province. If milk is sold by the can in the province of Quebec or any other province, then there must be a law to say what a can contains. There is no law to-day. It may be an unwritten law that eight gallons is a can, but there is nothing on the statute book to show. If I buy ten cans of milk from a man I do not know what I am getting. But in this Bill I make it specify that when you buy a can you get eight gallons, no more and no less. Now then the object of having these cans verified is this : There are to-day a great many cans in existence of different capacities, and it would be unfair to compel dealers to discard all these, and to say that the cans must hold only eight gallons. I presume that in future, as the cans are made, they will be made exactly to hold eight gallons no more and no less. But those that are in existence, it will be necessary to verify them, and have them inspected by an inspector of weights and measures who will show that they hold eight and a half gallons, or seven and a half, or nine and a half, whatever it may be, and thus you are injuring no one and avoiding disputes. The producer may say :This can holds eight and a half gallons. The dealer may say, No, it only holds eight gallons. How are you going to settle the dispute ? By taking it to the inspector of weights and measures. He measures the can and determines exactly what its capacity is, and this settles any difference as to the capacity of the can. Now as I have pointed out, Bills similar to this have already been passed by this House. I have no objection at all to making it apply to the province of Ontario alone. I do not wish to impose upon Quebec or any other province a law that they objected to. But I do say that in the province of Ontario it is becoming a matter of very great concern. Just imagine, Sir, where there are 2,000 cans a day brought in, or a farmer who brings in four cans loses two gallons every single day which, at twelve and a half cents a gallon, is twenty-five cents a day, and that goes on for 365 days in a year. Now the farmers are not small-minded in these matters, they do not object to giving a few gallons of milk for nothing ; but when you come to exact from them two gallons every day in the year, it becomes a matter of considerable importance ; hence the petition that I presented here from 600 men around the city of Toronto all praying for the passage of this Bill. Who is going to be injured by it ? Tell me any man in this country that is going to be injured by the passage of this Bill.

Mr. LANCASTER. The vendor of milk in this city will be injured.

Mr. CAMPBELL. He will not be injured, for he will get all the milk he pays for, and he sells that milk around by the quart or the gallon as he pleases. When he buys from the farmer a can of milk then he pays for eight gallons no more and no less, and the poor farmer is not obliged to give him eight and a half or nine gallons. Sir, this is a measure that ought to receive the commendation of this House, it is a measure that will remove a grievance that has been existing for many years, and should have been removed long ago. It is doing no injustice to anybody. If the Minister of Inland Revenue desires that this Bill should go to the Committee on Agriculture, I have no objections. I am satisfied the committee will see the good points in this Bill and will recommend it to the House.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. It appears to me that the object the minister announces is one that should commend itself to the member for York (Mr. Campbell) that is, that we should stick to the gallon measure. My hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain), I think, has shown you the reason why a can cannot always be equivalent to so many gallons, it is, that a can becomes dinged or dented by shipment continually, and an eight gallon can when it is new and may hold exactly eight gallons, after it has been used a considerable time and these dents become deep-

er, the can may have less than eight gallons in it. Further, to apply that measure simply to Ontario—it appears to me that legislation of that kind passed by this parliament should apply to the whole Dominion. If it is constitutional to apply it only to the province of Ontario, then we might consider a proposal to limit it to that province. But I think the idea would scarcely commend itself to this House that we should revise here the Weights and Measures Act altogether in order to meet a case regarding milk. What about cans containing maple syrup? That is a very important article of trade, particularly in the province of Quebec where the farmers sell syrup by the can.

Are we to have a different sized can for one commodity from what we will have for another? The hon. gentleman has mentioned that a bag contains a bushel and a half whatever it contains, whether apples, potatoes or onions. That is a recognized quantity, but a can, according to the hon. gentleman, will not be a can unless it contains milk, and that is the only article he proposes shall be put into that variety of can. It changes the whole Weights and Measures Act and we will have to revise our school-books in order that this different standard of measurement may be taught to our children in the schools. This involves a change in the arithmetical calculation as we have always made it in the schools. The hon. member for Renfrew (Mr. Wright) tells us that if we do not take this can while we can we cannot have any other can. I do not know how he figures that out. I believe that milk should be sold by the gallon as well as anything else, and if the dealer asks five quarts to the gallon it is optional with the farmer whether he shall give him that or not. If you stick to the actual standard measurement of an Imperial gallon, four quarts to the gallon, I do not see how there will be any difficulty or why it should be necessary to introduce a measure of this kind simply for Ontario. I do not see the reason for it and I agree with the hon. minister entirely that we should not change our Weights and Measures Act simply to meet an emergency that may arise in a case of this kind.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization.

ELECTIONS TO THE HOUSE.

On the order for:

Resuming the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. R. L. Borden for the appointment of a select committee of nine, to inquire into the Acts relating to elections to the House of Commons, and the prevention of corrupt practices thereat, &c.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The object of this motion has been subserved by the appointment of a committee to which certain Bills have already been referred. I would think that it might as well be removed from the order paper, and I would therefore ask leave of the House to withdraw the motion.

Motion withdrawn.

RAILWAY ACT, 1903, AMENDMENT.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 17) further to amend the Railway Act, 1903. He said: Mr. Speaker, I wish to explain this Bill. In consideration of what has happened this afternoon in reference to railway legislation I probably need not go into it very fully. The proposed amendment of section 199 of the Railway Act, 1903, is intended to effect two objects. One is to put the question of fencing a railway upon a more satisfactory basis and the other is in reference to cattle which accidentally get upon the railway not from the land of the owner of the cattle but from probably some adjoining land. In reference to the question of fencing, the policy that Canada adopted prior to 1888 was very definite, and it was that the railway, as a statutory corporation, should fence their line from end to end. The legislation prior to 1888 was based upon the principle that the railway company should fence the land that they had obtained as a right of way or as accommodation for their stations. That principle was preserved intact in the Railway Act of 1888 as far as I have been able to ascertain except that in the Railway Act of 1888, it was only applied to cases where a township had been set apart for settlement, had been surveyed and municipal government established. I refer to section 194 of the Act of 1888. It says that:

When a municipal corporation for any township has been organized and the whole or any portion of such township has been surveyed and subdivided into lots for settlement, fences shall be erected and maintained on each side of the railway through such township—

—of a certain height, &c. It goes on to make absolute provision for cattle guards and matters of that kind and the third subsection of section 194 says definitely:

Until such fences and cattle guards are duly made and completed, and if after they are so made and completed they are not duly maintained, the company shall be liable for all damages done by its trains and engines to cattle, horses and other animals, not wrongfully on the railway, and having got there in consequence of the omission to make, complete and maintain such fences and cattle guards as aforesaid.

Under that section certain amendments were made to that section, and in the years between 1888 and 1890 it was held that the railway company were liable although the cattle of A might have got on the land ad-

joining the railway belonging to B and from the land of B got upon the railway. But in 1890 some alteration was made, the result of that alteration being that the railway companies would not be liable where the cattle had strayed on the adjoining land, and so from the adjoining land had got upon the railway, the principle being laid down that they had only to fence against the adjoining owners, and not to fence against cattle generally. The case of Fensom vs. the Canadian Pacific Railway shows the condition of the law between 1888 and 1890, and it is to have the law restored to the same condition as it was in between 1888 and 1890 that I introduced the first part of subsection 3 as an amendment to sub-section 3 of 199 of the Railway Act of 1903. I have adopted some of the language used in the Bill introduced by my hon. friend from Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) in regard to cattle guards, the principle being that the mere fact that cattle have, without the neglect or default of the owner, got upon the railway shall not be an answer to the liability of the railway company for damages. It shall not be sufficient for the railway company to say that in so far as the half mile limit is concerned the cattle were wrongfully at the place where they escaped from the highway to the railway.

The law in force at the time Fensom vs. Canadian Pacific Railway was decided contained in effect the provisions I have incorporated in this section down to the word 'provided.' Then I provide the means by when the railway company shall escape the necessity for fencing in certain cases where it may be just they should not be called upon to fence, namely in districts where there is practically no settlement. As regards that the Bill provides :

> Provided, however, that where a railway traverses territory in which no municipal organization exists and which has not been surveyed and subdivided into lots or opened for settlement, the board may make orders modifying or relieving the company from compliance with the provisions of subsections 1 and 2 of this section for a limited time or until further order made therein ; but no order, unless renewed, shall have any force or effect beyond the period of ten years.

Until 1903 the law was that the railway had to fence in all organized territories in territory or where there was a municipal government established, and in localities which had been surveyed and opened for settlement. Section 199 of the Act of 1903 introduced a new system which I submit was not a wise system and was not fair to land owners. Subsection 3 of section 199 provides :

> Whenever the railway passes through any locality in which the lands on either side of the railway are not improved or settled, and inclosed, the company shall not be required to erect and maintain such fences, gates and cattle guards, unless the board otherwise orders or directs.

The present law is that a railway company need not fence if there is one vacant lot adjoining the railway, so that if a township is pretty thickly settled and almost every lot occupied, if there be two or three lots of bush lands, the company need not unless they do so voluntarily, erect a fence along the unoccupied lots. That I believe is unfair. It is provided of course that upon application to the railway board the board may compel the company to fence. This Bill provides that in cases in which the railway company wish to be relieved from liability to fence they must make application to the Railway Commissioners and obtain their order, instead of as now driving the farmer to take the initiative and throwing upon him the onus of establishing that it is a place that should be fenced. I quote from a speech of the late Postmaster General (Sir William Mulock) which expresses very distinctly the effect of the law of 1903 in placing upon the farmer the obligation of coming to Ottawa in order to obtain relief. In 1888 or 1890 Sir William Mulock said :

> To compel the individual to make an application at Ottawa amounts to a denial of justice, for the whole value of his land may not be equal to the expense of applying to the government here for redress. You are offering him a remedy which he cannot avail himself of, and the very knowledge of the fact that he has to appeal to Ottawa and have the whole examination made here where he cannot appear in person and must have some one to act for him makes him despair of getting relief and so he suffers.

I presume that probably the Minister of Justice will suggest that this Bill be referred to a special committee in the same way as the Bill introduced by my hon. friend (Mr. Lancaster) in regard to level crossings. I have no objection to that.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. This is quite an important piece of legislation and I would suggest that it be referred to the Railway Committee, or perhaps better still, to that smaller committee to which the Bill of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lancaster) is to be referred.

Mr. LENNOX. I am quite prepared to accept the suggestion of reference to the Special Committee, and I move the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. BRODEUR. This Bill provides that the onus probandi will be on the railway company, but suppose the railway company should be guilty of considerable negligence in reference to the fence and the owner of the animal should be guilty of a lesser negligence, is it not possible that under the Bill the railway company will be discharged from all liability.

Mr. STOCKTON. If the railway company is guilty of any negligence it would have to pay.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not think there would be any contributory negligence by the owner of the animal in the form in which I have framed my Bill. It says :

The company shall be liable to the owner of the animal for all damages in respect of it caused by its getting or being upon the railway, or by the company's trains or engines or the operation or management thereof ; and no animal allowed by law to be at large, and no animal running or being at large without the actual negligence or wilful act or omission of the owner or his agent, of which negligence the onus of proof shall be upon the comapny, shall be held to be unlawfully or improperly on a place adjoining the railway merely for the reason that the owner or occupant of such place has not permitted it to be there.

If the railway company neglects to fence where it should fence they would be liable, unless their owner has been guilty of negligence.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

On motion of Mr. Lennox the Bill was referred to the select committee to which was referred Bill (No. 8) to further amend the Railway Act.

INDEMNITY OF MEMBERS AND PENSIONS OF PRIVY COUNCILLORS.

On the order,

Second reading of Bill (No. 18) respecting annuities for certain privy councillors, and respecting the Senate and House of Commons.—Mr. Maclean (South York).

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Mr. Speaker, before the Bill is called I would like to ask the acting leader of the House if the government is prepared to fix a day for the discussion of this Bill. I have said to some of the gentlemen who feel interested in the Bill that I was prepared to have a day fixed and I would like to suggest that it be next Thursday.

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). I am not in a position to fix a day for the discussion of the hon. gentleman's Bill, but if the Bill meditates, as I think it does, a rather radical change, if it is intended to introduce the principle that members of the House of Commons shall receive no indemnity hereafter, I would like to have the Prime Minister present while it is discussed.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I may say to the hon. gentleman, to remove all doubts as to that, that there is an additional clause in the Bill to restore the conditions that existed before the Bill of last session was passed. That clause is substantially as follows:

The sections repealed and amended respectively by chapter 43 of the statutes of 1905 are re-enacted and declared to be in force.

Mr. PATERSON. That changes it somewhat, of course. However, that is rather open to the objection which my hon. friend's paper has taken and which I think he has taken on the platform, that the measure is a grab or a steal. He proposes to repeal that and to enact a grab or steal for a lesser amount—is that the idea?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The hon. gentleman asks what is the intention of the Bill. I have told him, and if he likes to say that the previous condition was of the nature of a steal or grab, he may say so; I have not said so. I propose to restore the previously existing condition of affairs.

Mr. PATERSON. I certainly do not term what the hon. gentleman now proposes to return to a grab or a steal; I never did. Nor do I deem what he proposes to repeal to be anything of that kind. However, as the hon. gentleman is not going to introduce the radical principle of requiring members to serve without indemnity, whatever his proposition may be, which does not appear in his Bill, I would rather have the discussion on this question deferred until the Prime Minister is in his place. The hon. gentleman's Bill will appear very early on the order paper, and as he proposes to let it go over till next Thursday, I suggest that it be allowed to stand till then if he does not wish to take it up sooner, but I am unable to say that the Prime Minister will fix that day for its consideration.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The question stands then?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I think the Minister of Customs does not quite grasp the intention of my hon. friend. He is quite sincere in proposing that we should all appear here without any indemnity. If his Bill becomes law that will certainly be the effect of it.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Not necessarily. Let the Minister of Justice express his opinion when the Bill comes before him. He is a little too quick in this criticism of his. The Bill will be in good shape when it is presented, and let him reserve his criticism. There was a good deal of discussion of this Bill last night when it was not before the House, but the Bill will be before the House and I think the Minister of Justice will somewhat change his view of this question before he gets through with it.

Order allowed to stand.

LOAN COMPANIES.

Mr. A. ZIMMERMAN moved second reading of Bill (No. 40) respecting certain Loan Companies.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. PATERSON moved that the Bill be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. PATERSON. We have had three late sittings during the present week, and if there is no objection on the part of the House, as we shall likely have a late sitting to-morrow, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business does the government expect to take to-morrow?

Mr. PATERSON. I fancy we will go into supply and take first the Department of Indian Affairs and finish that, and now that the report of the Department of the Interior has been brought down, the minister will go on with his estimates. Those of the Department of Inland Revenue will also be ready, and also those of the Minister of Justice with reference to penitentiaries, also those of the Fisheries Department, if we get that far.

Mr. LANCASTER. On behalf of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) I desire to notify the government that when the motion is made for the House to go into Committee of Supply, he will move:

That all the words after the word 'that' to the end of the proposed motion be omitted and the following substituted therefor :

The public lands of Canada, situated in the provinces and territories west of the Great Lakes, should be made available for settlement with the least possible delay ;

That to this end all railway companies, corporations and persons now entitled to select any lands earned by way of subsidy should be obliged to complete their selection of such lands within the earliest possible period, and not later than the first day of November, 1906 ;

That in arranging for the disposal of the odd numbered sections not so selected and which will thus be released from all such subsidy claims provision should be made to preserve them solely for the bona fide settler and to protect them from the exploitation of the speculator ;

That the government should take such administrative measures and introduce into parliament such legislative enactments as may be necessary fully to carry into effect the terms of this resolution.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 9.30 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, March 30, 1906.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery a return of the election of Alexander C. Ross, Esquire, for the electoral district of North Cape Breton and Victoria.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON moved:

That Messrs. Lemieux, E. M. Macdonald, Lancaster, Aylesworth, Lennox, Stockton and Emmerson form the select committee to which were referred Bills (Nos. 8 and 17).

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 67) to amend the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act.—Mr. Fitzpatrick.

Bill (No. 68) further to amend the Canada Evidence Act, 1893.—Mr. Fitzpatrick.

Bill (No. 69) respecting certain patents of Henry Edmunds.—Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 70) respecting the British-Canadian Loan and Investment Company.—Mr. L. G. McCarthy.

Bill (No. 71) to incorporate the Calgary and Fernie Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 72) to incorporate the Quebec, Montreal and Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Demers.

SUPPLY—RAILWAY LAND GRANTS.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Mr. Speaker, prior to the adjournment of the House last night notice was given that, upon the motion for the House to go into Supply to-day, I would move a resolution regarding our western lands which have been set aside as a reservation within which railway companies are to select their land grants. The subject matter of the resolution is one, in my opinion, of such very great importance as to require the earnest and prompt attention of the government. Anything that tends to hamper the development of our western heritage, anything that has a tendency to restrict the rapid settlement of our vacant lands, is of serious import, and if it is removable or preventable, the government should not only be in a position to propose a remedy, but lose no time in applying that remedy. We are all acquainted with the fact that within recent years there has been a large influx of population into our western country. It is true that we have still a large portion of that country to be settled, but notwithstanding that, the fact of there being millions of acres set aside as a reservation, and practically tied up, within which railways are to select their land grants, and that selection being indefinitely postponed, must re-

sult detrimentally to the best interests of the country. According to a letter of the Department of the Interior of November 10, 1905, the companies whose land grants have have not as yet been selected are the Canadian Northern, the Manitoba Southeastern and the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway and Steamship Company. It is true, the Minister of the Interior the other day in reply to a question asked in this House, stated that the land grant of the latter company has been completed, save and except that portion of it retained by this government as security for certain financial assistance rendered to the company. To that I will advert in a few minutes. According to the information received from the department on the 10th of November last, the total amount of land yet to be selected within this large reservation was 2,500,000 acres in round numbers. Were that the only amount of land tied up it would be of comparatively trifling moment; but when we take into consideration that there is an immense tract covering 11,000,000 or 12,000,000 acres tied up, so far as the odd-numbered sections are concerned, the government not being allowed to dispose of a single one of these odd-numbered sections until the 2,500,000 acres have been selected, it is patent to every body what very serious injury is inflicted on the country by the indefinite postponement of that selection.

It may be said that this is a condition of affairs of long standing. Well, that may be very true, but it was not the grievance in years gone by that it is to-day. There was then an immense area of lands to be settled, more than sufficient to satisfy the requirements of the incoming population of those days. Now, however that population is coming in more thickly and those lands are being selected, those homesteaders who have located on the even numbered sections are debarred from the privilege of acquiring the odd numbered sections unless at exorbitant prices out of all proportion to the value they would have were these odd numbered sections put upon the market by the government. It is to the interest of the railway companies to postpone indefinitely the selection of their land grants because the longer they postpone the selection the more valuable those lands are becoming. The more numerous are the homesteaders on the even numbered sections, the more valuable become the odd numbered sections. Consequently it is to the advantage of the railway companies to postpone the selection of their land grants until they can find purchasers. Once they take out patents those lands are subject to taxation so that until they do find purchasers the railway companies will not make their selection. The moment the lands are transferred to the companies that moment they become subject to municipal taxation, but while it is in the interest of the companies to defer taking out their patents until the even numbered sections are taken up, that policy is a serious detriment to the homesteaders who have settled on the even numbered sections. At present those homesteaders have to tax themselves doubly in order to provide themselves with modern facilities such as good roads and bridges and educational facilities or else do without those advantages. It is therefore very important that those odd numbered sections should be released and put at the disposition of the government at the earliest possible moment.

The Canadian Pacific Railway has completed its selection of its land grant. True there is in the neighbourhood of a million acres still to be patented by that company but inasmuch as the lands of the Canadian Pacific Railway are exempt from taxation even after they have been patented these lands need not enter into the discussion save in this respect. The premier of the new province of Saskatchewan during the last election declared on every platform that he was promised by the right hon, the Prime Minister that he would take up the question of the exemption of the Canadian Pacific Railway from taxation and have it settled to the satisfaction of the people in the west so that those lands would be no longer free from municipal taxation. I have looked in vain through Hansard to find any declaration to that effect by the right hon. gentleman but none the less that statement was made by the former member for Assiniboia (Mr. Scott). And if the right hon. the Prime Minister has made anywhere such a promise he ought to attempt to implement that pledge at the earliest moment so that those lands may be subjected to taxation. There is one feature of the Canadian Pacific Railway land policy which deserves commendation. That company has declared its intention not to sell in the future any land in large area to speculators but to reserve it for settlement by the individual settlers. That policy will be of great advantage to the incoming population, and it is certainly one I would also commend this government to adopt as soon as those odd numbered sections are open for settlement.

The Canadian Northern is an amalgamation of two companies—the old Winnipeg and Hudson Bay Railway Company and the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company. Each of these had its land grant, but the two have been amalgamated into one under the name of the Canadian Northern Railway. The land grant of the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Steamship and Railway Company has been disposed of except that portion reserved as security by the government, for certain financial assistance, upwards of 400,000 acres.

One million acres was sold to the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Land Company. After selling to individual settlers about 150,000 acres out of that million, the remaining 850,000 was disposed of

to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company so that the total reserve land grant at present is in the ownership of the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company.

Then the Canadian Northern Railway in the spring of 1903 sold its entire land grant to the Saskatchewan Valley and Manitoba Land Company. This parliament has therefore in the selection of those lands, to look, not to the railway company, but the Saskatchewan Valley and Manitoba Land Company. This is the same company which purchased some 250,000 acres of land from the government at $1 an acre in the spring of 1902, the sale of which was coupled with certain settlement conditions. I might here call the attention of the minister to this fact that when he was asked the other day what number of acres of this 250,000 have been patented, his reply was 142,808 acres. Well, the hon. member for Saskatchewan also last session asked what number of acres of this 250,000 were patented and what was his reply? His reply was not 142,000 acres, as he stated this year, but 149,450·21 acres. How does the hon. minister account for this discrepancy? Nine months ago he declared that there were seven thousand more acres patented than there are to-day. There surely must be some explanation of that discrepancy. If he will refer to the Hansard of last year, he will find there his answer given according to what I have just stated. So that if 149,000 acres were selected and patented nine months ago, it is strange that since that time there has not been a single acre of land patented, although the reply of the hon. gentleman would indicate that there were to-day 7,000 acres of land less patented than there were nine months ago. Has this quantity of land reverted to the Crown or what is their explanation of the discrepancy?

The Saskatchewan Valley Land Company was the parent company. That company has transferred its land two or three different times since. The original company was known as the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company. That is the company which purchased the 1,000,000 acres from the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Land Company. It then sold out to the Canadian Northern Prairie Land Company and this again disposed of its land to the Saskatchewan Valley and Alberta Land Company which is the present company doing business. But it is the same gentlemen who constituted the different companies and the exclusive selling agents are Davidson and McRea, so that we are practically dealing with the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company in the matter of these lands. That company was heralded as an organization different from and superior to all other land companies. We were told that they were bringing in American settlers in great numbers, and more than one hon. gentleman sought to convey the impression a couple of years ago that they were in a sense philanthropists who had undertaken to promote the settlement of land in a portion of country looked upon as an almost valueless arid waste. Well, I have here the pamphlet issued by this land company in which they advertise those lands for sale and they do not describe them as inferior in quality and unimportant in value as we were led to believe they were by the former members for Assiniboia and Saskatchewan if not by the Minister of the Interior. In this pamphlet the company state:

> The first purchase of the company included the entire land grant of the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad which, with the other holdings of the company made their aggregate acreage exceed 1,250,000 acres.

The other holdings of the company being 250,000 acres, purchased from this government, which, added to the 1,000,000 acres from the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company, made a total of 1,250,000 acres. They go on to say:

> The purchase was made in the spring of 1902—

That is very true.

> And, at the end of the first year, the company had no land left to sell.

That seems a remarkable declaration for this company, in view of the statement made by the Minister of the Interior that they have the right to select only 150,000 acres, and that they have patented only 142,000. How could they dispose of the whole? Nobody supposes that they have sold this land to individual settlers, as some hon. gentlemen seem to imagine. Their sale of these lands simply means that they have sold out their entire holdings to a subsidiary company.

> The sale of such a vast acreage in so short a time did much to attract the attention of land men throughout the United States to the importance of this Canadian invasion.

Not settlers, but 'land men.'

> In the spring of 1903, within one year from the date of their first purchase, the company acquired the entire land grant of the Canadian Northern Railroad, which exceeds 2,000,000 acres. In making these vast purchases, as might be supposed, we have secured them at the minimum price.
>
> We are the first holders and we are in a position and are to-day offering to the investor and to the settler lands at bottom prices. The Canadian government has set apart for the Canadian Northern Railroad a large district from which they have the right to select their land. In taking over this entire grant, this right of selection has been assigned to our company. Our privilege of selection differs from the ordinary railroad grant inasmuch as we are not obliged to take any specific number of sections in any one township.

In other words they are allowed to roam over this great reservation of eleven or

twelve million acres, in order to secure 2,000,000 acres.

We have the privilege of selecting in the districts reserved for us any odd numbered sections in the township, excepting the two school sections, namely, sections number 11 and number 29.

They have the privilege, but they do not select until they find a purchaser. Only when they find a purchaser do they take out a patent, and thus they evade taxation.

That gives us the privilege of selecting any part or legal subdivision of any one of the odd numbered sections excepting the two school sections. With the large reserve which we have for the selection of this grant——

They harp continually upon the large reserve which they enjoy.

—and with the privilege we have of selecting as much or as little as we desire in any township, it will be apparent to the reader that it is the desire of the company to sell nothing but strictly first-class land. We are not interested in any second-class land. Our reserve contains several million acres of strictly No. 1 prairie land, and we have only to select from it 2,000,000 acres.

Owing to the conditions under which we acquire our land we, in every case, extend to the purchaser the privilege of making his own selections. This privilege cannot be over-estimated, especially to the purchaser of any considerable tract of land. Our district offers more than one grade of land. We are interested only in selling you the best.

It goes on :

If forfeited, the land reverts to us and we take no chances of any land coming back to us that is not strictly first class. We have no poor land to sell.

That does not harmonize very well with the expressions of the hon. gentlemen on the other side, when they describe this 'arid region' on which the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake, and the Saskatchewan Railway was located.

The reserve set apart for the grant of the Canadian Northern Railroad, from which this company has to select 2,000,000 acres, is all included in the great Canadian wheat belt. Our district, on account of its large area, offers to the intending settler or investor localities presenting different features.

After a description of the various districts in which their land grant is to be situated, they go on :

No settlement requirements are exacted from the purchaser.

That does not look as if this differed very materially from the ordinary land speculating company. They will sell to the settler in large or small blocks if he has the money to buy; they will sell to the investor, no matter how much land he wants or whether he wishes to put settlers on it or not, the only condition being that he shall pay the price for the land. If that land were of the quality described by some hon. members in this House, and if it has been culled over and there is nothing left to be selected save and except this 400,000 odd acres that the government have held as security for the earning of the $80,000 of annual subsidy, what kind of lands will the government have as security ? If they are only worth $1 an acre, the government will have very poor security, and if they are worth $10 an acre, this Saskatchewan Valley Land Company will have secured the best of it. In any case it is clear that the government is very remiss in having failed to select this 400,000 acres. It is their privilege to select it before the 2,500,000 acres are selected by the company. It has been stated, in answer to a question put by the hon. leader of the opposition, that the total amount of indebtedness of the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company is :

Principal..	$1,154,457 74
Interest..	392,047 08

Making in all more than a million and a half dollars. For this, as I have said, they have reserved 493,269.34 acres, which is held by the government as security for the earning of the subsidy of $80,000 per annum for twenty years granted to the company, under the provision of the Subsidy Act. The government does not consider it advisable in this case to get an estimate of the value of the land for the purpose of fixing a valuation. I can see that it would have proved rather embarrassing in view of the statements of some of their supporters as to the inferior quality of a large portion of the land. If the land is of the value the company places on the other lands in the reserve, then the lands to be held as security by the government should have been selected long ago. Now, the land area reserved by the government for the railway company included range 9 west of the 3rd meridian. It now includes range 26 west of the 3rd meridian. And in view of this fact, which I learned from the maps issued by the company, I cannot understand the answer of the Minister of the Interior the other day to a question by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). That hon. gentleman asked whether there had been a transfer of any large blocks of land in exchange for any other land. The minister's reply, I think, was rather quibbling. But I can scarcely believe that this map would be issued at the instance of the Saskatchewan and Manitoba Railway Company to and including this range 26 if they had not secured possession of the land. We would like an explanation of how it comes that the company advertised that the area within which they have selected has been extended. I notice that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway runs through this area, largely adding to the value of the territory and so to the

value of the odd-numbered sections which the company will select. I would call the attention of the Minister of the Interior to a defence which has been put up by the organ of the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton), the Manitoba 'Free Press,' in an editorial on January 24, in which the attempt is made to justify the government in making this transfer. The reasons they gave were, first, that the original land reserve had been encroached upon by the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway in selecting their grant; also, that a great deal of land had been taken up by the forest reserves and some more by the Indian reserves. Taking into consideration the inferior quality of much that was left there was not sufficient land to fulfil the conditions of the contract, namely, land that was fairly fit for settlement; hence the transfer that has been made to them in the Territories. I would like to hear from the Minister of the Interior when he is speaking on this subject, as to whether there has been any additional land area added to the original area, and what lands included in such area have been granted in exchange, and what lands have been exchanged for them.

Now this parliament has dealt very generously with our railroad companies in the past. I do not find fault with that. It was an absolute necessity in order to secure railway privileges in that great western territory that this parliament should deal most generously with their land grants. Nor am I finding fault particularly with the large reserves which these railway companies had originally, and for which this government was not responsible. But that area has been added to, I think, on more than one occasion since the original grant was taken; and as I have pointed out, it is much more of a grievance to-day than in years gone by that the railway companies have not been compelled ere this to complete the selection of their land grant. It may be interesting to the members of this House if I read to them the amount of land that has been voted to railway companies by this parliament. The total area voted is 56,087,072 acres. Out of this amount the Canadian Pacific Railway sold back to the government 6,793,014 acres, leaving 49,294,058. Out of this 49,000,000, 29,986,826 acres have been earned; 13,227,232 acres have lapsed, that is the parties have not complied with the conditions under which they were voted this land grant, leaving in the neighbourhood of 6,000,800 acres now earnable voted to railways that have not as yet been constructed. So while parliament has dealt generously with them, the railway companies on the other hand have not been anxious to complete the selection of their land, largely because of the fact that they wished the land to escape taxation.

Now the resolution I have brought forward draws the attention of parliament to the fact of this large reservation being tied up, and also urges upon parliament to adopt a line of policy that I think will commend itself to every member of this House, no matter on which side he may sit, and one that I think the government will accept; because, if we believe their declarations in the past, it is one which in theory, at any rate, they have laid down as their policy. It asks first, that the companies may be compelled to make their selection at the earliest possible moment, naming the date at November 1st. I do not think the Minister of the Interior will object to that, because the other day, in answering a question, he declared that the Canadian Northern Railway had been notified in August, 1903, that they must complete the selection of their land grant by December 31, 1905, that is, they had twenty-eight and a half months in which to do it, and they have not completed their selection yet. Why have they not done so? Why have the government treated them so leniently? The Canadian Pacific Railway were only given eight months by this government in which to select their land grant for the branch lines, and only given four months for the main line grant. But the Saskatchewan Valley and Manitoba Land Company—and it is that company we have to deal with now and not with railway companies—were given twenty-eight and a half months, and they did not complete the selection of their lands within the specified time. It is true the Minister of the Interior declared that he expected that within the course of a few months the selection would be completely made; so that in that respect the date of November 1, allowing them all the coming summer season, should be quite sufficient.

The other portion of the resolution deals more particularly with the disposition of the released odd numbered sections. That is a matter for the government to take up. What we are more desirous of securing is that these lands should not fall into the hands of speculators, that they should not be purchased in large blocks by speculators for the purpose of enriching themselves, but that they should be reserved for the individual settler coming in to make his home on our western prairies. These are two principles that I think the government should accept. It is true that the ex-Minister of the Interior, when speaking in this House three years ago on the National Transcontinental Railway Bill, said that in the course of a few years there would be some 50,000,000 acres liberated, and he had no doubt that in the new territory at least 20,000,000 of these acres would be opened up within a specified time, and be worth $3 an acre. He said it was his intention to introduce legislation into this parliament for the disposition of those odd numbered sections in the near future. The Minister of the Interior has not introduced that legislation yet, although three years

have gone by since that time. Therefore the government must have by this time made up their minds as to what line of policy they intend to pursue, which however, they have not disclosed to this House or to the country. I may add in reference to the price, that it would be a great benefit to the settler if these lands were in possession of the government because he would receive them at a more reasonable rate. In looking over the last price list of this land company who have possession of the lands at the present time, I find that they have advertised their lands for sale at $8 to $12 an acre. I am certain much of this land is not worth that at the present time, and many of the incoming settlers will be held up for enormous prices over and above what the government would charge them had the government been selling these lands. In accordance with the facts I have placed before the House, I therefore beg to move the following resolution :

That all the words after the word 'that' to the end of the proposed motion be omitted and the following substituted therefor :

The public lands of Canada, situated in the provinces and territories west of the Great Lakes, should be made available for settlement with the least possible delay ;

That to this end all railway companies, corporations and persons now entitled to select any lands earned by way of subsidy should be obliged to complete their selection of such lands within the earliest possible period, and not later than the first day of November, 1906 ;

That in arranging for the disposal of the odd numbered sections not so selected and which will thus be released from all such subsidy claims provision should be made to preserve them solely for the bona fide settler and to protect them from the exploitation of the speculator ;

That the government should take such administrative measures and introduce into parliament such legislative enactments as may be necessary fully to carry into effect the terms of this resolution.

Mr. F. L. SCHAFFNER (Souris). In rising to second the motion of my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) I may say that it contains principles with which I have been in sympathy a great many years. To my mind that motion, divested of verbiage, means putting obstacles in the way of the speculator and removing them from the way of the settler. That to my mind is the real sentiment contained in that motion. I can scarcely understand how any one who has lived in that western country for many years, more especially in the early days, can feel anything but great sympathy with a motion of that kind. It has been said, and I believe truly, that our Canadian Northwest is the last west. If that be true, and I believe it is, then I believe the government and all other parties who have any authority in connection with the disposal of the lands of that country should be very zealous to get and protect the actual settler. I can quite understand members on the other side of the House saying to this side of the House : You were the originators of this scheme of disposing of these lands in the Northwest to railways and other speculators. I would draw your attention and the attention of this House to the fact that times have changed. When the Canadian Pacific Railway went into that country it was an absolute necessity, and I may say that notwithstanding the fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway was given a great deal of land, the necessity of giving them so much of it was added to, I believe, by the manner in which our friends opposite deprecated that country at that time. The Conservative party who were in power at that time must be given the credit for the wise policy of opening up that western country and I say, and I think it cannot be contradicted, that they received absolutely no assistance but a great deal of hindrance from the members of the Liberal party of the day. I shall just refer you to one sentence, uttered by a gentleman who was no doubt the leader of men who then sat on this side of the House. Mr. Blake, who in one of his addresses, said :

Granting that you open up that country, granting that you get your railroad into that country, it will be necessary for you to have 3,000,000 people there before your railway will even pay for the axle grease.

We have not yet nearly 3,000,000 people there, but we are not only paying for the axle grease of the Canadian Pacific Railway but we have another almost transcontinental line, the Canadian Northern, and we have also the road that our friends are building at the present time, the Grand Trunk Pacific. I may say that there is a little difference between the undertaking of our friends opposite in connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific and the work of the Conservative party in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway. I have never heard a Conservative during my campaign nor since I came into this House say that another road was not necessary. Any objection or any criticism the Conservative party has given to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway has been in reference to ways and means. We believed, Sir, we had a better way, a way and means more in the interests of the people of this country than they had, but we never objected to the building. I may say that notwithstanding the Conservative party had to give large tracts of land in order that that country might be opened up—and no one denies that we had to have the railway, which was the only way of getting our products out of that rich country—we had to give large tracts of lands for the building of railways. But to my mind the time has come when no railway company in that country should receive any grants of land and without detaining the House I am going to prove that no railway company requires a grant of land from this parliament in order to

enter that country. We had a very novel experience in our town last summer. Two men came to the town one day after dinner and asked the mayor to call a meeting. No one knew what it was about, but when they got us there, these two gentlemen said: Sirs, we want the privilege of building a railway through your town. Now is that not a novel experience? They said: We do not come here asking for any bonus, we do not come here asking you to pay for any right of way, we simply want you to give us the privilege of coming into this town and we ask you to appoint a committee of three men who may assist us to select a site for our station, and may get options, and prices on the land where we are to place our stations and where we wish to go around the town. Now Sir, that road was none other than the Great Northern—as we say in the west 'Jim Hill's road.' Jim Hill does not build roads for fun. He has an idea that with people coming to that country the products of the country will be sufficient to produce freight for the roads already there and also to make the building of a new railroad without a bonus a paying proposition. I understand that not only is this road coming into our town but that during next summer, before parliament meets again, we will have at least three railroads from the south coming into that country absolutely without bonus. He is going to do more than that, he is going on to Brandon, he is going on, as I hear, to Hudson's bay, and I would like for one moment to turn aside, to deviate a little from the subject before us, and say that that is a point in which we western people are very much interested. I hope I will be excused if I say that I am of the opinion and believe that it is the opinion of a great many people in that western country, that there never yet has been an unprejudiced inspection made of that great sea, the Hudson's bay, as to its facilities for transportation. You ask me why I think that? We think, rightly or wrongly, because of eastern prejudice. They are afraid, my friends here from Montreal and the eastern provinces are afraid that traffic will be diverted from their roads, and taken to the Hudson's bay. Now, Sir, I want to say that I will be pleased at any time to devote any amount of money that will be properly, economically and judiciously expended to improve the harbour of Montreal, to open up the River St. Lawrence. I want to see Montreal made a national harbour and will always vote for it, but on the other hand, I do not want eastern men to obstruct the Hudson's bay road. Talk about interfering with the rainmaker and Providence; I believe you people are interfering with Providence, when you are trying to keep us, or it seems to me you are trying to keep us, from getting to Hudson's bay. I do not see how any one can look at that inland sea and not come to the opinion that Providence had a very wise thing in His mind when He put Hudson's bay there. It was to carry out the products, not only of Manitoba and the Northwest Territories, but also, as Jim Hill realizes, from the Northern States, and carry these products out through that country. As I said before we are willing to grant all the money you want for the opening up of the St. Lawrence, but we want you not to put any obstacles in the way of building a road to Hudson's bay that we may get our products out as cheaply as possible. This is no new motion that has been moved here to-day. In looking up this question I find that when the senator from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Watson) was in this House he made, to my mind, a very wise motion. He moved that the Canadian Pacific Railway should make a return to parliament of the lands that had been sold up to April 1, 1896; he said that the Canadian Pacific Railway were in the habit of selling their lands to speculators; that these speculators neglected to get their agreement registered and that consequently they were not compelled to pay taxes, thus throwing all the burden of the cost of schools and roads and other municipal charges on to the ordinary ratepayer. The reasons then given by Mr. Watson are just as applicable to-day. When the Canadian Pacific Railway charter was amended in 1896 it was provided that the company should at the beginning of each session of parliament supply a return of all lands sold, the names of the purchasers, and the dates of sales. By means of this provision the municipalities were able to get a return of the lands that were sold each year, and that resulted in considerable benefit to them. Mr. Watson is no longer a member of this House; he has been transferred to a place of quiet repose.

Mr. AMES. Only sometimes.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. As my hon. friend (Mr. Ames) suggests, the Senate is only sometimes the place of repose. However that may be, Senator Watson has gone there and ever since we have not heard much from him about this question. The Hon. David Mills, and the Hon. Edward Blake expressed opinions somewhat similar to those of Senator Watson, and my object in referring to these gentlemen is that I want to raise this question of the disposition of our Northwest lands to a higher plane than that of mere party politics. I shall not go into details, as my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Roche) has dealt ably with the whole question, but I do say that if you take the map of the Alberta and Saskatchewan Land Company you will see that their lands occupy a very fertile belt. If you take a line running southeast to northwest from the Red River valley, you have 400 miles or a little more; you have the timber belt lying to the northeast, the grazing belt lying to the southwest, and the great wheat belt

(which produces the staple product of that country) lying in the district where they are likely to get their land grant. I firmly believe that this government or any government will make a tremendous mistake if it does not give these lands in the west to the actual settler. The day of the speculator has passed. It is no use for the supporters of the government to tell western men that it is the policy of the government to give the lands to the actual settlers. It may be their policy, but like a good many of their policies they have one policy on paper and another policy in practice, so far as the administration of the great west is concerned. I am surprised that the members from the Northwest particularly, do not take more interest in this question. There are not many of them here now who were here supporting the government last year; the most of them seem to have gone to their reward for work done last session, and as those who remain seem to be in the preparatory stage I suppose they are not in a position to speak out their minds. I can tell you, Mr. Speaker, that it is becoming a serious question in the Northwest as to whether our lands shall be given to speculators or whether they shall be given to to the actual settler. This is not a provincial question; it is not a question in which the people of Manitoba and the Northwest Territories alone are interested; it is a question of very great importance to every province in the Dominon, because your sons are going from Ontario (more perhaps from Ontario than from any other province) and they are going from Quebec and from the maritime provinces as well. If they go up into that country and find these odd sections reserved in order that they may be sold to speculators, these Canadian settlers from the east are going to experience a great many of the trials and hardships which the pioneers of Manitoba experienced in earlier days. Let us look well to the west; let us preserve that fertile territory for the people. It is said to be the policy of the government—and if it is I shall be happy to support it—that as soon as the odd numbered sections are brought into the market the first choice will be to the settlers living on the adjoining sections. That is a good policy. What I want to make plain is that the whole purpose of this motion is to keep out the speculator and to give a chance to the actual settler. And, Mr. Speaker, I care not from what country the actual settler comes. I am told that to-day one in every twelve of the population is a Galician. I would a little rather see them come from Northern Europe, but, Sir, I never intend either in the west or here to stand up and make very strong objections to these people. They are not coming in as large proportions as the people of other countries. We do not ask the government to bring in men with money particularly. But, we look to the government to see that the settlers in that country should be a sturdy and moral people, and if they are we will give them a good welcome. But when you get these settlers in the west, do not let them have to go to a land agent or any one else to buy land the value of which has been inflated by speculators. Let us have the land for the people; the land for the actual settler and not for the speculator.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (East Assiniboia). I do not intend to detain the House long, but there are one or two things I would like to say on this question. Judging from the remarks made by the mover and seconder of the motion there seem to be two points in the policy of the government which they particularly criticise—one is, that the railway companies have not been made to select their lands as quickly as they should have selected them, and the other is, that the government has disposed of certain of the lands to speculators. I would like to point out in the first place that practically speaking everything that has been done towards compelling the railway companies to select their lands has been done by this present government. For something like 20 years the Canadian Pacific Railway owned all their lands; they had I think earned all their lands prior to this government coming into power, and practically they had been compelled by the previous government to select only the few hundred thousand acres which they had sold to the actual settlers. But, as soon as this government came into power they immediately took the necessary steps to make the Canadian Pacific Railway and the other railway companies select their lands and with the result that a few years ago, in one year, I think some 8,000,000 or 9,000,000 or 10,000,000 acres were patented to the Canadian Pacific Railway by the government.

The same thing occurred with the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company. They were made to select their lands, and the patents were issued direct to the company, irrespective of whether the company had sold those lands to settlers or other purchasers or not. In reference to the Qu'Appelle and Long Lake Company, the same course had not been followed, but for what reason? Simply because that company objected to the lands. They made the claim that the lands that had been set apart for them were not lands fairly fit for settlement and that they were not obliged to take them. They had been given quite a large selection; and when they made that claim, what did the government do? The government said: We will allow you to select from any odd-numbered sections remaining undisposed of in the whole province of Manitoba and the

whole of the present provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta. The government went still further, and offered to allow them to select even-numbered sections as well as odd-numbered sections in vast tracts of the present provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta ; so that if they wanted land in the sections suitable for ranching, they could have it in blocks. What was the reply of the company ? They said : The land is not fairly fit for settlement, and they refused to accept it. What is more, that company offered to sell the lands back to the present government at $1.25 per acre. Reference was made by the hon. mover of this motion to the fact that the present owners of the Qu'Appelle and Long Lake Railway Company's land grant, the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, put a high valuation on the land, and were selling it at high prices. He also criticised the fact that the government had sold them 250,000 acres at $1 per acre. Let me point out this fact, that that same company bought 500,000 acres of that same land from the Qu'Appelle and Long Lake Railway Company, in which the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler), is largely interested ; and everybody recognizes, I think, that he is a good business man, that he knows the value of land, and that he has been connected with that western country for the last twenty years ; and the price paid for that land by the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company was $1.52 an acre, without any conditions of settlement whatever. The Saskatchewan Valley Land Company got that land from these good business men cheaper than it bought the 250,000 acres from the government, because in regard to the latter the company had to fulfil certain conditions. It was not sold to land speculators without settlement conditions, but they were compelled in each township to put twenty settlers on free homesteads and twelve other settlers on the lands which they might purchase from the government, making a total of thirty-two settlers in each township before they had the right to purchase the balance of the lands in those townships at the rate of $1 per acre. These onerous conditions made the land which they bought from the government cost a great deal more than the land which they bought from the railway company at $1.52 an acre, or even at $1.65, which they paid for a portion of the land. So that the statement that the land was sold to speculators is not correct. As a matter of fact they have put enough settlers on the lands to doubly, yes, five times, fulfil their conditions. In many cases, when they took the settlers to the lands they found that they had not been surveyed, with the result that they located the settlers in townships outside of the tract set apart for them; so that they put in double the number of settlers they were required to put in. In other parts, where they purchased the railway lands, they put settlers to the extent of between 5,000 and 10,000 on lands that were not included in the colonization lands which they bought from the government. So that the government did not sell to speculators, but to people who brought in settlers, and a good class of settlers.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I thought it was the Department of Immigration that brought these settlers in.

Mr. TURRIFF. There is no doubt that the Department of Immigration had been bringing in settlers by the thousand each year, and that some of these settlers settled in that tract ; but this company, of its own efforts, has brought many thousands of settlers into that part of the country. Reference was made to the fact that the larger tract was given to the Saskatchewan Valley and Manitoba Land Company, the successors of the Canadian Northern Railway Company, in which to select their lands. I can give a little information on that point. They were given the right to select 250,000 acres west of the South Saskatchewan river, in exchange for lands which this government got from the Canadian Northern Railway Company. This government secured from the Canadian Northern Railway Company all the odd sections that were included in the Doukhobor reservation, and the odd sections in the Riding Mountain timber reservation.

Mr. FOSTER. When were these lands got ?

Mr. TURRIFF. They were got from the Canadian Northern Railway Company six or eight years ago. The government was to give them other lands in exchange, and it gave them the right to select lands west of the South Saskatchewan river. That accounts for the extra area that was given to them in which to select their lands ; but they were only entitled to select a limited area, some 250,000 acres, if my memory serves me. That accounts for the whole matter ; there was nothing further given them. In regard to the Qu'Appelle and Long Lake land grant, I think it is within the memory of most of the members of this House, the old members at any rate, that that company had taken action in the courts to compel the government to pay them cash for the land in lieu of selecting land. I think that proves conclusively that the government made a reasonable deal with the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, a good deal better than the railway company made. There is no doubt that since that time there has been a great increase in the value of the lands, and that makes it a little easier now to criticise the deal. But I would like to point out here that the government preceding the present government went into a number of colonization schemes —they had twenty-six of them—and they

did not give the colonization companies poor land which could not be sold in any other way, but gave them the choice lands throughout the whole country. Yet all of those twenty-six colonization companies put together did not bring in as many settlers as this one company has brought in since 1902.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to ask my hon. friend a question. I do not as yet understand how he is able to distinguish between the settlers brought in by means of the $600,000 or $700,000 that we pay for immigration and those brought in by this company. How does he distinguish them?

Mr. TURRIFF. I could not go and pick out what settlers in one section were brought in by the Immigration Department and what were brought in by the company, but I can say this, that the methods adopted by this company and all Americans who are dealing in lands are these.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was this an American company?

Mr. TURRIFF. A good many of the members of that company were Americans and the settlers they brought in were practically all Americans. The way they disposed of the lands was this: They sell a man 10,000 acres at wholesale prices. This man would go back to the part of the country where he was known and would arrange to sell that land to settlers and bring them out and put them on the lands. In that way they directly brought in a large number of settlers irrespective of anything done by the Immigration Department.

As regards that part of the motion calling on the government to dispose of the lands to actual settlers, I have a great deal of sympathy with that object, but that is just what the government has been doing all along. The government has been disposing of the land to actual settlers. From what I know of the matter, I think it would be very advisable that the government should get their railway land grants cleaned out before they start disposing of the odd-number sections. Those railway companies are entitled to land fairly fit for settlement and for some years to come there are lots of even numbered sections opened for every body, open for free homestead entries, so that nobody need go without free homesteads on the open prairie at present. If the government decided to dispose of the odd sections directly to settlers I think it would be a good move.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. About how many homesteads does the hon. gentleman think are remaining at present?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Available?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. TURRIFF. Last year it took some 5,000,000 to satisfy the homestead entries. This year it will probably take 6,000,000 For three or four years there are lots of clear, open prairie for homesteads, and after that, for quite a number of years, there will still be lots of land to homestead, but more or less covered with scrub and some timber.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If that be the case, how is it that the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company and the subsidiary companies are selling their land at from $8 to $12 an acre?

Mr. TURRIFF. I cannot answer that any more than I can tell you why the Canadian Pacific Railway have put up their lands to $15 an acre. They claim that they are trying to keep it out of the hands of the speculators, but they are putting up the prices higher than any other company holding lands. At present there is such a rush to the country that people are looking forward to the future and land has been going up in price largely the last few years. Therefore I think it would be good policy on the part of the government to get all the railway land grants cleared up first of all before they begin to dispose of the odd-numbered sections. There is one point I would call attention to, and that is that the lands given to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, held by the railway people with whom my hon. friend from West Toronto (Mr. Osler) is connected, were for many years considered of no value. For ten years after the railway was built from Regina to Prince Albert, and when there was a train two or three times a week through that country, you could go from the town of Lumsden to where Saskatoon now is and find scarcely a homestead taken up. Not even the quarter sections on which the stations were built were homesteaded. It was considered a great drawback to immigration and the progress of the country that that land should be lying in that unoccupied condition, and that was one of the reasons why the government made the deal with the Saskatchewan Valley Land people, which induced these people to undertake to put settlers on that land that for ten years had lain vacant.

Mr. hon. friend made some reference to the Hudson Bay Railway. I hope and trust that that railway will be built in the near future. I also hope and trust it will be built without the expenditure of one dollar by either of the three provinces interested. These new provinces have each been given a subsidy, but not for the purpose of subsidizing railways, and I consider it would be the duty of this House to subsidize any railroads that may be necessary. I hope, therefore, it is the intention of the government to subsidize this line. I would also point out that the land grant given to the Hudson Bay Railway Company was given by our friends opposite, so that I am sure they at all events will have no objection

to that railroad being built with the assistance of the federal government rather than with the assistance of the local governments of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Prince Albert. I agree with my hon. friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner) that that railroad is a necessity and will be a valuable additional route for the whole of that western country. Whether the navigation be for four or five months, it would be a great advantage to have that railroad built.

I do not wish to take up further the time of the House, save to repeat that, under the circumstances, I think we can fairly and reasonably leave this matter in the hands of the government who have handled it so well in the past. I may say that during the last Dominion campaign I heard no complaint at all, in any shape or form, regarding the way in which the government have administered the lands of this country, and in that respect the contrast was great with the conditions which used to exist in the old days when hon. gentlemen opposite were in office.

Mr. R. S. LAKE (Qu'Appelle).—My hon. friend who has just sat down spoke in his closing words about the Hudson Bay Railway Company. It seemed to me that he spoke by inspiration. He certainly appeared most hopeful and to have very little doubt that this railway would be constructed in the near future. That reminds me that during the recent election in the province of Saskatchewan a very definite statement was made by the premier of that province, Hon. Walter Scott, in his address to the electors. He said:

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

I need not say that I hail that statement with infinite delight; and I take it that it is a definite fact that the government have made that promise to Hon. Walter Scott. It was foreshadowed in a speech made by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) to the electors of Moosomin, in which, after criticising the policy of the provincial rights party, which called—in desperation it seemed to me—for the building of that road by the joint efforts of the Northwest provinces, he said that that was a Dominion work and that the Dominion government would not deny their responsibility in connection with it. That is a change of attitude from the old days when the Minister of the Interior himself moved a resolution in the legislative council of which he was a member, seconded by Mr. Ross. That resolution was as follows:—

> That it is therefore advisable that steps should be taken by the government of the Northwest Territories towards joint action with the government of Manitoba, having for its object the construction of a railway to Hudson's bay to be constructed and operated under local control.

I believe that the Minister of the Interior had the right idea then, and I am sorry that the project then outlined and advocated by him, has not been advocated by him in the same terms since. However, as we are now, apparently definitely promised by the government that they will undertake this great work, we are all satisfied that they should do so and save this expense to the people of the Northwest.

And, while I have happened to refer to the election address of Hon. Walter Scott to the electors of Saskatchewan, I would also like to express the delight I had in the announcement that he made as to the policy of this government with respect to wiping out the exemption from taxation now enjoyed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. This is what he said:

> I have Sir Wilfrid Laurier's promise that his government will bring about the complete abrogation of these exemptions and free the lands of Saskatchewan in this respect.

We are delighted to hear this, and I can only urge upon the Prime Minister that it should be done at once. A heavy burden we have had to bear for years, and the sooner we are relieved of it through the action of the government the better pleased we shall be. I hope that in the course of this debate, the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will supplement the statements of Mr. Scott with his own assurance on the subject.

There is just one other matter that has occurred to me in looking up these old questions—and it was brought very forcibly to my mind by the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff)—that it was a Conservative government that had promised the land to the Hudson's Bay Railway Company and that he himself in those old days was also a warm advocate of the granting of lands to railway companies. I have here a resolution which was moved by himself on the 24th of July, 1884. It was as follows:—

> Moved by Mr. Turriff, seconded by Mr. McDowell: That a Liberal policy on the part of the government towards railways in the way of making grants of land, would most conduce to the opening up and development of the country, and would therefore recommend that the grants of land already made or that may be made in the future for railway purposes in the Northwest Territories at one dollar per acre, be made free grants.
>
> That this matter be referred to the executive council to be dealt with.

And it was not merely the member for East Assiniboia who held that opinion in those days. The Minister of the Interior

(Mr. Oliver) himself was in the legislative council at that time, and the resolution passed without division so I think we may fairly assume that he was also quite on the right track in those days according to the circumstances which then faced the people. Circumstances have altered; times have changed; things are very different at the present time.

Now with regard to the motion that is before us, I do not think that there is any member of this House who has the interest of the great Northwest at heart who will dissent from the proposition set forth in this resolution. To my mind it is the case that the grant of large tracts of land, in the form in which they were granted to railway companies for the opening of the Northwest, necessary as it was at the time, has been a very great detriment to the progress of the country. It created conditions which conduced to slow progress for many years. The country, as every hon. member understands, was surveyed on the checker-board system into square miles or sections. These were numbered consecutively, and every alternate section in the best portion of the country was reserved either for school purposes or for land grants to railway companies. The majority of the even-numbered sections were reserved for homesteading, while two of them were reserved for the Hudson's Bay Company. It will easily be seen that the ordinary homesteaders who came in without sufficient money to purchase lands from the railway companies and land corporations had to settle far apart—that is they had to settle on the alternate sections. This rendered settlements sparse. I can speak from some little personal experience on that subject, having settled in that country some twenty-three or more years ago. We in those days with our sparse settlement had to build up those religious and social institutions which must exist in every civilized country. It was a very great detriment to us to have such thin settlement all through the country. Further than that in the opening up of our roads, building our bridges, and so on, we had practically to tax ourselves double owing to the fact that the odd numbered sections were in the hands of the railway companies and exempt from taxation. And again in the matter of schools it was a very great hardship to us to find that in an area of five or six miles square we could get practically only about half the land for purposes of taxation—a very serious drawback to the people of the country. Now I say that we should profit by that experience in the past, and we should not allow for one day longer than we can help it any odd-numbered sections which we are not bound to keep back, to remain withdrawn from actual settlement. I consider the time has come when the situation demands the release of the odd-numbered sections which have been tied up, and for action to be taken to make them available for settlement.

The homesteads even now are getting comparatively scarce, and one has to go some distance from the railway in order to get them, and even then one is not able to get the very best. The hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) treated that part of the question rather airily. He spoke of 6,000,000 acres being homesteaded during the past year. I presume as the country continues to settle up the increase in the number of homesteaders to be provided for yearly will be in arithmetical progression, and year after year we may fairly expect a larger number of settlers to come in until all these homestead lands are taken up. I have made a calculation which I think is pretty accurate, that there are only about 12,000,000 acres of land still available for homesteading in the settled parts of the North-west, 12,000,000 acres of the best land. I listened last night to a very interesting lecture by the hon. member for St. Antoine Division, Montreal, (Mr. Ames), and I quite agree with the figures he gave as to the homestead land available, namely, that there are only about 12,000,000 acres of the best homestead land left, and that in two years the whole of that will practically be exhausted. After those two years, men who require free lands or come in with small capital, will have to take inferior lands. For my part I believe that only a very small portion of that whole western country is not fit for settlement; nearly all will ultimately be good settling land, but you will have to have railways pretty close to the people. You cannot send the settlers 20 or 30 miles away from the railway, and expect them also to take up the poorer land. If you do that you will very soon check the progress of the country. The settlement on the poorer class of land and in districts more distant from the present railways, must come later on. For the present we want to put within reach of all homesteaders coming in the very best land available. We also want to enable the settlers to settle as closely together as possible in order that they may be better able to build up their institutions, and I consider it is necessary for that purpose that we should have these odd numbered sections opened up at the earliest possible moment. As has been pointed out, the great land corporations of that country have been increasing the prices of their land month by month and almost week by week. We have seen how the prices asked for these lands are going up. Now what will happen when all the homesteads are taken up, and the only land that is procurable in that country has to be purchased from these great land corporations? Why, there will be an immediate stoppage of immigration, at any rate, of that class of immigrants who are not able to pay enormous prices for their land; whereas,

if the government would take such action as will render these lands available for settlement at moderate prices and on moderate conditions, they will be able to compete with the great land corporations and to keep their prices down to a moderate figure, and prevent them being constantly pushed up in a way which would be likely to check immigration in the near future.

Another point I would like to make is in regard to the question which has been raised relative to patenting lands and so rendering them liable to taxation. It was in August, 1903, I think, that the then Minister of the Interior declared that in a few weeks, I think he said, arrangements would be made by which these claims would be finally settled. He proposed then at an early day to submit a measure providing for the disposition of the lands so as to render them available for settlement by the actual settler. Well, that is a considerable time ago, and we are still waiting. Even yet we find that some of these companies have not yet selected their lands, and a considerable number have not yet patented their lands. The hon. member for East Assiniboia told us that the Canadian Pacific Railway had to get a move on in this respect. Quite right, and we are glad to hear they have had to make a selection of their lands. But I understand these lands have not yet been patented, or a considerable portion of them. I think it would be a good thing for the government to put on an extra force of men to issue patents for their lands at the earliest possible day to everybody who has earned a patent. I think it is false economy to allow the issue of patents to drag along as it is doing now. Every day that the issue of a patent is deferred means in many cases that the collection of taxes in those sections is also deferred.

With regard to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, the hon. member did not state that it was being pushed to get its lands patented at once. He did not reply to my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) who pointed out that, according to the answers given by the Minister of the Interior, apparently fewer lands are patented to that company to-day, of the even numbered sections, than there were a year ago, or fourteen months ago, and apparently the company is still at a standstill as regards these even numbered sections. They had earned in the neighbourhood of 158,000 acres of homestead lands last year, and they have still earned only about that same number. We find that there is no effort being made on the part of the government to inspect these lands, and to see that they have earned them. To my mind the company are not likely to come to the government and say : We have earned another block of land which we want to pay you for—the company would rather hang back in order to delay paying taxes. It stands to reason that is the course they would take. Yet we find the Department of the Interior made the last inspection, I think in January of last year, nearly fifteen months ago. It seems to me that these people should be forced to take out patents for the lands that they have earned and have a right to at once. Let them contribute their fair share of taxation to the development of the country. We have now been waiting nearly three years to see the promise of the Minister of the Interior carried out, when he said that the government intended to introduce legislation to dispose of these odd numbered sections which were to be set free at that time. I think it is time that the government should take steps to see that the selection of lands is completed, and that patents for them are issued immediately, in order that the lands may be released and made available for the actual settler on reasonable terms and conditions. I trust, therefore, that this House will agree to the motion which has been moved by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche). The member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) declared that he would sooner leave the whole question in the hands of the government. I presume from that that he intends to vote against the motion. Now is there any single portion of that motion with which the member for East Assiniboia is not in accord ? If there is I think he should come out straight and say to what portion of it he objects and not content himself with saying : Oh, I think I will sit down and rely on the government to do what this motion simply calls on them to do.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I am sure the House and the country, and particularly the western country, is to be congratulated upon the motion which is before the House, considering where it comes from, and upon the addresses that have been made in support of that motion. For many years, ever since, in fact, the responsibility of administering the affairs of the Northwest has been laid upon this parliament, there has been a division of opinion between the two sides of the House as to what should be the method of administration of the lands of that country. It is certainly a pleasant thing, and I must say particularly pleasant to myself under all the circumstances, that now at last, after some twenty-five years of division of opinion, we are unanimous and we believe on both sides of the House in the policy of the land for the settler. My hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Roche) said that this was an important question. It is an important question. It is a question of the very last and highest importance to the Northwest and to all Canada. It must be a matter of the deepest regret to Canada that this agreement was not reached many many years ago. The resolution, as it stands, expresses, in fairly good terms, the past and present,

and so far as I know it, the future policy of this government in the administration of the western lands. I may be asked: what is the evidence of that outstanding difference of opinion that has always prevailed between the two sides of the House in regard to this matter? I find here, so far back as the year 1880, that on the 5th or 6th of April, the following resolution was moved in parliament by Mr. Charlton and seconded by Mr. Schreiber:

That in the opinion of this House, the proper policy with reference to the disposition of the public lands of Canada should be, so far as practicable, to sell such lands to actual settlers only, on reasonable conditions of settlement, and in lots or quantities limited to the area which can be reasonably occupied by a settler, and that the sale of public lands to speculators, free from conditions of settlement, is impolitic and calculated to injuriously affect the settlement of the country by keeping large quantities of land locked up for years, and by obliging the settler thereon, ultimately to pay a price much larger than that which is paid into the public treasury for the same.

That was the expression of the policy and the principle of the Liberal party of that day, twenty-six years ago. Here is the position of their opponents, the gentlemen of whom our friends on the other side are the successors in place and in principle.

It was moved by Mr. Domville, seconded by Mr. Wallace, of Norfolk, that

This House do now proceed to the orders of the day.

But it was moved in amendment to the amendment by Mr. White of Cardwell, afterwards Minister of the Interior, under the party of the opposition, seconded by Mr. Colby, who is not now a member of the House but who was in recent years, that

The policy of the government for the disposal of the public lands in Manitoba and the Northwest is well calculated to promote the rapid settlement of that region and to raise moneys required for the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway without further burthening the people, and that it deserves the support and approval of this House.

And that principle of the land for the speculator was carried by a vote of 120 to 40.

Mr. FOSTER. That was rather the lands for the railways.

Mr. OLIVER. The result of that motion, as any man who has lived in the Northwest, as many of us have, during all these years, knows, was most disastrous to the welfare of our western country and to the welfare of Canada. Because of the principle there enunciated and because of that principle being carried into effect under the then administration, that western country, which today is the foundation of the greatness and prosperity of this Dominion stood still for fifteen years and was a drag or considered to be a drag upon Canada. It is a happy thing, I say, that, after all these years, we have come to a unanimous choice in regard to this matter of administration. Might I call the attention of the House and the country to the fact that this decision has been reached on very short notice by our friends on the other side. I fancy it might almost be said it has been come to on the spur of the moment, because it is only a matter of two or three months since we had an appeal to public opinion, or I might perhaps more correctly call it an appeal to prejudice, in the Northwest in the provincial elections. There were figuring in that contest the Liberal party and the Conservative party. It is true that in one of the provinces the Conservative party assumed, very properly, I fancy, a disguise. They were, very properly, ashamed of their name and their record. But although the name was changed, the men were the same. The battle cry of the Conservative party, if I may be permitted to use that name in this connection—in these two provinces, only three months ago, was, as it was in this House of parliament in the year 1880, 'the land for the speculator.' The leader of what has turned out to be the opposition in Alberta and the leader of what has also turned out to be the opposition in Saskatchewan announced from platform after platform that their policy was to sell lands in the west to the highest bidder in order to secure money for expenditure in that country.

Mr. LAKE. May I ask a question?

Mr. OLIVER. They spoke of the sale of millions of acres of land, they issued literature in which they declared that the policy of this government in giving the land free to settlers was robbery of these provinces, and they headed their document 'Public Lands Robbery.'

Mr. LAKE. May I ask a question? Does the minister say that that was the policy announced by Mr. Haultain.

Mr. OLIVER. I most assuredly say so.

Mr. LAKE. Has he ever heard that policy announced by him——

Mr. OLIVER. No, I did not hear him speak.

Mr. LAKE. And can he produce documents to show it was Mr. Haultain's policy.

Mr. OLIVER. Most assuredly I can, without any question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Prove it.

Mr. BENNETT. Make good.

Mr. OLIVER. I will make good if my hon. friends opposite wish and if they give me a little time. I am not carrying

these documents around in my pocket, but in the meantime I will suggest for the information of my hon. friend that my word is quite as good as his, and my memory as well.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understand the hon. gentleman to say that he did not hear it.

Mr. OLIVER. I did not hear it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Did he see it ?

Mr. OLIVER. I saw it in print, credited to Mr. Haultain.

Mr. FOSTER. 'Credited' to him ?

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly, I saw the literature on which Mr. Haultain hoped to secure judgment in his favour. He and his friends may repudiate it if they please, and if they did it would be part of the policy on which they appealed to the electors of that province.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was he speaking of the odd sections or the even sections ?

Mr. OLIVER. He was speaking of the public lands.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But which ?

Mr. OLIVER. Without distinction, so far as I know between the odd and even sections. He claimed the public lands for the provincial government for the express purpose of selling these lands to raise revenue with which to conduct the business of the provincial government.

Mr. LAKE. I understand that means, that he claimed the whole of them for the purpose of selling the whole of them, odd and even numbered sections alike.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend (Mr. Lake) and I will hire a hall some time if we cannot get along here, but we do not want to waste the time of the House.

Mr. LAKE. Is that what the hon. gentleman means ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I ask one more question ?

Mr. OLIVER. Surely.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the minister assert as a matter of fact, that Mr. Haultain stated that he proposed to sell the land now reserved for homesteads ?

Mr. OLIVER. Well, he did not go into such detail as that, but he certainly spoke, his literature definitely spoke of a proposed sale of six million acres of the public lands, and based a long calculation upon that proposed sale as showing to what extent the provinces were robbed by this government.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The minister is aware that his predecessor proposed to sell 50,000,000 acres.

Mr. OLIVER. Possibly.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The late Minister of the Interior did ?

Mr. OLIVER. Possibly, I am not discussing that at all.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Oh.

Mr. OLIVER. The late Minister of the Interior was always able to take his own part in this House.

Mr. FOSTER. He took the part of a great many others too.

Mr. OLIVER. The conversion of my hon. friends opposite is quite recent; I only hope it is sincere. But, I think that a better evidence of sincereity would have been given by them if they had been willing to accept the policy of the government as they knew it to be, rather than to seek by a motion under these circumstances to discredit the government or secure its defeat. I do not think we can accept a vote of want of confidence of our friends opposite as a true evidence of their conversion to the principle which they have enunciated in this motion.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Although we are all unanimous.

Mr. OLIVER. I only hope that when the time comes, these gentlemen opposite will support the government in placing before the country the continuance of that policy of the administration of the public lands in the interest of settlement, which has been the policy of this government in the past, which is its policy now, and which will be its policy in the future.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I ask the hon. gentleman whether it is to be introduced this session ?

Mr. OLIVER. Well, I am not able to give the hon. gentleman an answer on that point.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It seems to be rather sudden.

Mr. OLIVER. I can only say that the government rests upon the confidence which it holds from its followers and supporters, and that as long as we retain the confidence and support of our supporters in this House we will be able to give the necessary legislation as circumstances demand.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. At some future date.

Mr. OLIVER. However, as our friends on the other side have seen fit to raise this question, and while endorsing the policy of the government have seen fit to use the occasion to criticise the government—and as I think to unfairy criticise it—it may be well to point out the advantage which has accrued to this country because of the policy this government has pursued, and to show how diametrically op-

posite the policy of the former Conservative government was to the policy of the present government.

We find that in regard to the matter of railway land subsidies (this question that is exciting our friends opposite so very much) we find that this whole question arises from their policy and practice as expressed in the motion, so far back as 1880, which I have read. These gentlemen saw fit, or their predecessors when they were in power saw fit to reserve from sale and settlement in the Northwest Territories and Manitoba for the purpose of bonusing railways, a total area of practically 50,000,000 acres. They attached to this reservation such conditions that twenty years afterwards, the present government notwithstanding its persistent and determined effort to secure a settlement of these railway subsidies has as yet been unable to absolutely secure their settlement. Would you care for an instance? If so we will take that of the Canadian Pacific Railway and its exemption from taxation. Our friends opposite have spoken of the disadvantage to the country of permitting these railway companies to hold their grants without selection and without patenting their lands in consequence of which they are relieved from taxation. Let me point out that the Canadian Pacific Railway company was granted some 25,000,000 acres of land with the exemption from taxation to run for 20 years. But there was a word—one word—in this provision, the effect of which was that the twenty years exemption on the Canadian Pacific Railway lands did not begin until the land was patented to the company. And because during the 15 years succeeding the granting of the Canadian Pacific charter, while the Conservative government was in power, they never granted a patent (so I am credibly informed) on one acre of that 25,000,000 acres to the Canadian Pacific Railway, they extended by their deliberate act and contrary to the intention of parliament, that exemption of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company from twenty years to thirty five years.

Fortunately, after this government attained power, under the administration of the late Minister of the Interior that company was compelled to complete its selection of its land; and I observe that my hon. friend from Marquette complained because they had not been given sufficient time in which to make the selection. But they were compelled to make the selection: and now we know that their exemption from taxation will terminate some time; but had our friends opposite remained in power, all the evidence is that instead of the exemption being for twenty years, it would have been for ever.

There is a condition connected with these railway land subsidies which I think the House and the country should know in justification of the fact that all the lands are not yet selected. There were in all practically 50,000,000 acres of land reserved for railway subsidies; and of the part of that vast amount that has been earned, there yet remains to be selected about 1,750,000 acres. And our friends opposite wax indignant because that quantity remains yet unselected. May I explain to the House just how it happens that this is the case? There is the land grant to the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway Company; there is the land grant to the Hudson Bay, now the Canadian Northern Railway Company; and there is the land grant to the Manitoba Southeastern Railway Company. The conditions attached to the two first mentioned were that the companies were entitled to select two-thirds of their land grant immediately on the completion of their road, but the remaining one-third was held as what is called indemnity lands, as security for the repayment by the company of certain cash advances which were to be made according to contract, to that company. Now, until the twenty years expires, for which this subsidy contract runs, this government cannot compel the railway company to select its indemnity lands, because the railway company need never accept them. This is a condition not created by this government; it is a condition for which our friends on the other side are responsible, and it is certainly unfair that they should to-day put before the House a motion of censure on this government for not doing something which the very conditions they themselves or their friends imposed absolutely prevented from being done. The lands involved in these two partial subsidies, the indemnity lands amount to nearly 1,000,000 acres. There is the Manitoba Southeastern Railway land grant, something over 600,000 acres. The company is entitled to select that land in a certain part of the country; but, owing to an arrangement made, I understand, by the late government with the province of Manitoba, there is a dispute between the railway company and the province in regard to those lands; and again, because of action taken by our friends on the other side when they were in power, it has been as yet impossible to compel a selection by that company of those lands, for the simple and evident reason that the lands are not there. Outside of these three cases involving something over 1,750,000 acres of land—two instances of indemnity lands, and one instance of a grant which, owing to circumstances it has not been possible to select—the vast area of the land grants that have been made and have been earned by the companies, within a small amount, the last acre has been selected and is being patented to the companies as fast as the staff of the Interior Department connected with patents can issue those patents to them. This is a record which I think our hon. friends opposite can hardly justify

themselves in asking this House to censure, if they are really in earnest in asking that land grants shall be closed out. There is the further land grant to the Hudson Bay Railway Company. This is a grant made by our friends on the other side. It has only in part been availed of by the company; but I understand that the company stands ready to earn the balance of the grant, and it will be for the government and possibly the House to consider in what way that matter shall be dealt with. So far the company have selected almost all the lands to which they are entitled, except the indemnity lands of which I spoke; and the balance of their grant made years ago not having yet lapsed, this government is not able to deal with that land. That is to say, the government, in dealing with any Northwest lands, have to take into consideration the fact that a vast area has been pledged towards the construction of the Hudson Bay Railway. With the record of our friends on the other side, who in the first place made the land grant, and in the second place attached these conditions to them, and retained power for fifteen years without patenting the first acre to the first company, as far as I am aware, we can very well compare our record, in which the last acre has been patented up to the point where it could properly be patented to the companies. The question of dealing with the odd numbered sections throughout the country cannot be dealt with until these questions of land grants to railways are closed out. Once they are closed out there will be no difficulty in dealing with the matter, and I can assure the House on behalf of the government that this government will deal with that question as it has dealt with the land question from the beginning of its taking power, with a view to the settlement of the land and for the benefit of the settler.

I may say in regard to these odd numbered sections, that we have to consider not only a matter of some 50,000,000 acres of odd numbered sections that were granted to railways. The policy of the opposition, when in power, was that every odd numbered section throughout the Northwest should be locked up for the benefit of the railroads then existing or to be constructed. It was not only a matter of 50,000,000 acres; but every acre there was held under reservation; and because of the conditions attached by that government to the grants then made, this government has not yet been free to open up that tremendous reservation of odd numbered sections throughout the whole Northwest. In every particular this government has carried out its principle and policy of the land for the settler; and, as its policy has been in the past, so it will be in the future.

Mr. H. B. AMES (St. Antoine, Montreal). The hon. gentleman who has preceded me has endeavoured, to a very considerable extent, to show that in times past the Conservative party has not dealt justly with this country in the matter of the land. The hon. gentleman knows the history of the building of the Canadian Pacific Railway quite as well as any other member of this House. He must be perfectly well aware that the first offer which was made to the promoters of the Canadian Pacific Railway was not accepted and that it was only with the greatest difficulty they were induced to agree to the second offer. From all we can gather, there can be no doubt that the railroad could not then have been built on terms less onerous than those to which the Conservative government agreed at that time, and the country has since repeatedly declared that the government then acted wisely and well. I do not see that the hon. gentleman has quite made clear the impossibilty of an immediate selection taking place of that one million and three-quarters acres of which he has spoken. Therefore, we shall continue the argument, convinced as we are that the government has so administered these lands as to cause them to be selected with much less despatch than might have been shown.

Last year I had the privilege of driving several hundred miles across the Canadian prairie. What surprised me as much as anything else was the fact that one could drive many miles without meeting any habitation and yet could not find a free homestead, nor, in many cases, a single acre of purchaseable land. I was given two explanations. First that the even sections have been taken up and are being held for homestead settlement, and secondly, that the odd-numbered sections were withheld as an area out of which certain land grants were to be chosen. Those immense areas are still being held, and the least the goverment can do is to reduce the immense area which is kept out of occupation by its present policy. We all know the procedure which is followed in these matters. We know that the government passes a Subsidy Act, by virtue of which a railway is entitled to earn certain lands and, when the company has earned these lands, it is permitted to select them in areas designated and under conditions set forth by orders in council. For the last ten years this government has been in power and has had a monopoly of orders in council. Therefore, we are of opinion that if there are matters to be remedied, such as the hon. gentleman states, that if these are conditions that require administrative action, the government has had in its power to bring this condition of affairs to an end I contend that at present if there be but one and three-quarter millions of acres of land to select, it is obviously unfair on that account to hold back from the actual settler an area of land containing upwards of thirteen millions of acres.

It is very evident that in this matter there is a conflict of interest between the

general public and the land companies. It is in the public interest that these lands be rendered available for immediate settlement, but it is in the private interest that they should be withheld from settlement. You can readily see why a company should be anxious that these lands should not be selected or why the time of selection should be delayed as long as possible. Until the selection is made the companies escape municipal taxation, and besides they are able to get the benefit of the building of new railways and to acquire land contiguous to town lots which have a high value. Therefore, every day these companies are able to put the government off, every day they are able to steal of time, means to them an advance in the value of their lands. You have only to look over the figures to see how remarkable have been advances in value. Take the Canadian Pacific Railway sales. In 1900 the average selling price of their lands was $3.04 per acre. In 1903 it was $3.67; in 1904, $4.10, and in 1905, $4.80. And in the last six months of the last calendar year the price had risen to $5.32. In January of this year the average selling price was $5.63. The prices of lands in the west are advancing very rapidly, so that every month, every day in fact of additional delay which these companies can get, means to them many dollars in the disposal of their lands.

We have introduced this motion because we believe that the policy we are advocating is one obviously in favour of the purchaser, although it may not be to the same extent in the interest of the jobber or speculator. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) has already pointed out to us what lands are yet to be selected. Last November I wrote to the department and was informed that two and one-half million of acres were still to be selected, that the Canadian Northern, the Manitoba and Southeastern, and the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan had not completed their choice. We have since been told that the Qu'Appelle and Long Lake and Saskatchewan has completed its choice of lands, but that the lands which the government hold as security for loans made to the company have not been selected. I cannot see why it would not be possible for the government, if they are desirous of securing their lien, to take a considerable smaller area than the one of which we are speaking to-day, and I am sure they could get sufficient land therein to enable them to recoup themselves for the money advanced.

We understand that an area of selection including four and one-half million acres has been kept for the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan and that a further area of eight and one-half million acres was reserved for selection of the Canadian Northern Railway lands. So that to-day we have a total area of thirteen million acres within which are to be selected the remaining land grants.

As a matter of fact a large portion of these land grants has passed entirely out of the hands of the railway companies to whom they were originally given and have come into the hands of this company of many aliases which we first knew as the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company and now known as the Saskatchewan Valley and Alberta Land Company. This company has the right of selection, and their agents to-day can be seen travelling through the Northwest from one end to the other picking out the cream of the land wherever they can find it. Towards this company it would seem that a great deal of sympathy has been shown. I have here a map furnished by the company last October in which it says to the subordinate companies which wish to buy lands from it that they may make a selection within the limits marked off by red lines. They have an area of land stretching all the way from Lake Winnipeg to the fourth meridian, 500 miles in length and 150 in width, inclosed in red lines, and which must contain upwards of thirteen or fourteen million acres in odd sections, from which selection can be made. Regarding that immense area the company says:

> The district reserved by the government for the selection of our land grant you will find included in a red line marked 'district of the Saskatchewan Valley and Manitoba Land Company, Limited.'

They, therefore, have the right of selection, according to their pamphlet, in all that immense area. Now, the terms on which they are entitled to these lands contain some clauses which it is difficult for the uninitiated to understand. For example, you find this clause taken from their pamphlet entitled "Western Canada the Bread Basket of the World," published by the Saskatchewan Valley and Manitoba Land Company, Limited:

> Our privilege of selection differs from the ordinary railway grant inasmuch as we are not obliged to take any specific number of sections in any one township.

Why does it differ from the ordinary railroad grant? If the Saskatchewan Valley and Manitoba Land Company have acquired a railroad grant which is supposed to be similiar to all the other grants given to railroad companies, how does it happen that its mere transference to this land company makes the grant better than any that their predecessors have had? They say:

> Our privilege of selection differs from the ordinary railroad grant inasmuch as we are not obliged to take any specific number of sections in any one township.

Evidently they have a very much larger area at their disposal than is customary,

and evidently, like the honey bee, they can go from flower to flower selecting only the very best. So we find in their circular the following :

In this enormous district, in each township we have the right to select, as heretofore stated, all odd numbered sections, with the exception of two school sections, and unless the land has already been sold by us, it is open for selection to our purchasers.

'Open for selection to our purchasers.' That means that this company is a jobber in lands. That means that this company can tell the intending purchaser that he may go over this vast area, select where he will the lands he desires, which, up to last fall, he was able to buy from the company at $6.50 to $8 an acre. It would seem that this company has a marvellously easy time of it—a cinch of the most perfect kind. When the purchaser selects his land, he pays the company $2 per acre cash down ; then the company indicates to the government that they have selected this or that area of 160 acres or more. If ever there was an agreement made whereby a company, without investing capital, and without assuming any risk, could become wealthy, this is that arrangement. So they have gone on. The land has been bought and the first payment has been made, and then, after the settler has made his first payment, the company becomes the owner for a few minutes, and then allows it to pass to the settler. They have no taxes to pay, they need no bank account, not being really purchasers, but having only the option of selection. And so we find that, to-day, that company is selling lands in that country at from $8 to $10 per acre, that being according to the price list they at present publish.

I think we are justified in charging dilatoriness on the part of the government. The hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) says that in the early days, the Conservative government did not sufficiently push the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in the selection of their lands. But the minister knows very well that the lands were not surveyed in those days, and lands cannot be selected before survey. Moreover, the minister knows there was no demand for the lands at that time. For ten years the prices of lands were practically the same. At present, the prices are advancing with each succeeding day. And to-day there is not the excuse of lack of survey, because 120,000,000 acres have been surveyed, and the surveys within the last two or three years have aggregated 30,000,000 acres. If these surveys were made in the right places, there would need to be no delay in selecting the lands.

The reply which the minister gave to a question a few days ago, was in effect, that the department was making every possible effort to have the lands surveyed, selected and patented, and it is interesting to look back and see that, on the 17th of June, 1903, the Postmaster General of that time (speaking for the Minister of the Interior) made almost verbatim, the same reply. Of course, the department is willing to say that it is using every possible effort, but I think the country is about coming to the conclusion that the time has come when a definite limit should be fixed. If certain lands cannot be selected before November 1, 1906, there should be a special statement of them added to this amendment that all other lands may be at once opened and this immense area, to a great extent, reduced. If we leave the matter 'entirely in the hands of the government,' as the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), has suggested, and allow them to continue as they have been doing for the past few years, carrying on this matter at whatever rate of speed may suit them, we may find ourselves still in the same predicament when parliament meets next time.

Now, I wish to speak of a phase of this question to which it seems to me, the government is not altogether alive. I wish to point out that the time is very rapidly coming when there will be no free land in the fertile prairie belt of the Canadian Northwest. I think the government is not sufficiently awake to the fact, that, in a very short time, within two or three years at the outside, they will be face to face with the situation of having no more free homesteads within a reasonable distance of railroads within the fertile prairie belt of the Northwest. What are you going to do when lands are held for sale from $8 to $10 per acre, and the free lands are all gone ? Is there soon to be a day when the man who goes into that country with but little money, but with experience and with willingness to establish a home, will have to choose between paying $8 or $10 per acre for land, and going into the wooded regions of the north or the semi-arid regions of the south and west ? The government must ponder this condition and decide upon some method of dealing with these reserves. There must be some sort of semi-homesteader, some class who can avail themselves of the odd numbered sections which are to be released by the railroads. The government should take this subject into immediate and serious consideration, with a view to bringing in necessary legislation with regard to these odd-numbered sections to be released. Here we have an immense area of 13,000,000 acres that is being held down and kept out of use, simply because about 1,750,000 acres must be selected out of that belt. Is not the government going to provide in some way that those 11,000,000 acres and over shall be released and opened for settlement ? Surely, the government can see that something requires to be done.

There is another phase of the question that may possibly appeal to the government. So long as these lands are unselected there

are temptations which must face the government pretty nearly every day. I sometimes think that it is most probable that the Minister of the Interior finds himself much in the position of Alexander Mackenzie years ago, when he likened himself to a sentinel, lying on his arms night and day keeping guard over the public treasury.' There are many designs on our free lands to-day. There are many people who know that they are of great value ; and I am sure that the Minister of the Interior could tell us of many propositions that are made in order to obtain lands in the Canadian Northwest.

There are temptations which, I am sure, the Minister of the Interior would like to see out of the way. But, as long as that great area lies unsettled, as long as that 10,000,000 or 12,000,000 acres of odd sections are unassigned, these temptations must exist. There is a temptation to dispose of them to one of these so-called colonization companies, which may turn out to be a company jobbing in lands, as the Saskatchewan Valley and Manitoba Land Company. There may be another temptation, namely, to exchange areas with one of these companies. This innocent looking Bill about timber reserves may mean something more than it purports to mean. It is a great temptation, possibly, for the government, when one of the favoured companies has a large area of land that it cannot sell, to condemn that as a timber reserve and then give to the company an equivalent somewhere else. As long as these rich odd sections are unassigned there is always that danger.

There is also that danger that will arise in building the Hudson's Bay Railroad. We know that a Conservative government in 1887 authorized a company to build a railroad to Hudson's Bay ; we know they have offered 12,800 acres per mile all the distance from the Canadian Pacific Railway line to Hudson's bay. We know that the Canadian Northern can build from Erwood to Fort Churchill and can earn 6,400,000 acres of land whenever they choose. We also know that they are at present only entitled to select out of 22,000,000 acres lying between the 49th township and Hudson's bay. But stranger things than that have happened before. If the company builds that road from Erwood to Hudson's bay and is not pleased with its lands, who knows but that they may want to make an exchange, and again there will be an attack upon this great belt of odd sections lying unoccupied. So it seems to me the Minister of the Interior must agree that the wisest possible thing the government can do is to open those odd sections for settlement within the shortest possible period. If you put good settlers directly upon that land, certainly the danger I have pointed out will be removed.

One thing at least we insist upon on this side of the House; we insist upon it that when the government comes to consider legislation with reference to odd sections that will be released, the government should bring in legislation that will enable that land to reach directly the settler himself. We are not discussing to-day the policy which the government may see fit to adopt in that respect. The question is up to the government, the time is ripe, and the government must within a very short time, if it wishes to relieve the situation, devise ways and means for dealing with the greater portion of the ten or eleven million acres which are not needed to satisfy railroad grants, but which will be left over after the railroad grants have been taken out, but which cannot to-day be used until those grants are completed. The government should at an early day bring legislation before this House in order that we may know what will be done with those odd sections, and in order that the odd sections may reach the actual homesteader, or actual settler. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, we have introduced this resolution, and for these reasons we are pressing it.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 38) to incorporate the Temple Mutual Life Association.—Mr. Bole.

Bill (No. 49) respecting La Banque Provinciale du Canada.—Mr. Bergeron.

Bill (No. 50) respecting the Pacific Bank of Canada.—Mr. Belcourt.

Bill (No. 51) respecting a Patent of Henry Luther Houk.—Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 52) to incorporate the United Empire Bank of Canada.—Mr. Belcourt.

Bill (No. 53) respecting the Crawford Bay and St. Mary's Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 54) to incorporate the Pacific Marine Underwriters, Limited.—Mr. Macpherson.

SUPPLY—RAILWAY LAND GRANTS.

House resumed consideration of the motion to go into Supply and the amendment thereto.

Mr. W. E. KNOWLES (West Assiniboia). Mr. Speaker, as far as I can understand the utterances of the hon. gentlemen opposite, their remarks seem to fall into two divisions, one an attack on the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company deal and the other the utterance of their own remorse or an apology for the legislation of this country made while the party of which they are members was in power. I wish to state

country made while the party of which they are members was in power. I wish to state briefly how the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company deal is regarded in the west. A good deal of that land is in my constituency but I have heard a great deal more this afternoon in condemnation and criticism of that deal than I ever heard in the west. The facts are that prior to the sale of that land the ground that was eventually given was one that no man desired to live in, even the Indians gave it a wide berth. For many years men passed over it and it was always known as the great salt plain, in which men never desired to linger. I have often heard old teamsters, whose duty it was to transport goods across the plain during the rebellion of 1885, glory in the financial prosperity that the rebellion brought to them. That was almost the first money they had seen in large quantities when they got $10 a day and they said: If this be war, may there never be peace. But when they had occasion to go over this land which was eventually given to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, they hurried through it as men would through a desert, and as I have said it was called the great salt plain. A railway ran through it for 10 or 12 years, before any one settled on it. You could travel through it for nearly 100 miles without seeing a house except the houses of section men or those who were obliged to live there. Nothing dwelt there but the gopher and prairie chicken and things of that kind. Now it came to pass that an opportunity presented itself to the government of selling this land at a dollar an acre. That is the only sale of lands the Dominion government has been party to, since the Liberals came into power. A railway company composed of the most astute men in Canada sold at the same time to the same company much more choice lands, lands which gave them a wider choice of selection at $1.52 per acre. True it was an advance, but it was sold strictly according to its value, not at all to secure colonization. There was not one restricting feature about any settlement duty being performed; and yet we find this land company, subsidiary to a railway company composed of the most astute business men in Canada, glad to sell this land at $1.52. I contend, sir, that the sale of the government land there at $1 an acre with the binding conditions of settlement attached was a splendid sale. While I do not for my part believe that the selling of public lands should be continued, yet I believe that at that time it was a most wise policy. In fact if there is anything the present government has a right to be proud of, it is its whole land administration policy in the west. We have our own views about the tariff, and if the tariff had come up at this time I should have been very glad to have said how much my people love a low tariff, but while we want the tariff lowered we have an outstanding wish or desire to present in regard to the administration of land in the Northwest Territories. I mean that no radical change is requested. These lands, it is true, have become valuable now, Mr. Speaker. It was read in this House by two hon. gentlemen opposite this afternoon, that the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company is now asking as much as $8 or $10, or perhaps more, an acre for land for which they had paid only $1. I must confess I fail to follow those gentlemen. I take it as a matter for which the government should be commended if by their administration they have converted that ground in which no man would dwell into a thickly settled country, with waving fields of grain, with villages and towns there as every place else in the west. I say it was a most wise step, three or four years ago, when they secured the co-operation of this company. More than that, we are called upon and asked in the most formal way to say how this land company can say their land is worth $8 an acre. It shows there is a great dearth of material on which to criticise the government; it shows that our friends opposite have great trouble to find anything to bring against the government when they have to go to the Northwest Territories and bring the statements of land men here, and ask us to vote the government out of power on the strength of what land men in the Northwest say.

I am not here to decry in any way the Northwest Territories, nor am I here to in any way question the truthfulness of statements made by land men, but I do say that we have some land men in the Territories, regarding whom I for one, should not like to stand or fall by what they say. They are very naturally praising what they want to sell, as every vendor is prone to do. If hon. gentlemen opposite will frame legislation on the basis of what may be found about the value of land in the literature of these prospectuses, then we will have a strange muddle of legislation indeed. As I have said, the land is more valuable to-day then it was a few years ago. We know that it is not so long since that men could not be coaxed to take homesteads. In many cases where there are now thriving villages, a few years ago a man would not take the land for a homestead and yet at the present hour that very land is worth in very many cases not $8 an acre, but $40, and $50, and $100 an acre. Take scrip itself—it is now worth something over $6 an acre, and just as well might hon. gentlemen ask us: How is scrip worth $6 an acre as to ask us why is land worth $8 an acre. Well, the answer is that it is because under the administration of the present government the whole country is clothed in prosperity, and land is coming to near its normal value. I believe that there

will be an enormous annual increase in the value of land during the next few years. Will hon. gentlemen opposite come to us every year and seriously make it a charge against us that land is becoming more valuable every year, and every month for that fact. I was pleased to hear the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames) make the statement that he believed the day was close at hand when there would be no more homesteads. But, he wished to know how might that condition be relieved. My answer is that we do not want it relieved. We want the day to come when there will not be one desirable homestead left, just because for every homestead some good desirable settler has come to take it up. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ames) wants to know are we going to have more homesteads than we have homesteaders. He seems to desire that. Well, I do not know any better way to bring that about then to restore the old order of things that prevailed in the early nineties. Then you will have lots of homesteads and no homesteaders. Let me briefly call the attention of the House to the record of this present Liberal government as compared with the record of the former Conservative government. The hon. gentleman who moved the motion asks that certain legislation shall be passed by which the railroad companies shall be kept strictly within their limits. Let us take a moment's view of the history of that party. Let us look at the time when these hon. gentlemen opposite were in power. It is distressing to us in the west now to have to reap the bitter harvests they sowed in these years, when they tied up the lands in railway companies and lavishly and improvidently parted with their control, and saddled us with almost intolerable exemptions from taxation. I say in all seriousness and in all civility, that these same men who gave away not thousands, but hundreds of thousands and tens of millions of acres have monstrous audacity to-day to look the Liberal party in the face;—the Liberal party which never gave an acre of land to a railway company —and to say: Don't you give away the railway lands; when the fact is that was these gentlemen themselves who gave away these lands. To my mind, it is as if the prodigal when he returned home had called the family together and given them a severe lecture on the evils of prodigality. The Liberal government has never given one acre of land to a railway company, and the Liberal government has built railways with speed and economy, and the people are pleased. We have seen the Canadian Northern Railway built, and we see the Grand Trunk Pacific building, and when we realize that to effect this the present government has given not one acre of land, we are greatly pleased. I contrast this with the policy in the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and say that is our answer to the hon. gentlemen opposite. I say 'look at that, and it will alleviate your strange unrest.' I give the hon. gentleman from Marquette (Mr. Roche) credit for good sense, and I can only believe that when he beholds the satisfaction of the people of the west, when he sees how pleased they are with the land and transportation policy of the present Dominion government; when he sees how they prospered and flourished and are content, he is desirous now of placing himself side by side with the Liberal party in order that he may participate in their success. It is only ten years ago since the conditions in the west were far different from what they are to-day, and Sir, if we may judge by the trend of events, then, if the same satisfactory conditions prevails, the same acceptable administration of our lands, the same statesmanlike handling of our transportation problems; in the next few years instead of sending a majority of Liberal members from the Territories, I believe we will follow the good example of Nova Scotia and British Columbia and send a solid delegation to support this government. I can readily understand why it is that my hon. friend (Mr. Roche) is glad, to a certain extent, to ally himself with us and to claim our land policy as his. I have not had the slightest connection with the administration in the past and so I am absolutely free to express an opinion, and I say so far as I know the minds of the people there, I believe there is a universal desire that the same policy and the same principle shall prevail in the administration of our lands in the future, as has prevailed since this government came into power in 1896.

Mr. THOMAS GREENWAY (Lisgar): If it is agreeable to the House I would like to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House went into Committee of Supply.

Indians—Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and Northwest Territories—provisions, &c., $109,244.

Mr. BENNETT. I would like to ask the minister a question in reference to some timber lands on the Georgian bay. Has the minister made any disposition of the timber on a large island known as the Giant's Tomb to Mr. Peter Ryan, of Toronto? And if the sale has not been carried into effect, how far have the negotiations proceeded, if any?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). There has been no sale of the timber on the island to Mr. Peter Ryan, and I am informed that there have been no negotiations looking to a sale to Mr. Ryan.

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask, then, has there been a sale of timber on the Giant's Tomb to a party named Alexander?

Mr. OLIVER. The pine and oak on the Giant's Tomb island is under license to a

Mr. Alexander. The license was issued to Mr. Alexander, but it is now held by the Canada Furnace Company. I cannot give the number of years ago that this license was issued.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the minister state positively that there has been no dealing by the department with any person or persons as to the maple or other kinds of timber on this island ?

Mr. OLIVER. There has been correspondence in regard to it, but no transaction of any kind.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the minister please inform me how far these negotiations have proceeded, and who is acting in the negotiations ?

Mr. OLIVER. The negotiations have not proceeded at all. There have been applications for the timber on the island, that part of it which is not under license to the Canada Furnace Company, but no step has been taken by the department to license the timber, for the reason that it is now under license to that company.

Mr. BENNETT. I am quite well aware, and everybody in that neighbourhood is aware, that twenty years ago or more the timber was licensed by the then Liberal government to H. H. Cook, and has been passed on by assignment to others ; but I think that there are at present negotiations pending between Mr. Peter Ryan, of Toronto, and the Department of Indian Affairs for the immense quantity of maple timber on that island. Will the minister inform the House what offer Mr. Ryan has made for the timber, and who has been acting for Mr. Ryan in the negotiations ?

Mr. OLIVER. There are applications in from different parties for the purchase of this island, but the department is not in a position to dispose of the island so long as the present licensees hold their license.

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask the minister who has been acting on behalf of Mr. Peter Ryan in the negotiations ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am informed that we have correspondence from Mr. Peter Ryan, from Mr. Beck, of Penetanguishene, and from the Canada Furnace Company, all applying for the timber on the island.

Mr. BENNETT. And from any solicitor on behalf of Mr. Beck or Mr. Peter Ryan ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am informed that these gentlemen have applied in their own names.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, I have succeeded in getting a little information from the minister, and I suppose I might as well suplement it with what the minister already knows, that Mr. D'Arcy Scott, of Ottawa, has been the solicitor engaged by Mr. Ryan in these proceedings. I do not suppose that his name will be a shock to the minister, as he has probably seen him in this connection. Do I understand that as soon as the claim of the Canada Furnace Company, is arranged for, the timber and the island are then to be disposed of to Mr. Beck ?

Mr. OLIVER. As soon as the Canada Furnace Company's right is disposed of, of course the timber and the island will be for sale.

Mr. BENNETT. With or without the Indians' surrender ?

Mr. OLIVER. It has been surrendered by the Indians.

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask the date of that surrender ?

Mr. OLIVER. In 1856.

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask the minister what other islands were surrendered at the time ?

Mr. OLIVER. A group of islands were surrendered at that time, including the Giant's Tomb, Beckwith island, Beausoleil island, and others in that vicinity.

Mr. BENNETT. How many acres of land and what amount of timber is it estimated there are on this island, and what is its approximate value ?

Mr. OLIVER. The island contains about 1,200 acres. It has been estimated to be worth about $9,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Do I understand that the department are prepared to sell the whole island for $9,000, or that that is the value they place upon it ?

Mr. OLIVER. That is the valuation which has been given the department.

Mr. BENNETT. By whom ?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot say at the moment but if the hon. gentleman insists I can get the information later.

Mr. BENNETT. The sale of an island of that extent is not an every day occurrence, and surely the minister's deputy, who is beside him, must know it.

Mr. OLIVER. I am informed that the estimate was made by Mr. Chitty, timber inspector for the department.

Mr. BENNETT. Was there a written report by Mr. Chitty that the timber on that island is worth only $9,000 ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the minister consider that this Island should be sold by private sale or public auction ?

Mr. OLIVER. I would be inclined to sell it by tender—advertise for tenders and sell it to the highest bidder. That is if the question came up, but it is not up for consideration.

Mr. BENNETT. How long has this correspondence been going on with Mr. Peter Ryan or Mr. Beck ?

Mr. OLIVER. Various applications have been made dating back for a period of about four years. Mr. Ryan's communications with the department have been within the last year, Mr. Beck's about two years ago, and other parties before that.

Mr. BENNETT. Were there other applications besides those from Mr. Beck and Mr. Ryan ?

Mr. OLIVER. From the Canada Furnace Company.

Mr. BENNETT. I think I have drawn all the information out of the minister I can possibly get, but it is not nearly half as much as I know myself and as is pretty well known in that neighbourhood. The House might as well know what the minister is being pressed to do by some of his party friends in that part of the country. Driven from the spoilation of the Toronto timber reserves, these gentlemen are now making a raid on Ottawa. The minister saw fit last year to dispose of a property up there worth $2,000 to a brother member from North Ontario for $100, and the Marine Department gave for the paltry sum of $100 to Mr. Chew, a defeated candidate, timber worth $3,000. The Indian tribes have always believed that this island belonged to the Indian Department and the department has always treated it as such, but ever since the change of government the train has been laid to pass this timber on this island to party supporters. Mr. Peter Ryan and Mr. Beck are one and the same in interest. Mr. Ryan is the go-between and the minister knows also that Mr. D'Arcy Scott, son of the Secretary of State, has acted as solicitor in the matter, and to-day in the courts an action is pending between Mr. Ryan and Mr. Beck regarding the commission which Mr. Ryan is to receive from Mr. Beck. The minister must not imagine that these things are not known in that part of the country. I have my eyes and ears always open to the suspicious circumstances and instances occurring there from day to day, and it is not possible that such a colossal scheme should pass unnoticed and unseen. The minister might as well throw down the veil at once and say that the deal has been stopped owing to the dispute between Mr. Ryan and Mr. Beck, the beneficiary. Yet in the face of all that the minister says that we are to have that convenient way of concealing the facts, namely, a sale by tender. I will not believe it, until I see the report, that Mr. Chitty estimated the timber on this vast island as only worth a paltry $9,000. Why, the timber on the Giant's Tomb is known far and wide by practical lumbermen in that part of the country, and since the change of government very covetous eyes have been cast on it. The whole train was carefully laid. First there was Mr. Ryan as the go-between. Then Mr. D'Arcy Scott, son of the Secretary of State, figuring as solicitor, and Mr. Beck was to be the beneficiary. If the minister should sell this timber for $9,000 to Mr. Beck, he will be doing the best thing he could in the interests of the opposition for political purposes. He will only be going one step further to show the people in that part of the country that dealings with any department in this government are marked by distrust and suspicion and that they need not expect anything honest and aboveboard. Would the hon. minister bring down at our next sitting this report of Mr. Chitty valuing the timber at $9,000 ? When did he make that report ? Was it in the summer or in the winter ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not able to give the date but will bring down the report when next we are on these estimates.

Mr. BENNETT. It would be better not only in the interests of the country, but in the interests of the Indian Department—because from all I have heard the Indian Department will regard it as their own property and the proceeds of the sale will go to the benefit of the Indian fund—that there should be a public auction of this property rather than a private sale. It is notorious that for years the late Conservative government were asked by numerous parties to sell the timber on that island either by public auction or by private sale, but the then minister always replied that until there was a surrender by the Indian tribes, who are on the Christian islands, no sale could be had. Would the minister say whether there was a surrender of Hope island ?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot say for certain.

Mr. BENNETT. I think the minister has a tip not to make any admission as regards Hope island. The reason of that is this. There has been so much underhand dealing about the timber on these islands that his officers know every move which has been made. How can it be possible that the Giant's Tomb which is alongside of Hope island, and Beckwith island and Beausoliel island, which are in the same cluster, could have been surrendered in 1856 and not Hope island ? Hope island was surrendered if the others were. And the deputy minister knows well that if the minister had said that Hope island had been surrendered, I would have asked why it was necessary for the Marine Department, when 100 acres of that island was required for a light-house reserve, to go to the Indian Department first for a surrender of the property. The Indian Department has never treated this island, with the vast quantities of timber upon it, as having been surrendered. The maple timber on Hope island and on the Giant's Tomb is of immense value.

I have been on the island repeatedly. There is no man engaged in lumbering but knows the value of that timber. Yet we are told to-night by the minister that if this is sold, it will be sold by tender. I think that if it could have been sold by private tender Mr. Peter Ryan would have been the tenderer ; and if it had not been for the falling out between Mr. Beck and Mr. Ryan, I think the sale would have been consummated long ago. I can tell the hon. minister that the people of that section of the country will keep their eyes open for this projected sale. I only hope that when the sale is to take place it will be advertised, not alone in the British Columbia and Prince Edward Island papers but in the papers of this portion of the Dominion. There is no doubt that if the government does sell to Mr. Ryan or Mr. Beck in the way in which many fear the sale will take place, the transaction will not find favour with his political friends. Cannot I prevail upon the minister to sell it in the good old-fashioned way, by public auction ? Let men come into the open market where they may know who are bidding, and where there will be no room for suspicion, which there always is in the case of a sale by tender. Cannot I prevail upon him, for the sake of his own good name and the name of his department, to have this sale free from suspicion, and if the sale must take place, to have it take place openly and above board ?

Mr. OLIVER. As to whether the island shall be sold by public auction or by tender, I have already suggested that the time to decide upon that point has hardly yet arrived, because, while the department is quite willing to sell the island, or the timber upon it, as a matter of business for the benefit of the Indian fund, yet the department is not in a position to sell either the island or the timber, because of the timber license which now exists upon the island. I did say a few minutes ago that my view would be that when the sale takes place, it should be by public tender and not by public auction. The reason I suggested that was, because, it being an island and uninhabited, it would be rather difficult to hold the sale upon the property, and it might be difficult to satisfy all who might desire to bid, whereas there would be no difficulty about satisfying everybody if tenders were publicly invited. My hon. friend (Mr. Bennett), who is certainly inclined to be critical, might very well have found fault if we held an auction sale upon the island, because it might be complained, if the attendence at the auction was small, that the bidders had combined to purchase the island at too low a price. If we held the sale at the town at which the hon. gentleman resides, the people of any other town on the coast might possibly complain that the sale was not held there. But if the sale is properly advertised and tenders are received, no person is placed under special difficulty no matter where he may be—all have an equal opportunity to tender ; and so the Indian Department would probably get the highest value for the timber. I am afraid there is no possibility of relieving the mind of my hon. friend of the suspicion of wrongdoing on the part of any department of this government. But, so far as the transactions of the government in connection with these islands are concerned, he did us the honour to discuss the matter at the last session of parliament and he has done us a similar honour this session. In the year that has intervened, the nearest he has been able to come to unearthing a scandal in connection with these sales, is his announcement to a horror-stricken world of the terrible fact that one Peter Ryan, of Toronto, has applied to purchase a certain piece of property. So long as he does not come any nearer than that to finding a wrong transaction, I think the department will be fairly safe in the eyes of the public.

Mr. MILLER. I have no knowledge whatever of the particular island under discussion ; but I have had some experience which has led me to a conclusion as to the best method of selling such islands whether by public auction or by public tender. A few years ago the department advertised for sale by public tender islands that were under control of the Indian Department, Hay island and Griffith island in Georgian bay, each containing between 2,000 and 3,000 acres of land and having a considerable quantity of timber. The advertisement of sale appeared in the Toronto 'Globe', and possibly other papers. I spent a considerable time, with another officer of a furniture company with which I was connected in examining one of the islands, for which we afterwards put in a tender. Our tender was not the lowest and we did not get the island. Each island was sold at a price which, most people thought, was considerably higher than the value. So, I can believe that what the minister has said is correct, that these islands bring a larger price when sold by tender than they are likely to bring if sold by auction, because if they are sold by auction there is an opportunity for the bidders to arrange with one another to keep down the bids. In the case of each island to which I have referred the highest tender was considerably above the tender next below it. I agree that the better method, and the one by which the highest price would be realized is to sell by public tender.

Mr. TELFORD. As the purchaser of Griffith island, I believe we paid nearly $1,000 more than the thing was worth. But we were afraid that it might be sold for a very large sum, and we gave $4,020 for it which, I believe, was a long way above the value.

Mr. BENNETT. Coming as he does from the province of Ontario, I can well understand that my hon. friend from South Grey (Mr. Miller) approves of sale by tender. He has a recollection, no doubt of the famous limit bought by Captain Sullivan for $90, and afterwards sold for $10,000—that is always a very dear recollection to the Liberals of Ontario. They are sighing for the good old days in that province, and, knowing that province, and, knowing that they are very far away so far as lands held by the province are concerned, the hon. gentleman looks for the fulfilment of his friends' desires at Ottawa. The minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) talks about having the sale on the premises. Why, whoever suggested that the party should adjourn up to the Giant's Tomb ? Certainly, I did not, and no person in his sane senses would. Let me tell the hon. gentleman that when his friend, Mr. Peter Ryan, has sales of timber lands, those sales do not take place on the limits, but in the Board of Trade building in Toronto. And where does the province of Quebec have its sales ? Surely the party do not go from river to river to show off the limits.

They have a public auction, above board. It is true I complained of a sale made by the hon. gentleman's department last year when he sold an island to a brother of the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Grant)—I do not suppose they would do anything more now in that quarter after the onslaught made by the member for North Ontario on the cabinet, I do not suppose he could get anything now—but they gave away then for a paltry $100, an island worth $2,000. and the minister knew it at the time. And now the minister is going to put up this island by tender and says : What an awful thing it would be to the detriment of the department if you had a public auction, that these bidders would all go there and conspire one with another not to bid against each other, and in that way keep the price down. That is a wonderful theory for the minister to put forward. He runs away with the idea that all the property has to be exposed at a sale. He has recollections of old time auction sales in country newspaper offices where they got together to see the cattle show. This is not a cattle sale at all, this is a sale of valuable timber amounting to many thousands of dollars. The very best proof that the limit is a most valuable one is the manner and form in which the train has been laid by these hangers-on to possess themselves of it. The minister, I suppose, will not put it up at public auction, he is so afraid that the buyers will stand together and conspire one with another to keep it down. They will do nothing of the sort. Each one will vie with the other to become the possessor of a very valuable timber limit. There will be suspicion and distrust if this matter of tenders is persisted in. Perhaps the hon. gentleman will do like another head of a department did a little time ago, he will ask for tenders, and if prices are too low, then he will withdraw it from sale, and afterwards he will send some circular letters out to a few friends and ask them to put in tenders. Perhaps the minister will adopt that plan. That was done the other day in the matter of flour for a penitentiary. Perhaps the minister will follow that idea ; and perhaps it may happen then as it happened with the penitentiary flour, that the public will get the benefit. I hope the minister will yet see his way clear to selling this property openly on the market by auction.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In connection with this matter of flour for a penitentiary, the statement just made by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) is absolutely unfounded in fact, and he knows it. Tenders were called for through the public press for flour. The price asked for flour was higher than the ruling market price at the time, and the tenders were refused. Now tenders were called for, and we got the flour for less price than it was originally offered. These are the facts, and the hon. member for Simcoe knew them to be facts when he made that statement a moment ago.

Mr. BENNETT. I made the statement a few moments ago to this House that tenders were called for, and the department, for reasons best known to themselves, did not give the tenders to any person, that later on certain persons were invited to tender, and that then an hon. gentleman who sits on that side of the House and who is practically the owner of a certain company, secured the tender. I did not say that his was the highest tender or the lowest tender. I did not say there was anything unfair about it. But I do say this, that an examination of the papers produced show that that hon. gentleman's tender was only a few cents lower than the lowest—but of that perhaps more anon.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Hear, hear, the sooner the better.

Mr. BENNETT. Very well, perhaps we will see that. I will not do like the member for North Ontario, assail the Minister of Justice outside and come in here and be as calm as a cooing dove, I will not do that. Why that should be so, I know not. All I know is that after the attack of the member for North Ontario upon the Minister of Justice and upon his connection with the Grand Transcontinental, the Solicitor General busied himself, and the member for North Ontario was placed again as chairman of the committee of which he had formerly been chairman. It goes without saying then that if a man wishes to obtain eminence under this government—if it is eminence to have a chairmanship—all he will have to do is to attack them outside and then come in here and get a chairmanship on

condition that he won't say anything more. It may be this, that the ex-Postmaster General who went out of this government very much against his own will, and making great mutterings when he did go out, was very close to the member for North Ontario, and it was a notorious fact that of all that brood the brother of the member for North Ontario was the only duckling the Postmaster General had. Perhaps the government thought the member for North Ontario had been loaded up by the ex-Postmaster General and that it was better to smooth his fur down the right way than to smooth it the wrong way, and that the member for North Ontario might have been annoyed if he had not been given that chairmanship. And so the Solicitor General went over the other day and assured the committee that the government desired, that the government wished, that the member for North Ontario might again be reinstated in his position. Now, Sir, I have only this to say with regard to tenders for flour for the penitentiaries, that as it was necessary to call for tenders in the first place it was equally necessary to call for tenders in the second place. Instead of sending out eight or ten circulars, why didn't the Minister of Justice call for tenders in the second instance ?

Mr. FOSTER. Too expensive.

Mr. BENNETT. It cannot be too expensive, because the Minister of the Interior who sits alongside of him is advertising to-day for the sale of a single little island up back of Peterborough or Cobourg. So the government do not find that expensive, we saw it advertised the other day. As to firms tendering for thousands of dollars worth of flour, if the government thought it was necessary in the first instance to call for tenders it was equally necessary in the second instance. And it will be a matter of public comment and a matter of public suspicion that the tender of the hon. member for Centre York (Mr. Campbell) for that large quantity of flour was only a few cents lower than the lowest tender, as the returns show. But of that perhaps more anon.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Perhaps it is best to settle that question now, I do not like these things to lie too long.

In May, 1905, tenders for flour (and other penitentiary supplies) were asked for by advertisement in seventy newspapers. Tenders were received as follows :

Kingston Penitentiary, 10 at $4.19 to $5.20 per barrell.

St. Vincent de Paul, 8 at $4.19 to $5.30 per barrel.

Dorchester Penitentiary, 8 at $4.29 to $5.70 per barrel.

Manitoba Penitentiary, 5 at $4.28 to $5.60 per barrel.

British Columbia (Manitoba hard), 4 at $4.90 to $5.75 per barrel.

British Columbia (local wheat), 3 at $4.20 to $4.95 per barrel.

These prices were sixty cents higher than the then current contract prices It was decided to accept none of the tenders, but to ask again in September. Eighteen firms tendered, some for one penitentiary, others for more than one penitentiary.

On the 15th September, a letter inviting tenders was sent to every one of the eighteen who had tendered in May and to a number of others —thirty-one firms altogether.

Instead of the five or six that the hon. gentleman has alluded to. Of course, accuracy of statement is not essential.

Mr. BENNETT. I did not say five or six.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Well, perhaps seven or eight. We will consult 'Hansard' as to that.

Mr. BENNETT. Try again now.

Mr. FITZPATRICK (reading)

Thirteen responded, some tendering for the supply of one, others for more than one, penitentiary. The following were received :

Penitentiary.	No. of tenders.	Range of price.
Kingston	9	$3 84 to $4 75 per barrel.
St. Vincent de Paul	9	3 84 to 4 80 "
Dorchester..	8	4 04 to 4 65 "
Manitoba..	6	3 55 to 4 40 "
British Columbia	7	4 00 to 5 30 "
British Columbia	6	3 80 to 5 30 "

In every case the lowest tender was accepted.

Mr. BENNETT. The Minister of Jusice should be a little better natured with me. I do not say that there was anything wrong with the tenders.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Then I apologize.

Mr. BENNETT. I said that it was a matter of suspicion, that the figures of the hon. member for Centre York (Mr. Campbell) should be the lowest and that it should be four cents. Now these things are not going to redound to the credit of the country. I am going to use the remarks of the hon. member for North Ontario. Why Sir, the way he assails the Minister of Justice is wonderful. He says :

Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick, whom they looked to to influence the actions of the chairman of the Transcontinental Railway Commission. This chairman, S. N. Parent, was a law partner of Mr. Fitzpatrick, and the Ontario Liberals fear that there will be certain arrangements relating to the Grand Trunk Pacific made, which will not redound to the credit of the country. Contracts would be let for the construction of the section east of Winnipeg within 48 hours, and he was doubtful whether they would be let in the best interests of the country.

Why Sir, when millions of dollars worth of contracts are being let, when a supporter of the government comes out in the public press and states openly that he fears they will not be on the square and will not be straightforward on account of the Minister of Justice, surely the Minister of Justice should be a little more pacific with me

when I point out that some officer in his department has accepted a contract for flour at four cents a barrel less than other tenderers after it has not been tendered for in a public way. I care not whether the whole twelve or the whole eighteen were asked, the fact was that a large quantity of flour was needed, the public tenders were not called for in the newspapers, and according to the return which I saw hurriedly the other day, by a very odd coincidence, the figure of the hon. member for Centre York is just a few cents below the others. I do not say that the hon. member for York knew the figures of any tenders, because I am not in a position to state that, but I do say in the words of the member for North Ontario, that such deals as that will not redound to the credit of the country.

Triennial clothing, $5,237.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not see how you should have an item so much larger here for the nine months; the weather has not been cold.

Mr. OLIVER. We supply only one suit of clothes to each person and the reason of the increase is because there is a greater number of chiefs. This issue is only to chiefs, and on account of the new treaty in northern Ontario there is a larger number of chiefs than before, and of course the chiefs of the new treaty all have to be dealt with this year.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the clothing given every three years ?

Mr. OLIVER. Every three years.

Mr. BENNETT. I would like to ask the minister a question in connection with another deal in the Indian Department. How much was paid for the water power sold to the Pulp Mill Company known as the Imperial Pulp Mill Company in Sturgeon Falls ? That is a pretty old friend in the department and has been well canvassed in North Ontario. How much was paid for the twenty-five acres or the quantity of land that went along with the water power by this company ?

Mr. OLIVER. $10,000.

Mr. BENNETT. Who acted on account of the Indians in that sale, and how much has already been paid to the Indians on account of the sale ?

Mr. OLIVER. The Indian agent, Mr. Cockburn.

Mr. BENNETT. Is he the postmaster too, may I ask ?

Mr. OLIVER. I could not answer that question.

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask the minister as to the balance of $9,000 and the rate of interest which the Indians are to be paid on that ? It is to be paid every year is it not ?

Mr. BENNETT.

Mr. OLIVER. The deferred payments on the property carry five per cent interest to the government. This interest is counted along with the principal and on both interest and principal the Indians get the usual rate of three per cent.

Mr. BENNETT. Now this is about exactly as my informant has told me in connection with this deal. The Indians have been overreached in this deal. In the first place the Indians had no independent adviser at all when the deal was consummated except Mr. Cockburn, who is actually closer to the Pulp Mill Company judging from the large correspondence I have had, than to the Indians. What lawyer or counsel acted for the Indians in the contract that was drawn up ?

Mr. OLIVER. The Indian Department is responsible for the interests of the Indians and the officers of the department are the parties who are responsible for the Indian side of the transaction.

Mr. BENNETT. There is no doubt about it, the department is responsible, and there is no doubt about it the Indians are the losers. Here was this wealthy pulp company who had very strong influence through certain members of parliament with this government making a deal for this water power in which the Indians have alleged they were overreached. A contract is made and they are to receive $10,000 and that contract is so worded and drawn up that the company make payments of $1,000 a year, as I understand, and there is not one cent of interest payable to the Indians afterwards. It is true the money is to be paid in and they will receive the usual rate of interest on the fund, but I am going to ask the minister why the wealthy company should not have to pay the money to the Indians at fair rate of interest instead of paying off as they do. May I ask this question ? His deputy could name the solicitor who drew it up.

Mr. OLIVER. There was no contract as it is generally understood, there was a surrender on the part of the Indians which was prepared by the officers of the department, but the Indians receive on account of the surrender the government rate of interest, and just what they are entitled to according to custom in dealing with Indian bands, under such circumstances. The company pays five per cent on its deferred payments. The terms are $2,500 down and three annual payments of $2,500 each. The deferred payments carry five per cent interest so that the company gets no advantage from the rate of interest that the Indians receive. The Indians lose nothing because both interest and principal paid by the company form the funds on which the Indians are paid three per cent, the government rate of interest.

Mr. BENNETT. I quite understand that the Indians are paid 3 per cent interest, but

my contention is that on this $9,000 they should have been allowed the rate of interest received by the government. The Indians did not know at the time the deal was carried on by Mr. Cockburn that that was the manner in which it was being done, and they were led to believe they would be paid interest on the $9,000 balance. I understand the payments are $1,000 each year?

Mr. OLIVER. $2,500 a year, and the company pays 5 per cent on the deferred payment.

Mr. BENNETT. The net result is that the Indians are not drawing any interest at all on the deferred payment.

Mr. OLIVER. The 3 per cent interest goes to the funds of the band and is distributed to the band each year.

Mr. BENNETT. It amounts to this, that the government pays the Indian fund 3 per cent on that amount, but the 5 per cent the government is deriving from the company does not go to the Indians at all. If there was no interest paid by the company, the Indians would still be paid 3 per cent on their money.

Mr. OLIVER. The Indians are being paid 3 per cent, and there is no reason I know of why the Indians of that band should receive a rate of interest different from that paid the Indians of any other band. I understood that the hon. gentleman at first complained that an unfair advantage had been given to the company. That is not so, because the company is paying a fair rate of interest upon the money that is still due and the Indians are being dealt with just as all other Indians are.

Mr. BENNETT. I could understand that if it were a cash sale the department would invest the money and pay this tribe 3 per cent, but a certain sum being due, and the government being paid 5 per cent on that the Indians naturally expect they would get the 5 per cent. They are apparently getting 3 per cent, but the contention of the Indians is that they should be paid 5 per cent on the balance remaining unpaid. The Indians were deceived, because they were led to believe by the agent they were going to get the 5 per cent interest.

Mr. OLIVER. The 5 per cent interest is added to the capital and upon that capital the Indians receive 3 per cent interest for all time to come. They are getting exactly the same treatment as all Indians similarly circumstanced. I cannot answer for what the understanding of the Indians was, but my acquaintance with Indian thought leads me to the conclusion that this would be a very remarkable band of Indians if they were getting under any possible circumstances all they thought they were entitled to.

Mr. BENNETT. The minister has developed a new phase of the question, when he says the 5 per cent interest is added to the fund as capital. What I first inferred from the statement of the minister was, that the 5 per cent went into the general funds of the government. I am simply voicing the complaint of the Indians that they were overreached by the agent when he lead them to believe they were to have the interest on the money.

Mr. OLIVER. When it takes my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) so long to understand such a simple explanation, the Indians are not to be blamed for failing to understand it.

Mr. BENNETT. If the minister will look at 'Hansard' he will find that when he started out he was ignorant of the whole case, and it was difficult for me or any one else to understand what he was saying or trying to say, but being prompted word for word and line by line by his deputy he at last made an intelligent explanation.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The ex-Minister of the Interior stated some time ago, that he was in communication with the Indians of the Crooked Lake reserve with reference to the surrender of that reserve. Has there been any surrender since then?

Mr. OLIVER. There has been no surrender of that reserve.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Are the Indians subject to the game laws of the various provinces?

Mr. OLIVER. It is to some extent an open question, but for purposes of administration it is assumed they are.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. If an hotelkeeper sells liquor to an Indian and he is fined by the Indian agent who is also a justice of the peace, does the fine go to the Dominion treasury?

Mr. OLIVER. In Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba it does; in British Columbia it goes to the provincial government.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. In Manitoba the fines go to the Dominion government?

Mr. OLIVER. Half the fine is to the informer and half to the government.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Assuming that the magistrate is not the Indian agent but a justice of the peace appointed by the provincial government, does the fine go to the Dominion government when the administration of justice is under the provincial authorities?

Mr. OLIVER. If the offence is under the Dominion Indian Act, I am informed that half the fine comes to the Dominion.

Indian schools, $221,795.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Do the teachers in these Indian schools require to have the same qualification as the teachers in the public schools of the province ?

Mr. OLIVER. The desire of the department is to secure teachers who hold at least third-class certificates, but it is not always possible to get such teachers.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. What inspection are they subjected to ?

Mr. OLIVER. The inspectors of the department and the agency.

Surveys, $11,000.

Mr. LAKE. I brought to the attention of the minister last year the case of an application which was being made for the opening up of a portion of the Crooked Lakes Indian reserve. The people in that section are most anxious that a portion at any rate of that reserve should be placed on the market.

Mr. OLIVER. Several attempts have been made to secure a surrender, but so far, they have not been successful. We hope at some favourable time and at an early date to make another attempt.

Mr. LAKE. This is a matter which has been under consideration a very long time. I myself brought it to the attention of the then Minister of the Interior about seven or eight years ago, and it seems that the department takes a very long time to do anything. There is an area of something like 181,000 acres reserved to the Indians close along the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I think that the furthest distance it is from the line is about four miles and much of the way within a mile. It extends from the town of Whitewood to the town of Grenfell and cuts off a great deal of the business of those towns and the town of Broadview, which comes in between, is not able to get any business at all from the north. On these 181,000 acres there are living 520 Indians, according to the report of the minister. That gives an average of about 350 acres per head for every man, woman and child on that reserve, and that is four or five times as much land as they can possibly make any use of. As a matter of fact they make very little use of their land. On a strip of about six miles broad and four townships long they practically make no use of the land at all. Occasionally there may be a few tons of hay cut there and at the extreme eastern end of the reserve there may be one or two Indians living, but if that strip of land were taken off it would only reduce the area of the reserve one half and still leave double the quantity of land which the Indians can possibly make any use of in the future. It must be quite apparent that the existence of so large a tract, absolutely undeveloped, lying in an old district on the original main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, is a great drawback to the progress of the country, and every effort should be made to have that drawback removed. It ought to be removed from another point of view. I calculate that the cost to the country of maintaining the Indians in the Northwest amounts to something like $40 per head. Well, a strip of land six miles broad along the southern part of that boundary, which is not used by the Indians, which is not used for anything at all, would probably supply a capital sum which, put out at interest, would keep the whole of those Indians on the reserve. It would give them an average of $40 per head, sufficient to relieve the government from any further expenditure. At the same time there would still remain to the Indians living on the other part of the reserve twice as much land as they are able to make use of. The idea that it is impossible to act unless we can get the free consent of the Indians to parting with these lands, seems to me rather strained. It would not apply to any other portion of the country. If lands are required to open up a railway through private property, there would be an expropriation and reasonable compensation paid, and the existence of private rights would not be allowed to stand in the way of public development. I cannot help thinking that some little pressure and negotiations on the part of the department would bring about a voluntary surrender by the Indians of a portion of this reserve. If the Indians will not give it up absolutely voluntarily, the government should put some little pressure on them and not allow the development of that part of the country to be retarded by keeping that great undeveloped tract of land there.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to add a word in support of what my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) has said. It appears that this reserve extends 24 miles along the main line of the Canadian Pacific Railway between Grenfell and Whitewood and is on an average one and a half miles from the railway. It has an extent of 182,000 acres and a population of 520 Indians and the land under crop last year was less than 900 acres. It shuts out the town of Broadview from the farming country to the north and the towns of Whitewood and Grenfell from a good deal of the territory which would naturally bring business to them. I understand that the southern portion of the reserve is not occupied or used by the Indians to any extent. Of course the rights of the Indians must be absolutely respected, but when you have a population of 520 Indians on 182,000 acres, situated in a part of the country which is rapidly developing, and in close proximity to the railway, this is a case which demands every effort of the government to bring about better conditions, so far as the development of the white population is concerned, without any

detriment to the Indians, but realizing always that we must keep the most absolute good faith with them.

Mr. TURRIFF. I am in sympathy with what both the hon. gentlemen who have preceded me have said. This reserve is mostly, if not all, in my constituency, and for the past two or three years every effort has been made to induce the Indians to give up a portion of their reserve. One half might be sold for the benefit of the Indians and the Indians would still have more land left than they can possibly use. But the land cannot be disposed of until the Indians of their own accord agree to the proposition. Two or three attempts have been made by the department to get the Indians to surrender this part of their reserve, but in each case the effort has failed. I am, however, in hopes that the next time the matter is submitted to the Indians, it will be more successful. I have been doing all I possibly could, and will continue to do all I possibly can, to bring that about, because there is no doubt that Whitewood, Broadview, and to a certain extent Grenfell, are largely interested in having that land put up for sale, so that it will be brought under cultivation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was a part of an Indian reserve secured for the National Transcontinental Railway?

Mr. OLIVER. On the Fort William Indian reserve, some 1,600 acres were secured for the Grand Trunk Pacific Railroad.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was that done with the Indians' consent?

Mr. OLIVER. That is done under a special law which permits expropriation for railway purposes. It is only for railway purposes that Indian lands can be expropriated.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is that a provision of the Indian Act?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes. Section 35 of the Indian Act provides for dealing with Indian lands for railway purposes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understand that there is a legislative difficulty, but it is remarkable that the law should give a railway company power to do that for the benefit of its promoters which the government has not power to do for the inhabitants of a large community. If it is proper that a railway company, carrying on an enterprise for its own profit, and to a certain extent exercising a public function, should have the power of expropriation, it would seem equally proper that for good cause and in the interest of a large community, which is developing very rapidly, some similar power under proper restrictions should be placed in some tribunal to be created by the government, either a commission or a department of the government. This is a subject which urgently demands the attention of the government.

Mr. OLIVER. What has been said is well worthy of consideration. The case of the Broadview reserve is only one of many in the west, and it is no doubt a hardship to the surrounding country and to large business enterprises that these reserves should be in the position they are. But the case is hardly the same as a matter between a railway company and a private individual. A railway must connect the points which it is intended to connect or the whole country suffers damage, and it would never do to allow the possibility of constructing a railway to rest upon the good will of a body of men who have no interest whatever in its construction. The moral right of the Indian is no doubt just the same in the case of a railway as in the case of a private individual; that is to say, the Indian is the absolute owner, and he should not be deprived of his right without his consent. But, just as in the case of an ordinary individual, so in the case of the Indian, there is a recognized public necessity in connection with a railroad which makes it proper that private rights should be to some extent overriden. As to whether conditions in the west are so grievous as to require special legislation dealing with Indian reserves in such a drastic manner as has been suggested, is a matter for consideration. It is contrary to all the record of the government of Canada or of Great Britain to deal with the Indians in that way. But of course the interests of the people must come first, and if it becomes a question between the Indians and the whites, the interests of the whites will have to be provided for. In the meantime, it is the policy of the department to make every reasonable effort to secure an amicable surrender from the Indians of such lands as are not being employed by them and as would be of value to white settlers. Quite recently the department has been successful in securing the surrender of a part of a reserve at Kamsack on the Canadian Northern, and some time before it was successful in securing a part of the Stoney reserve south of Sintaluta and also a part of the reserve south of Battleford. The department is so thoroughly alive to the necessity of making special efforts to secure parts of Indian reserves that it has made considerable alterations in the terms it now offers to the Indians for these surrenders, and we hope it will be possible, by continuing these efforts, to secure such surrenders as will avoid any necessity for legislation on the subject. However, I am very glad the leader of the opposition has drawn attention to the matter, as it will show the House and the country that it is not a matter that can altogether be secured by departmental action, but that in the last resort legislation would be necessary.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the minister will permit me, I would like to say that the cases appear to me to be more analogous than he seems to think. It is not necessary that any particular land should be taken for a railway. The railway can be run around the land ; but the law does not require that to be done. In the one case you run the railway through an Indian reserve, and the law gives you power to expropriate. I do not know whether it gives power to expropriate the whole of the Indian reserve ; I suppose that would depend on the view of the Railway Commission and on the consent of the Minister of Railways ; but in any case you can expropriate what is reasonably required for the right of way. In the other case a railway runs two miles distant from an Indian reserve, and the development of the country causes a prosperous community to be established there. It is all due to the railway in the first instance. I do not see much difference between expropriating the land for the right of way of the railway and expropriating it in order that the community established by the railway may have its proper development. So far as the public reasons are concerned—and that is what we are discussing—it seems there is about as much ground in one case as in the other. I fully appreciate what the minister has said, that, whether for a railway or for any other public purpose, you must consider carefully what you do, and you must observe as sacred the rights of the Indians ; if you take their lands you must make sure that they have a habitation elsewhere and also that they have full and ample compensation for everything that is taken. Subject to that, it seems to me that the cases are much upon the same level.

Mr. LAKE. I was very glad to hear the remarks of the minister. One thing I should like to have heard him say was that an immediate effort would be made with regard to this particular reserve, because the thing has been hanging fire for so very long. Year after year this matter has been up, yet nothing seems to have been done. It seems to me that surely the exercise of a certain amount of diplomacy and negotiations ought to be, and must be, successful with Indians. If an honest effort is made to push the matter through, I do not see how it can fail. I appreciate, of course, the rights of the Indians and our duty of keeping absolutely sacred our promises to them.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. I understand that the minister has stated that every effort has been made to obtain the consent of the Indians to surrender. Now, certain representations have been made to the department with regard to the Sarcee reserve, about three miles from Calgary. I understand that the minister's friends in Calgary, as well as the Board of Trade there, have made representations to him with regard to that reserve. I would like to know what action has been taken by the department to obtain the consent of these Indians. I notice that the report of the Indian Department gives the area of that reserve at something like 69,120 acres and the total population as 205. There are reserves for Indians not far away which are far in excess of the requirements of the Indians. No person can seriously contend that you require that quantity of land for 205 men, women, and children, or rather Indians, squaws and papooses. I would like to know what steps have been taken to enter into negotiations with the Indians with regard to that reserve.

Mr. OLIVER. The question of the Sarcee, reserve, of course, has been under my notice for a long time. A special agent of the department was sent, some time in February, I think, to the Sarcees—an agent in whom the department had every confidence—with instructions to try to secure from them a surrender. This agent was authorized to offer the Indians the best terms that we could arrange to give them, as we were very anxious to secure the surrender of at least a large part of the reserve, because of its proximity to the city of Calgary and its desirable agricultural character. However, the Indians refused to sell—in fact, they simply refused to negotiate, they would not listen to proposals at all. We thought it was better to drop the matter completely at the moment than to try to struggle against the expressed wishes of the Indians at the time. I can assure the hon. member (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) that at the very first moment that seems opportune negotiations will be resumed, and that every advantage that the Indian Act permits us to give in order to produce that surrender will be offered to these Indians.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Did the department offer to negotiate with other Indians at the same time with respect to their reserves ?

Mr. OLIVER. Not exactly at the same time. But the same officer was successful in negotiating the Kamsack reserve on the Canadian Northern.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Have not reserves been surrendered in the neighbourhood of Battleford and Prince Albert and along the lines of the Canadian Pacific Railway and Canadian Northern ? Have not surrenders been obtained from the Indians on reserves further north ?

Mr. OLIVER. As I have just stated, within the last year surrenders have been secured on the Kamsack reserve on the Canadian Northern. The same is true of the Stoney reserve at Battleford and part of the Assiniboia reserve at Sintaluta.

Mr. FOWLER. I would like to ask the minister if any of the reserves in British

Columbia have been surrendered or if steps are being taken to have such reserves surrendered ?

Mr. OLIVER. There have been no surrenders in British Columbia within recent years. There was an exchange two or three years ago, of part of the land in a reserve for another piece of land.

Mr. FOWLER. Where was that exchange ?

Mr. OLIVER. At Hadley, in the Similkameen Valley.

Mr. FOWLER. It seems to me that it is more important that there should be surrenders of some of the reserves in British Columbia than of the reserves in the Northwest, because of the fact that the area of cultivable land in British Columbia is so much more limited than in the great provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. Take two reserves that I know a good deal about, one near Kamloops and the other near Enderby. These two Indian reserves are upon the very best land in the country, lying very close to these towns, both of them thriving growing towns. It is very important, in the best interest of the community, that the Indians should be removed from these reserves and the land taken for the purposes of settlement, for fruit farms for which it is especially suitable. The Enderby reserve is particularly valuable for cultivation, but it is not being cultivated by the Indians; the land is simply lying there waste, in a province, where as hon. gentlemen know, there is not a very large quantity of available agricultural land. Moreover it is not particularly good for the morals of the Indians themselves that they should be so close to the towns as they are in these cases. As we know, the Indians are not so strong to resist temptation as are the whites; they more easily acquire the vices of the whites than they do their virtues. Of course, the rights and interests of the Indians must be considered and safeguarded by the Indian Department; but it would be a very important matter for the people of these communities which I know, and of which therefore I speak, for the department to take steps to remove these Indians from reserves, paying them a proper and reasonable price for their lands. They are lands which will bring a large price if opened up and sold by auction. The Indians could be removed to some other place in the province more removed from the towns. I think this is a matter that might be well looked into. It is one of great importance, not only to the Indians but also to the people of British Columbia.

Mr. OLIVER. I appreciate the special conditions existing in British Columbia as stated by the hon. member. There is one difficulty in British Columbia, however, that does not exist in the Northwest Territories, namely, that the British Columbia government claims to hold a certain interest in these reserves. Therefore, in order to get the land into such shape that the government can give a clear title to it, we have to deal with the British Columbia government as well as with the Indians. The question is therefore more complicated than it is in the Territories. Besides, the Indians are possibly more difficult to deal with, owing perhaps to their more businesslike disposition, and also to the fact, which is apparent to them as well as to everybody else, that they have a corner practically on the best there is, and they do not feel like giving it up. In this case I may say the terms which the department is permitted by the Indian Act to give the Indians in order to secure their consent to surrender, are not particularly attractive to the Indians. If the sentiment that has been expressed here to-night is a general sentiment, it might be worth while considering whether the terms which are permitted now by the Indian Act might be somewhat relaxed so that they would be more likely to meet with the views of the Indians. Perhaps we had better move in that direction rather than adopt the somewhat drastic suggestion of expropriation. We are anxious to do the best we can to secure the land for valuable development ; at the same time the traditional policy of this country in regard to the Indians is to observe very carefully their treaty rights.

Mr. FOWLER. Those who selected the reserves for the Indians in British Columbia certainly gave them full justice, because in the tracts I know of, they have selected the very best lands in the country. I would like to ask the minister if the British Columbia government claim a reversionary interest in the land after the rights of the Indians have been extinguished.

Mr. OLIVER. I understand the position is that if an Indian band becomes extinct, or if the band abandons a reservation, the British Columbia government claims the right to that land, that is to say, they claim a reversionary interest in the reserves.

Mr. FOWLER. If the rights of the Indians were extinguished by purchase would they have that reversionary interest or would that only apply in case of abandonment? I do not know the law with respect to the matter. Is that a statute or a decision of the courts ?

Mr. OLIVER. That is by arrangement between the British Columbia government and the Dominion. It has not been made the subject of a judicial decision.

Mr. FOWLER. Then it is simply in case of abandonment by the Indians. I suppose there might be some question as to what was meant by an abandonment, whether a sale outright, or a removal of the Indians would be an abandonment,

they moving away voluntarily without receiving anything for their lands.

Mr. OLIVER. I understand the contention of the British Columbia government is that whenever a reservation becomes vacant for any reason they then take possession of the land.

Mr. HERRON. In the western country particularly we all recognize the importance of the government keeping faith with the Indians. But has as been stated here tonight, these reserves are very important in many parts of our country. Not only do they exist in the places already mentioned, but they extend, I may say, to many other portions of our country. In my district there is a Blood reserve which extends to the town of Cardstone. I have no authority from the people to make an application to the government to secure the abandonment of any portion of that reserve, but I know they have been making an effort for a number of years to get a portion of it thrown open. Cardstone is a very thriving town, one of the most prosperous towns in the southern country, and this Blood reserve extends, I might almost say, to the very centre of the town, the town has actually grown round a corner of the reserve, and the main street comes squarely to the line fence. Now it would be a great advantage to that town if a small portion of that reserve could be thrown open. I do not know what obstacle is in the way. The minister is well aware of the circumstances, and I would like him to take the case of Cardstone into consideration when he is considering these other Indian reservations.

Mr. OLIVER. I am well acquainted with the circumstances alluded to by the hon. member. Some years ago an effort was made to secure a surrender but it was not successful. We are now arranging to renew negotiations with the Indians in regard to that piece of land, and I hope we will be successful.

Mr. BENNETT. Who has the lease of the Blood reserve, when was it granted, for how many years and the consideration?

Mr. OLIVER. The reserve is not leased. But there is a lease of a right upon the reserve which was granted in 1903 to the McEwan, Cattle Co., of Brandon.

Mr. BENNETT. What is the consideration?

Mr. OLIVER. The cash consideration is $5,000 a year, and the limitation is 7,000 head of cattle. Then the lessees are compelled to purchase 700 tons of hay at $4 a ton from the Indians. There are other conditions with regard to the fireguards, &c.

Mr. BENNETT. Are not Mr. Peter Ryan and Mr. Charles Beck connected with that so-called McEwan Cattle Company and are they not known in the department as the actual lessees ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am informed that the department has no knowledge of the connection of these gentlemen with the lease.

Mr. BENNETT. Is there any correspondence between Charles Beck and Peter Ryan with the government in reference to this ?

Mr. OLIVER. My officers say they have no remembrance of any such correspondence in the department.

Mr. BENNETT. I can tell the minister that Mr. Beck has either a hallucination, or a very vivid remembrance of it. One of the boasts of Mr. Beck's life is the deal that he made with the Indian Department at Ottawa when he got the celebrated grazing rights on the Blood reserve. What is the usual rate per acre for such a privilege as is enjoyed?

Mr. OLIVER. There are two grazing leases on Indian reserves, on the Bloods and the Piegans, and the rental is per head of stock, not per acre of the reserve. I have said the rental is $5,000 per year with a limit of 7,000 cattle.

Mr. BENNETT. Is there a fixed two cent rate ordinarily on these leases in the department and for how many years is this lease granted ?

Mr. OLIVER. The lease is for 10 years. The rate of 2 cents an acre that my hon. friend speaks of is the rate paid by the holders of grazing leases from the Interior Department, not connected with the Indian Department at all.

Mr. BENNETT. Can the minister tell me of another 10 year grazing lease in the department ?

Mr. OLIVER. The only leases on Indian reserves are the two I have mentioned, and they are each one for a ten year period.

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask who has the other one, the Piegan ?

Mr. OLIVER. Maunsell Bros. of Macleod.

Mr. BENNETT. I am not in possession of facts about the Maunsell one but was it subsequent to the MacKenna one ?

Mr. OLIVER. The Piegan reserve was leased shortly before the Blood reserve. The Piegan reserve was leased in the beginning of 1903, and the Blood later.

Mr. BENNETT. The minister will see that an extraordinary privilege was granted by his predecessor in office. In the first place none of them, I am informed, have been for more than two years, and yet this is made for 10 years. The worst of it, is as I figure out, that this amounts to about 1¼ cents an acre of what is notorious-

ly the finest grazing reserve in the Northwest, and yet it is given to these gentlemen. It is a notorious fact that Peter Ryan and his colleagues are the beneficiaries at a cent and a quarter an acre ; that is what it amounts to and they are given it for 10 years. I am surprised the minister's officers have not heard of Mr. Beck or Mr. Ryan. Mr. Ryan is so interested that he goes out to view it and admire it, and Mr. Beck makes similar pilgrimages. Perhaps the minister, with a little persistent inquiry from some of his officials, can recall to their minds Beck or Ryan as being concerned in the transaction.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not able to answer the hon. member as to whether these gentlemen have negotiated with the department in that case or not. Of course it is possible to bring down the papers that would show it if it is considered important.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Who are the ostensible lessees ?

Mr. OLIVER. The McEwan Ranching Company of Brandon.

Mr. BENNETT. I think the House will be surprised that with his deputy beside him the minister has to inform us that his deputy cannot recall these gentlemen ever figuring in the transaction, which is one of very great note. Perhaps I can remind the deputy of the great struggle there was in the department ; perhaps the deputy can recollect it if I recall the great struggle there was on behalf of friends of an hon. member from British Columbia who were looking for this concession also. This was one of the great boasts of Mr. Beck that they had beaten all other competitors in securing this ground at 1¼ cents an acre when the going rate is 2 cents an acre on the very best grazing lands in the Territories. And better than that they had got it for 10 years when its value might be enhanced, doubled or trebled, and yet the minister informs the House that the deputy has no recollection of these gentlemen being in the transaction. I will accept that statement and friends of Mr. Beck will know what reliance is to be placed on the official statements made in this House through the Minister.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know if the House is as much interested in Mr. Beck as my friend is, but it may be interested in knowing what these people are getting for the 1¼ cents an acre which they are paying. I said a little while ago that they are not paying by the acre but by the head of stock pastured. My hon. friend figures out the acreage of the reserve and the number of stock, and figures the payment at 1¼ cents an acre. He is not aware that the largest band of Indians I think in the country the tribe who own the largest number of stock also pasture their cattle and horses on the same reserve. The Indians have 11 stallions, 3,034 mares, 135 bulls, 371 steers, 2,695 breeding cows and 2,937 young stock which they also pasture on the reserve, along with the 7,000 head which the McEwan Company is entitled to pasture on it. Therefore, as the Indians are pasturing something like 8,000 or 9,000 head of stock on the same reserve that the ranche company is pasturing 7,000 head upon, if the figures which my hon. friend gives are correct and that figures out at 1¼ cents a head, then the 8,000 or 9,000 head pastured by the Indians should figure out about the same way. Therefore that lease or that reserve is carrying stock at the rate of 2½ cents per acre, and not at the rate of 2 cents an acre, which my hon. friend has said is the going rate of leases from the Indian Department. Instead of these people paying less than the going rate they are paying more than double when you consider the number of stock.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the area of the reserve ?

Mr. OLIVER. About 350,000 acres.

Mr. BENNETT. I was figuring on so large a number and it amounted to about 1¼ cents. On this other basis it amounts to about ¾ cents per head for the cattle. May I ask the minister—this is no sin of the minister's he found it when he came into the department if it is a sin—if tenders were called for this arrangement ?

Mr. OLIVER. No, no tenders were called for. The arrangement was made direct with the Indians under the sanction of the department.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the statutory authority with regard to that.

Mr. OLIVER. This arrangement being a lease and not a sale it is not dealt with by statute. There was a large area of 350,000 acres carrying the stock owned by the Indians, but it was not yielding any other revenue and the Indians were not making any very serious use of it. Other ranchers in the vicinity were, according to the custom, using the reserve for pasturage without being interfered with by the Indians. The department thought it well to arrange that the pasturage not required by the Indians for their stock should yield a revenue for their support, and the Indians were permitted to enter into this arrangement whereby they received a fixed yearly revenue for permitting the grazing of this stock on the reserve.

Mr. BENNETT. The Indians are supposed to be the wards of the government, and if, as I am informed, Mr. Peter Ryan made the contract it was certainly taking advantage of these Indians to let Mr. Peter Ryan, who has the reputation of a spell binder, go there and deal with them. Tht minister stated that the Indians derived no

revenue from other people who let their cattle pasture on the reserve. I was there four years ago and I heard a gentleman say that he paid the Indians for the privilege. There is a strong suspicion that the Indians were not looking for Mr. Peter Ryan and Mr. Beck but rather that Mr. Ryan and Mr. Beck and some one else were looking for the Indians when the arrangement was made. It was a beautiful arrangement for these gentlemen, and it is thought that McEwan and Company were only stalking horses in whose name the deal was made. There was no public competition in this deal and there will probably be no public competition in the deal that Mr. Ryan and Mr. Beck are making with regard to Giant's Tomb. If the deputy minister can find any correspondence from Mr. Beck or Mr. Ryan in connection with this, the minister can bring it down with Mr. Chitty's valuation of the timber on the Giant's Tomb and the valuation of the island at $9,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The condition of affairs seems to be unsatisfactory. The Indians are simply wards and the lease in the end must be made with the Crown. If the government can make a lease for ten years without any statutory authority, I do not see why they cannot make it for 100 years; the result of which, of course, is that those who have influence with the adminstration might make a very pretty arrangement about some of these reserves in the Northwest. If it is desirable that a lease should be made, then there should be statutory authority, or regulations by the department under statutory authority. The present system is not in the public interest nor in the interest of the Indians.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. What is the name of the officer who negotiated with the Sarcee Indians in February last?

Mr. OLIVER. The gentleman is not in the regular employ of the department, but was especially employed for the purpose of making this arrangement. He is the same gentleman who made the arrangement with regard to the Kamsacks. He is the Rev. John McDougall, of Calgary; a gentleman who has been in the Northwest for a very long time, and no other man in the Northwest is as well acquainted with the Indians or as fully trusted by them as the Rev. Mr. McDougall. The department got his services and we thought we were exercising the best judgment in doing so.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Who negotiated for the reserve close to Edmonton?

Mr. OLIVER. There has been no surrender in the vicinity of Edmonton within the past year.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. There was one near Battleford, one near Kamsack, and one at Sintaluta. Has not a reserve been surrended in the vicinity of Edmonton within the last two years?

Mr. OLIVER. There has been no surrender within the past year, or I think within the past two years, but before that there was a surrender of a strip of what is called the Stoney Plain reserve, of another strip of what is called the Michel and another strip of what is called the Alexander reserve. Many years ago, there was a reserve known as the Passpasschase, which lay immediately south of Strathcona and which was surrendered, but that is very long ago.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. The situation seems to be that it is a very difficult matter to receive the consent of the Indians in the south, but it is an easy matter to receive their consent along the line of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway and Canadian Northern Railway.

Mr. LAKE. The minister gave an answer the other day, and I understood he was speaking of all the reserves that were being opened at the present time. In his answer he said:

It was the intention to open for sale the following lands which have been surrendered by the Indians to be sold for their benefit.

A portion of Alexander's reserve, No. 134, about 25 miles from Edmonton, comprising 9,518 acres which have been surrendered by the Indians to be sold for their benefit, and which will be subdivided as early as possible for purpose of sale.

Sioux, $4,514.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What does that mean?

Mr. OLIVER. They are a band of Sioux Indians who came to this country in 1860 and for reasons between themselves and the government of the United States, they have never been able to move back. They have lived in Manitoba ever since, and while this government has no obligation to these Indians, it has been thought good policy to treat with them in such a way as to keep them under reasonable control.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are there reserves for them?

Mr. OLIVER. Reservations have been set apart for them, and they have been given certain consideration, but they are not treated the same as Indians who have been the original inhabitants of the country.

Indians—Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and Northwest Territories—general expenses, $130,036.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before going into a general discussion of that item, I would ask the minister if he has any information to give to the House about the Indian schools, which were a subject of discussion the other evening?

Mr. OLIVER. There are a number of different kinds of schools, nearly as many kinds as there are schools. The difference of situation also makes a great difference. One particular class, however, has attracted the most attention, that is, the industrial schools. These are large and expensive institutions, with buildings erected by this government and in two instances conducted directly by the Indian Department. The other schools are conducted in connection with the missionary enterprises of various religious denominations. These schools were instituted many years ago with a view, to put it shortly, of turning the Indians into white men, and I think I am not going too far when I say that at this date and after the experience that has been had, it is evident that success to that extent has not been attained. Just how far short of that measure of success we can be content and still consider that we have done good work, is something that must always be an open question. I may say that the question of the usefulness of the industrial schools has been brought somewhat strongly to the attention of the department by the fact that some of the religious denominations charged with the joint conduct of these schools find difficulty in carrying them on under the financial arrangements under which they were begun. I have met representatives of several of these denominations, have heard their representations, and have discussed the question with them, but have not yet been able to reach a conclusion which would enable me to make any announcement. I can only say that the department is thoroughly aware of the importance of the question and of the interests involved and of the great difficulties surrounding the question; but an effort will be made to reach an adjustment which, if not satisfactory to every one, will be as satisfactory as possible.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. While I have considerable delicacy in criticising payments to medical men, knowing that there is no class of persons who render better service for their fees, still, there is an item in this connection to which I think the minister's attention should be called. In looking through the Auditor General's Report, I find that Dr. Lafferty, of Calgary, as medical attendant of the St. Joseph Industrial School, received a salary of $300, besides expenses; for the Calgary Industrial School, a salary of $200; for expenses to Ottawa, $200; as medical officer for the Stoney reserve, a salary of $400; as medical officer for the Sarcee agency, a salary of $300; a large amount for livery; as medical officer for the Blackfoot agency, a salary of $600; besides expenses; making a total in all $2,000. I would like an explanation from the minister as to how this gentleman comes to have a monopoly of all these reserves situated at various distances within fifty or sixty miles of Calgary. Surely there must be medical men who live much nearer the reserves, and whose expenses would be much less; or is it that none of these local men are of the right political colour? I have been in Calgary lately, and some people there claim that Dr. Lafferty was in Ottawa on a mission for a senatorship; but I cannot imagine that he would charge to the government his expenses on a mission of that kind. Is it necessary for this gentleman to visit Ottawa in connection with the discharge of his duties as medical officer for these agencies? I think this matter requires an explanation from the Minister of the Interior, especially as this gentleman engages in private practice, or, to use the words of the Postmaster General, is subsidized by the government to the extent of $2,000 to compete with his fellow practitioners in Calgary. An Ontario postmaster was dismissed the other day because it was said that he was subsidized by the government to engage in the grocery business in competition with his fellow grocers; and here we have a medical practitioner subsidized to the extent of $2,000 and engaged in private practice in the city of Calgary. Perhaps the Minister of the Interior has some explanation of this.

Mr. OLIVER. I may say that the idea of the hon. member that there may not be any medical officer available at these reserves is correct. Settlement is sparse in their vicinity, and it is practically necessary, if the Indians are to have such medical treatment as would warrant the government in paying a salary, that the physician should be one residing in Calgary, and therefore likely to possess medical skill of a high order. The Blackfoot reserve is sixty miles east of Calgary. The Stoney reserve is some fifty miles west. The Sarcee is immediately adjoining Calgary and there is an industrial school within the city of Calgary. There is no reason why Dr. Lafferty or any other physician in the city of Calgary should not discharge the duties on all these different reserves.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And carry on private practice besides?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know any reason why he should not, provided the Indian Department has the first call upon his services. If it does not require those services, I see no reason why he should not engage in private practice. I understand that Dr. Lafferty is not able to engage in any lucrative amount of private practice because of his visits to these reserves which take up most of his time. As regards the expenses, Dr. Lafferty came to Ottawa on departmental business connected with medical work.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What was it?

Mr. OLIVER. To discuss hospital arrangements and the treatment of the Indians. Dr. Lafferty is a physician of considerable eminence, a long resident in this country, and his advice and experience are

considered of value by the department. At the same time the Tuberculosis convention was sitting in this city. As is well known tuberculosis is the great cause of death among Indians of the west, and it was thought well that Dr. Lafferty should attend this convention in the hope that some advantage might accrue.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Did he come here in consequence of the direction of the department ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I suppose that is contained in a letter or telegram.

Mr. OLIVER. I am informed that he came with the approval of the department, but on the suggestion of Dr. Bryce, of the Interior Department, who was in Calgary and discussed some of these matters with Dr. Lafferty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is Dr. Bryce an official of the Indian Department ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, of the Indian and the Interior Departments.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was it part of his duties to send this gentleman to Ottawa ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am sure my hon. friend will agree that it is his business to do anything that may be necessary in order to improve the medical standing or work.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why does not the minister own up and say that Dr. Lafferty came down here to lay claim to the senatorship. That would save a good deal of time. I would suggest that it might be advisable to appoint this gentleman medical officer for every Indian reserve in Canada. Perhaps that would simplify proceedings. The Minister of the Interior, says he knows of no reason why Dr. Lafferty should not carry on his private practice. I would refer the minister to the Postmaster General. If that hon. gentleman were in his place, he would give the minister a more effective answer than I can and one to which he would give greater regard. The Postmaster General seemed to think that although a postmaster gave the whole of his time to the duties of his office, he should not be interested in any other business. Now, however, we learn that this rule does not apply to a gentleman who fills the position of medical officer in five different agencies, and yet I understand that there are medical men nearer some of these agencies than this gentleman, although I did not gather that from my hon. friend. My hon. friend said there was no one else, but I understand there are others nearer some of these agencies, so that the minister will have to abandon that ground and consult his deputy again in order to find some better excuse.

Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. OLIVER. There is no medical man near those agencies of anything like the standing or qualification of Dr. Lafferty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is rather a serious reflection on those gentlemen. Is the Minister of the Interior so thoroughly conversant with the different capabilities of these men that he is able to pronounce as to their respective merits ? He is certainly very venturesome. I should think that that would be a little difficult for the hon. gentleman considering the short time he has been in the department. It indicates, however, that he has gone into the business of his department in very great detail since he is able to state that although there are other medical men nearer these reserves, none of them possess the qualification of Dr. Lafferty. My hon. friend is evidently master of the details of his department to a greater extent than any of his predecessors.

Mr. OLIVER. I happen to be personally familiar with the facts in this connection. I am well acquainted with the ground and the circumstances and with the gentleman whose name is in question. I think it must be obvious to everybody that at outlying places, where there is no density of population, it is not possible to have a physician of the same standing as in a city of 12,000 or 15,000 people.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Who are the medical men to whom my hon. friend refers as not being equal to Dr. Lafferty in qualifications ?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know that there is a medical man resident in the vicinity of the Morley reserve.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How then can you speak of his qualifications ?

Mr. OLIVER. I know that if he were of the standing of Dr. Lafferty, he would not be there.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Is there not a medical man at Cochrane between the Stoney and Sarcee reserves? I understand there are two medical men there and with all due difference to Mr. Lafferty's qualifications, I do not think he bears that superior reputation with which the hon. gentleman credits him or at any rate not more so than Dr. Parks, who is at Cochrane. The hon. gentleman is not so well acquainted with the particulars as he would lead us to suppose he is, for if he were he would know that there are medical men in these localities. At Cochrane, there are two, Dr. Parks and Dr. Ritchie. Dr. Parks especially is a very eminent man in his profession, just as eminent, if not more so, than Dr. Lafferty. There is another, Dr. Rose, at Gleichen, right at the Blackfoot reserve. Why has a medical man to come all the way out from Calgary, when you have on the spot a man abundantly qua-

lified to perform the duties of physician on the reserve ? I think the minister has not improved his position by his later explanation. He started with the explanation that Dr. Lafferty came here in connection with departmental work to consult about the hospitals, but when driven from pillar to post, he explained that he was here in connection with the tuberculosis conference, and had come at the suggestion of Dr. Bryce. I think his attempt at explanation of this gentleman's position is not very successful.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The successful lieut. governor gets two terms and the unsuccessful senator has his expenses paid.

Mr. HENDERSON. Are we to understand that in the event of one of the Indians on this reserve being taken ill it is necessary to send sixty miles for a doctor ? Why the Indian might die, long before the doctor reached him.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Or he might get well.

Mr. HENDERSON. Are we to understand that this medical man is the only one who is permitted to attend these Indians and that the Indian patient live or die, is obliged to await this doctor's arrival ? It might be that Dr. Lafferty might be fifty miles off attending some other Indian; then when he returns to Calgary he must undertake a trip of sixty miles to attend his patient. I presume they have no telegraphs or telephones to call the doctor, in which case a messenger has to be sent all the distance to call the doctor and the doctor must drive out. That seems to be an arrangement not very much in the interest of the Indians. If there are doctors living in the neighbourhood of the reserve, even if they are not so politically eminent as Dr. Lafferty, I think it would be well, in the interest of humanity, to give the Indians the privilege of calling them. I am surprised that, with all this heavy cost of providing medical attendance for the Indians, it seems to be managed according to a system that gives very little relief to the Indian population.

Mr. OLIVER. The position is this : The government, assuming the responsibility of doing what can be done to maintain the health of the Indians, does not feel that it would be discharging that responsibility in such a case as that of Calgary except by employing a medical man of recognized standing and ability. Such a man Dr. Lafferty is. He certainly received his appointment when there was no medical man available at Gleichen. It is true that Cochrane is nearer to Morley than Calgary, but it is also true that it is as easy to go from Calgary to Morley as it is to go from Cochrane to Morley, because the communication is by train and the run from Calgary is the nearest point, as it is, of course, in the case of the industrial school at Calgary. Having to employ a Calgary physician for the Sarcee reserve and the industrial school, it is only reasonable that the same physician should have charge of these other reserves until such time as there shall be physicians of standing and reputation at points convenient to the reserve. It is simply absurd to suggest that a medical man resident at a town like Gleichen or even Cochrane has the same standing and reputation as a man with an established practice for many years in a city like Calgary. If these gentlemen have the ability and standing, they certainly show very little business instinct, or they would get into some place where they would have an opportunity to build up a larger practice.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That seems to be rather a reflection on the inhabitants of Gleichen and these other towns. The argument with the minister seems to be that the physician who is presumably fit to attend the white people at Gleichen or one of these other towns is not competent to attend the Indians on the reserve. The people living in these towns employ these physicians and, presumably, are satisfied with the treatment they receive, yet these physicians, although unknown to the Minister of the Interior are branded by him as absolutely unfit to attend the Indians. I presume that the minister would not have gone so far and pronounced this judgment upon them, or instituted this comparison, unless he had made a thorough study of the diplomas that Dr. Lafferty possesses and the diplomas that these other physicians have. Would he be good enough to tell us where Dr. Lafferty graduated and where these other physicians graduated ?

Mr. OLIVER. I have no knowledge where any of these physicians graduated. But I do know that Dr. Lafferty has been a physician of first-class standing in the city of Calgary for the last fifteen years. And I am satisfied, as every man must be satisfied, that a physician has not open to him the same opportunity for a lucrative practice in a small village that he has in a large city. If he has ability he will be found in a city and not in a village. That is evidence that I put before my hon. friend far more conclusive than any evidence concerning diplomas.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would it not be reasonable to help out the struggling young men to eke out a livelihood in the towns that the minister describes, instead of adding this wealth of salaries to the splendid practice which he says Dr. Lafferty has in Calgary ? This seems to be a case of giving to him that hath and withholding from him that hath not.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I do not think the minister has improved his position much by his explanation. He undertakes to judge of the qualifications of gentlemen of whose

being at these places he was not even aware. He says that Dr. Lafferty enjoys a large and lucrative practice in Calgary and has been there for fifteen years, and yet a few minutes ago he said that Dr. Lafferty had all his time taken up attending to the Indians. When I was speaking of the local physicians I should have mentioned Dr. Richardson, of Canmore, besides the two I have mentioned at Cochrane and one at Gleichen. As to the minister's judgment of these gentlemen, how does he know but that, like Dr. Lafferty, they may have some other employment more lucrative than medicine—land speculation for instance, or land cultivation. It is not necessary for a physician to have a large country practice to be well qualified or to be well known. However, perhaps the minister has made the best explanation he could. There is another item to which I would like to call attention. At page J—19 of the Auditor General's Report, I find the items of the expenses of Dr. Spurgeon Campbell and nurses to the Norway House agency, Manitoba. I notice this very large item : Dr. S. Campbell, services, 169 days to April 10, $25 per day. Then his expenses, $15, amounting altogether to $4,240 for the one year. There are two nurses, Miss. Langridge, a nurse, 228 days to June 8, at $4 a day, and Miss. Webster, a nurse, 228 days to June 8, $4 a day, making altogether, with dog trains taking them in and out again, upwards of $7,000 for this trip. Would the minister say whether there was an outbreak there of any infectious disease, such as smallpox, which took them up to the Norway House agency and kept them there over five months and a half ? I think the nurses were there for seven or eight months. I am sure that if the doctor had remained in Winnipeg where he resides he certainly could not have earned $25 a day. This seems a very liberal allowance.

Mr. OLIVER. I am informed that there was an outbreak of diphtheria at Norway House which occurred in the month of January, and in order to cope with that outbreak it was thought necessary to send a doctor and nurses there, which at that time was a very expensive operation of course, involving substantial remuneration, and the charges which are shown in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The minister will see by the item that the doctor must have gone up in the month of November, because he was there 169 days to April 10, which I think would mean that he went there some time in November. The item is found on page J—19. Did this outbreak last all that time ? How many patients were there under the doctor's charge ?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot give the hon. gentleman the information off hand, but I will place it before the House later on if desired.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I think I can explain the item probably a little better than the minister himself. As a matter of fact, the doctor and the nurses went there in the month of November, and there were no dog trains to bring them out, and they had to stop there until spring, and charged for all the time they were there, even though doing nothing, Dr. Campbell at $25 a day, and the nurses at $4 a day. I think that is the true explanation. It was owing to some negligence on the part of the department in not making arrangements for the return trip. As a matter of fact I know that to be the case, because I employed one of the nurses since myself, and she explained it to me.

Mr. OLIVER. I will be glad to bring down a full report in regard to this matter, if desired. It occurred last year, and I have no knowledge of the circumstances.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. There is another item I would like to have explained, I notice on page J—45 of the Auditor General's Report an item that might be made a little clearer.

Salaries to June 30, 1905 : Agent, A. J. McNeill, 12 months, $1,100 ; stock man, A. Marshall, 11 months, $550 ; interpreter, G. Hodgson, 12 months, $480 ; scout, Otter, 12 months, $120.

Well, these are quite well understood. But I am not so clear about the meaning of the following items : Herders at $15 a month, Bull Collar, $45. I do not know whether it is so much a month or not by the way it is printed here. I imagine these are the names of the herders. First there is Bull Collar, $45. Is that the name of one of the herders, or is it $45 for a bull collar ? If so, I think the collar must have been silver mounted. The next item is 'Dodging a Horse, $45.' We have to pay that high price for this piece of agility. The next is 'John One Spot, $165.' If we have to pay $165 for one spot, I suppose we would have to pay double that sum for two spots. The next is 'Jim Starlight, $15.' No doubt his work was done after sundown. The next is ' Sarcee Woman, $75.' I do not like to press the Minister of the Interior too closely to tell us what she was doing, because I do not know whether this is a woman or not. But if she is a woman, what was she doing ? Is this one of the herders ? Evidently they believe in woman's rights up there. The next item is 'Wolf, $45.' The next 'Assistant Issuer, Tom Godin, twelve months, $60.' Am I right in interpreting these names as the names of herders ?—because if so, they are as unique as the names of some of the hon. gentleman's constituents.

Mr. OLIVER. These are the names of herders.

Some resolutions reported.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Report of the Minister of Public Works for the year 1905.—Hon. Mr. Paterson.

ADJOURNMENT—RAILWAY CONTRACTS.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to ask whether the two contracts mentioned a few days ago for two sections of the National Transcontinental Railway have been awarded ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. They have not been awarded.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, April 2, 1906.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 73) respecting the Boundary, Kamloops and Cariboo Central Railway Company.—Mr. Duncan Ross.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Alexander C. Ross, Esquire, member elect for the electoral division of Cape Breton North and Victoria, introduced by Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. A. Johnston.

HARBOUR OF NORTH SYDNEY.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 74) respecting the Harbour of North Sydney, in Nova Scotia. He said : Some years ago the harbour commission of Nova Scotia obtained power to borrow the sum of $4,000. This power was acted upon by the corporation to the effect of borrowing perhaps the full amount of $4,000. Since that time they have paid back most if not all of the money which they borrowed. Last year they asked for power to borrow the same sum of $4,000 less the balance remaining due. The matter was referred to the Department of Justice, and it was considered that their borrowing power was exhausted. So it becomes necessary to have an Act passed empowering them to borrow the sum of $6,000.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

BROCKVILLE CHEESE CURING ROOM.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I wish, in justice to my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor), to refer to a matter which he brought up in the House on March 27. On that day he brought before the House an answer which had been given by me on the day before regarding the Brockville curing room, and he pointed out that there was an inaccuracy in my reply. I had the matter looked up, and I wish now to inform the House and my hon. friend that the clerk in the accountant's office, to whom was entrusted the making up of this expenditure did make an error in his computation. Here is the explanation which has been furnished me by my deputy:

I find that the clerk in the accountant's office who was entrusted with making up this expenditure, made an error in his computation. The figures which were furnished you as the expenditure were $18,661.34. They should have been $20,831.50.

These figures are made up from the Auditor General's Report for the year 1901-2, 1902-3, 1903-4, 1904-5, and for the current fiscal year up to the 1st March instant from the ledger of the department. The details are as follows :

Expenditure.

1901-2—building, plant, installation, &c. (D—67-68)..	$ 7,553 26
1902-3—maintenance, $3,806.04 (D—101-102) ; hauling, $1,011.60 (D—100) ..	4,817 64
1903-4—maintenance, $2,265.95 (D—85) ; hauling, $1,076.30 (D—84)..	3,342 25
1904-5—maintenance, $2,958.61 (D—67) ; hauling, $660 (D—66)..	3,618 61
1905-6, March 1, 1906—maintenance, $1,333.24 ; hauling, $166.50..	1,499 74
	$20,831 50

Mr. Taylor, according to 'Hansard' (page 710) undertook to give the expenditure from the Auditor General's Reports for the fiscal years ending respectively 1st July, 1903, 1904, 1905. For the first two years the accountant is unable to say what items Mr. Taylor included in his addition, as he does not and the totals of any of the several items in the reports for those two years tally with Mr. Taylor's totals.

For the last fiscal year, however, it appears that to make up the total given by Mr. Taylor viz.: $5,929, he took the expenditure shown at (D—67) under the heading 'cheese curing room, Brockville, $2,958.61,' the item 'Brockville cheese haulers, $660,' page (D—66), and also the item 'Brockville curing room, cheese purchased and cured,' under the heading 'cheese account,' at page (D—66), $1,732.72, and, lastly, the item 'services of N. G. Somerville, Brockville, to 30th April, 1905,' under the heading 'cheese curing rooms, general,' at page (D—67), $578.38. These two latter items should not be included in making up the total expenditure in connection with the Brockville cheese curing room. It has happened that cheese have been purchased at some of the cool curing rooms and resold, but the transactions did not affect the expenditure, were not connected therewith, and had no connection with the operation of the cool curing room. These transactions have generally resulted in a gain, but the losses, whenever they have occurred, have not been charged against the curing rooms, nor has any gain derived from such transactions been treated as revenue. The matter of such transactions has been considered quite separately and distinct from the operation of the curing room. The item of Mr. Somerville's salary, $578.38, should

not be charged against the curing room, as during the time when this salary was earned, he was not working in connection with the curing room, but was doing the work of the department generally.

I make this explanation in justice to my hon. friend and the department.

WINTER NAVIGATION, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. ALEX. MARTIN (Queen's). Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to call the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to a reply which he gave to a question regarding the winter communication between the province of Prince Edward Island and the mainland. That reply appears not to have satisfied the people of that province. They appear to consider it as rather equivocal. The reply given was as follows:

A steamer is being built which will, in conjunction with another steamer, assist in winter navigation.

There is a rumour afloat that the intention is to put on this service the steamer 'Montcalm', and the people of our province have some doubts as to the ability of that steamer to be of any great assistance in maintaining communication. To show the minister that I have some proof of what I say, I would ask the House to be patient while I quote from one of the leading papers in my province:

A disquieting report comes from Ottawa that no new steamer for the Prince Edward Island winter service has yet been contracted for and that the reply given in parliament to Mr. Hughes, M.P., in relation thereto, was misleading. The report referred to intimates that a new ice-breaking steamer is being constructed for the lower St. Lawrence, and the steamship 'Montcalm,' which has proved rather disappointing there, will next winter be assigned to help out the winter service across the Straits of Northumberland.

Another rumour has it that after the late lamented Minister of Marine (Mr. Préfontaine)—whose death we all regret—started for England, a cablegram was sent after him with the advice not to enter into an agreement with anybody for the construction of a boat. Perhaps the minister will give the date on which the contract for the building of the boat was let and also state whether this boat is to be finished by July 1. Would he also be kind enough to state whether this new boat is to be put on the route between Prince Edward Island and the mainland or whether the 'Montcalm' is going to be put on that service?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I cannot undertake at present to give any definite answer. I shall have to look up the record in order to see how the matter stands and I shall give my hon. friend an answer to-morrow.

Mr. FISHER.

STEAMER 'SEAGULL.'

Mr. BENNETT. May I ask the hon. minister if the department have purchased the steamer 'Seagull' from the Parry Sound Lumber Company?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think so. If that is the boat we had last year, it has not been purchased.

VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). I would like to call attention to an inacuracy in the Journal of the House on Friday last. The Journal has this entry:

The House resumed consideration of the proposed motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, That Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair, and the motion of Mr. Roche (Marquette) in amendment thereto.

And the debate continuing—the said amendment was, with leave of the House, withdrawn.

And the question being put on the main motion, it was agreed to.

That is not an accurate record of what took place. The amendment of the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. Roche) was not withdrawn. But what happened was this. The government whip came to me and asked if I had any objection to the debate being adjourned. I said that I had not, and it was adjourned accordingly upon the motion of the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway). I did not observe for a few moments, as I was otherwise engaged, to what business the House then proceeded, but I observed presently that it was in Committee of Supply. That was brought to my attention as being irregular, as undoubtedly it was, because the main motion having been put that the House go into Committee of Supply and to that motion an amendment having been moved and the debate on that amendment having been adjourned, it was perfectly obvious that the main motion could not be put again, and the House could not go on with supply as if the motion had been put and carried. I had a conversation with the clerk of the House and he suggested that the amendment should be technically withdrawn. To this I objected, but I told him that there was no objection to ignoring the proceeding then being had in committee, upon the understanding that the items discussed and passed, should, as soon as the House resumed supply regularly, be passed without further discussion.

I thought that the clerk of the House understood me, and I told him that I would mention the matter to the Prime Minister, to whom it had also been mentioned by the clerk. I stated it in that way to the Prime Minister and he assented to it. I came back and gave the message to the clerk, and supposed it would be arranged in that way. The clerk of the House informed me—and I am quite satisfied as to that—that he under-

stood me to have assented to his original suggestion. I did not intend to, and never did, assent to his original suggestion in any way. I think, therefore, that the journals should be amended so as to leave the matter as it was when the debate upon the motion was adjourned. I repeat my assurance, which I have already given privately to the Prime Minister, that any items which were passed on Friday evening in that informal and irregular way, shall be passed without further discussion when the House once more resumed consideration of Supply.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). My hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) is quite correct, when I read the Votes and Proceedings I was surprised to see that the motion of my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) had been withdrawn, because as I understood it the leader of the opposition had agreed to just what he has now stated. If the clerk will correct the proces verbal, we will resume the discussion of my hon. friend's motion at the stage at which it was left.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I ask the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), through one of his colleagues, as I see the hon. gentleman is not in his place at the moment, to lay upon the table of the House, some time to-day, any documents from his department which were referred to in his speech on Friday upon the motion of my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche). If there are any which are not available in the Statutes, I think that it is only right that we should have access to them before the debate is resumed.

In that connection I would also point out to the Prime Minister that some thirty motions for returns were adopted on March 14th last, nearly three weeks ago. My hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) informs me that two of these returns have been brought down. Especially in the case of papers concerning which notice was given to the department from ten days to three weeks in advance of the session, I think we might reasonably expect the returns to come down very soon.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Returns from the Department of the Interior ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Some from the Department of the Interior and some from other departments. I trust that especially those of which notice was given, as I have said, will be expedited.

TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—CONTRACTS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I ask whether the contracts mentioned on Friday have been awarded ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The government have not yet received the report of the commissioners with regard to these contracts. I understand, however, that the papers will be laid before the Railway Department to-morrow.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 57) respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.—Mr. Belcourt.

Bill (No. 59) to incorporate the Women's Art Association of Canada.—Mr. Grant.

Bill (No. 60) to incorporate the Inter-Ocean Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. Bole.

Bill (No. 63) to incorporate the National Fire Insurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Zimmerman.

Bill (No. 64) respecting the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Gauvreau.

Bill (No. 65) respecting the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company.—Mr. Bureau.

QUESTIONS.

ACCIDENTS ON ST. LAWRENCE ROUTE.

Mr. BERGERON asked :

1. How many accidents have happened on the St. Lawrence route below Montreal since 1890 ?
2. How many between Montreal and Quebec, and how many below Quebec ?
3. What is the number of sea-going vessels wrecked, what are their names, and the date of the accident ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I am sorry to say, I have not the information for my hon. friend. I expect to have it on Wednesday.

Mr. BERGERON. If my hon. friend (Mr. Brodeur) will say that they are working on it, I will let it stand.

Mr. BRODEUR. Oh, yes.

EXPERIMENTAL FARM STATIONS.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked :

1. How many experimental stations are maintained by the government in Canada ?
2. In what provinces are those situated ?
3. What is the annual expense of maintaining each of those stations for the last five years ?
4. Does the government intend to act on certain representations made for the establishment of a station in Prince Edward Island ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) :

1. Five experimental stations, or farms, as they are generally called.

2. Nova Scotia, Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and British Columbia.

3. 1900-1.

Central Experimental Farm, Ontario		$35,102 69
Nappan Experimental Farm, Nova Scotia		12,076 41
Brandon Experimental Farm, Manitoba		10,493 75
Indian Head Experimental Farm, Saskatchewan		9,630 17
Agassiz Experimental Farm, British Columbia		8,799 02
Seed grain distribution		3,897 96
		$80,000 00

1901-2.

*Central Experimental Farm		$ 48,607 87
*Nappan Experimental Farm		14,536 43
Brandon Experimental Farm		12,324 49
Indian Head Experimental Farm		10,508 76
*Agassiz Experimental Farm		10,799 03
Seed grain distribution		5,223 42
		$102,000 00

*Including importation of pure bred stock.

1902-3.

Central Experimental Farm		$40,022 36
Nappan Experimental Farm		11,499 95
Brandon Experimental Farm		11,581 67
Indian Head Experimental Farm		10,568 57
Agassiz Experimental Farm		10,455 63
Seed grain dstribution		5,871 82
		$90,000 00

1903-4.

Central Experimental Farm		$37,219 33
Nappan Experimental Farm		12,085 32
Brandon Experimental Farm		11,919 08
Indian Head Experimental Farm		9,675 28
Agassiz Experimental Farm		7,534 11
Seed grain distribution		6,610 19
General expenditure:		
The sum placed under this heading is spent for general purposes, and was in former years divided between the central and branch farms, and is made up as follows:		
Entomological and Botanical division, including salaries of officers	$4,098 81	
Chemical division, including salaries of officers	4,720 20	
Salaries of directors, director's secretary, accountant and assistant accountant	6,137 51	$14,956 54
		$99,999 85

1904-5.

Central Experimental Farm		$39,760 63
Nappan Experimental Farm		9,801 21
Brandon Experimental Farm		10,492 52
Indian Head Experimental Farm		8,131 79
Agassiz Experimental Farm		8,283 64
Seed grain distribution		7,962 35
General expenditure:		
Entomological and Botanical division	$4,265 38	
Chemical division	4,952 48	
Salaries of director et al	6,350 00	$15,567 86
		$100,00 00

4. The matter is under consideration.

GRAIN INSPECTION ACT.

Mr. LAKE asked:

1. Has the government received any communications, resolutions or memorials from parties or associations in the provinces of Manitoba or Saskatchewan during the last twelve months, asking for changes in the Grain Inspection Act, in respect to the definition of the various grades of Manitoba grain?
2. From whom were these received?
3. Is it the intention of the government to introduce at the present session of parliament any amendments to the Grain Inspection Act in respect to grades?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (for the Minister of Trade and Commerce):

1 and 2. In so far as the Department of Trade and Commerce, to which such communications and resolutions would naturally come, is concerned, no such communications or resolutions or memorials have been received within the time specified.

The department has, however, noticed various communications in the public press of Manitoba on the subject, and some viva voce discussion has taken place between members of the staff in connection with the subject.

3. The matter is under consideration.

EMPLOYEES ON THE INTERCOLONIAL.

Mr. BARKER asked:

How many employees were employed on the Intercolonial Railway in the months of July, August, September, October, November and December, respectively, in each of the years 1903, 1904 and 1905, as charged to the following accounts: (a) to locomotive power; (b) to car expenses; (c) to maintenance of ways and works; (d) to station expenses; (e) to general charges; (f) to works on capital account?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1—(*a*) LOCOMOTIVE POWER.

Mileage	1314	1321	1446
——	1903, No. of Men.	1904, No. of Men.	1905, No. of Men.
July	1635	1823	2130
August	1616	1833	2071
September	1632	1865	2072
October	1639	1982	1994
November	1667	2040	1999
December	1664	2051	2102

(*b*) CAR EXPENSES.

July	1729	1850	2216
August	1734	1869	2298
September	1710	1896	2276
October	1721	2042	2263
November	1735	2092	2238
December	1713	2086	2223

(*c*) MAINTENANCE OF WAYS AND WORKS.

July	1691	1561	1913
August	2067	2017	2379
September	2397	1857	1778
October	2036	1588	1427
November	1008	1107	1233
December	999	1085	1194

(*d*) STATION EXPENSES.

July	1267	1356	1425
August	1268	1343	1422
September	1299	1358	1429
October	1305	1374	1417
November	1320	1386	1423
December	1319	1368	1459

(*e*) GENERAL CHARGES.

July	434	485	536
August	494	478	549
September	503	473	546
October	463	486	514
November	449	487	527
December	447	473	518

(*f*) WORKS ON CAPITAL ACCOUNT.

July	366	249	544
August	132	230	625
September	138	377	658
October	219	665	604
November	312	540	666
December	206	52	359

GERMAN DUTIES ON GREEN DRIED APPLES.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked :

1. What are rates of discriminatory duties imposed by the German government on green and dried apples ?

2. If any change has been made, what is the date on which the German Government announced said change ?

Hon. WILLIAM PATTERSON (for the Minister of Trade and Commerce) :

1 and 2. Inasmuch as neither the German tariff in force up to the first instant nor the proposed new tariff gives any further intimation as to the discriminatory duty other than that given in the answer to the question on the 19th instant, the government has no official knowledge with reference to the duties imposed by the German government on green and dried apples further than was stated in the answer to the previous question. The rates of duty quoted were those of the tariff in force up to the first day of March instant and the only official figures so far received on the subject.

In 1903 the German government issued a proposed new tariff, but it was distinctly stated that 'the date upon which the new tariff is to enter into force will be fixed by imperial ordinance subject to the approbation of the Bundesrath; until otherwise ordered, therefore the latter duty, July 15, 1879, together with subsequent amendments thereof as published in the first edition and respective supplements continue to be in operation,' which is supposed to have been the first day of the present month, as the 'Trade Journal' of the 22nd February ultimo states that it would be put in force on that date.

The proposed tariff in question was under discussion for months after its issue and many changes were made therein. The government receives through the International Tariff Bureau at Brussels a number of copies of all tariffs as issued; but no recent one concerning Germany has as yet come to hand; and until the text of the present tariff is received no other answer can be given.

NEW BRUNSWICK PETROLEUM COMPANY.

Mr. BARKER asked :

1. Is any member of parliament, to the knowledge of the Minister of Railways, a stockholder, president or other officer or director of, or in any way interested in, the the property of the New Brunswick Petroleum Company, or has he been so at any time since 1st July, 1902. If so, when, for what period and in what manner ?

2. Who are such members, if any ?

3. What offices and interests did such member or members hold in said company or its property ?

4. What are the names, addresses and positions of the several officers of said company ?

5. What are the names and addresses of the shareholders of the said company ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. Yes.
2. H. R. Emmerson.
3. Was formerly a director and president of the company, and is now a stockholder in it.
4. F. W. Summers, of Moncton, president and managing director; Hon. A. D. Richard, vice-president; Matthew Lodge, of Moncton, secretary. The department has no knowledge as to the other officers of the company, and I may add that neither has the minister.
5. The department has no information nor has the minister, nor has he or they any means of information.

MR. J. H. LAMONT, PRINCE ALBERT.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT asked:

1. Referring to the Auditor General's Report for 1905, volume II., page (M—4), there is an item for Crown prosecutor, J. H. Lamont, Prince Albert, salary $902.65. Is this the same Mr. Lamont who sat as a member of this House during the session of 1905?
2. Referring to item on above page, A. Turgeon, Crown prosecutor, salary $1,306, is the said Mr. Turgeon, the business partner of Mr. Lamont, and member of this House during 1905?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Solicitor General):

1. Mr. Lamont resigned the Crown Prosecutorship on 8th October, 1904, on the ground that he was a candidate for parliament at the general election of November, 1904. The Auditor General's Report for 1905 is for the fiscal year ending 30th June, 1905, so that the amount paid Mr. Lamont was for fees paid him from July, 1904, until he resigned in October, 1904. The Crown prosecutors were paid by fees not by salary.
2. We have no information.

TELEPHONE COMMITTEE.

Mr. MACDONELL—by Mr. Lancaster—asked:

1. Does the report of the select committee appointed last session to inquire into and report upon telephone systems, contain any conclusions, or make any recommendations upon the subjects referred to them?
2. If not, is it the intention of the government to appoint a select committee this session for the same or like objects and purposes, which shall come to conclusions and make recommendations to the House upon the subject?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The report is before the House and speaks for itself. It is not the intention of the government to appoint another select committee for the same or a like object and purpose.

PAYMENTS TO WOODS LIMITED.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

What amount of money has been paid to Woods, Limited, for supplies for the different departments of the government up to 31st December, 1905, and what parts of the several amounts have been paid on contracts after public tender had been called for?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (for Minister of Public Works). Total payments by the Department of Public Works up to December 31, 1905, was $11,036.33.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. By the Department of Railways and Canals, $426.90; by the Transcontinental Railway Commission, $16,125.29. The purchases represented by these amounts were made from time to time to meet immediate requirements without tenders.

Mr. FOSTER. I have not had an answer to that question yet. It would be a great deal more convenient if some one were instructed to put these answers all in one. It is quite a task to go through all the departments and know that you have the information supplied from all of them. As it is now, you see we have only answers from three of the departments and by no means the most important one.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Is there another department?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. The question is: 'What amount of money has been paid to Woods, Limited?' There ought to be a compilation of this information.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes; let it stand.

Mr. BRODEUR. As far as the Marine and Fisheries Department is concerned I suppose there are no supplies because no answer has been given to me by the officers of the department.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think that would follow.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Stands.

Question allowed to stand.

SUPPLIES FOR STEAMER 'ARCTIC.'

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. What amount of money was expended by the Dominion government in supplies for the steamer 'Arctic'?
2. Of this, how much was purchased and paid for under contract after public tender?
3. What amount was expended upon repairs to same steamer, and what proportion thereof was paid out on contract?

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

1. $118,582.60.
2. None.
3. $29,839.75. No contract; partly in Sorel shipyard and partly in Quebec.

SUPPLIES FOR DOMINION STEAMERS.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

What amount was paid out during the last fiscal year for supplies for Dominion steamers and of this what was paid on contracts awarded on public tender ?

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

Steamers.	Supplies.	Fuel.	Provisions.	Total.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Druid.....	3,238 56	8,774 62	3,285 60	15,298 78
Lansdowne	6,989 54	6,900 41	7,591 76	21,481 71
L. Laurier.	10,725 59	7,904 58	12,567 21	31,197 38
Aberdeen..	4,335 72	11,116 89	7,215 34	22,667 95
Minto.....	5,867 63	13,407 64	14,953 49	34,228 76
Stanley....	4,333 88	6,923 41	12,696 59	23,953 88
Quadra....	6,799 59	5,104 00	7,294 45	19,198 04
Champlain.	1,893 63	4,211 60	3,520 68	9,625 91
Montcalm..	4,134 77	20,015 69	4,453 48	22,603 94
Eureka....	55 17	.....	19 00	74 17
	48,374 08	84,358 84	73,597 60	206,330 52

PAYMENTS TO B. J. COUGHLIN.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. What amount of money was paid to B. J. Coughlin for supplies from 1st July, 1904, to 31st December, 1905 ?
2. How much of this was paid on contracts based upon public tenders ?

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

1. $6,628.24.
2. No tenders or contracts.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. There was paid to Mr. B. J. Coughlin for supplies from July 1st, 1904, to December 31st, 1905, $13,715.70.
2. The sum of $13,594.94, was paid out of above mentioned amount on contracts based on public tenders.

WINDMILL LIGHTHOUSE, PRESCOTT.

Mr. TAYLOR—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. What was the cost for installing the acetylene gas system in Windmill lighthouse, east of the town of Prescott ?
2. What was the cost of maintenance for the year 1905 ?

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

1. $2,096.25 (double storeholders).
2. $110.10.

DICKENSON'S LANDING LIGHTHOUSE.

Mr. TAYLOR—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. What was the cost for installing the acetylene gas system in Dickenson's Landing lighthouse ?
2. What was the cost of maintenance for the year 1905 ?

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

1. Not installed.
2. $125.

ACETYLENE GAS BUOYS.

Mr. TAYLOR—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. How many acetylene gas buoys are placed between Lachine and Kingston ?
2. What was the cost of installing same ?
3. What was the cost of maintenance for the year 1905, including the cost of maintaining and running steamers necessary to look after the said buoys ?

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

1. 36.
2. Cost of compression installation for charging acetylene gas buoys including cost of changing gas lanterns to burn acetylene $2,945.
3. $31,246.57 includes cost of placing and maintaining gas buoys, spar buoys, and cost of maintenance of lighthouses, exclusive of keeper's salaries and cost of caretakers.

WILLIAMSBURG CANAL.

Mr. J. D. REID—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. What was the total expenditure on Williamsburg canals under heading of staff, for the year ending 30th June, 1905 ?
2. What was the total expenditure on the Williamsburg canals under heading of repairs, for the year ending 30th June, 1905 ; also for the year ending 30th June, 1906?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. $20,683.54.
2. $21,492.46 for the year ending June 30, 1905. There must be some mistake as the fiscal year called for does not end until June 30, 1906.

PORT BURWELL HARBOUR.

Mr. MACDONELL—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. Were tenders called for the harbour improvement works at Port Burwell ?
2. If so, when, and in what newspapers ?
3. Has the work been let ? If so, to whom, and at what price ?
4. Were there any other tenders received ? If so, from whom, and what were their amounts, respectively ?
5. Has the work been commenced ? If so, is it being proceeded with ? If not, why not ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (for Minister of Public Works) :

1. Yes.
2. October 3rd, 1905. In following papers : Aylmer 'Sun', Dutton 'Advance', St. Thomas 'Journal', Tilsonburg 'Liberal', Wiarton 'Echo', Amherstburg 'Echo', Blenheim 'News', Galt 'Reformer', Inger-

soll 'Chronicle', Little Current 'Manitoulin Expositor', Hensall 'Observer', Belleville 'Ontario', Brockville 'Ontario', Chatham 'News', Cornwall 'Freeholder', Guelph 'Mercury', Hamilton 'Times', Hamilton 'Herald', Kingston 'Freeman', Kingston 'Whig', London 'Advertiser', London 'Echo', Ottawa 'Free Press', Ottawa 'Le Temps', Ottawa 'Danebrog', Peterborough 'Examiner', Peterborough 'Times', Stratford 'Beacon', Toronto 'Globe', Toronto 'Star', Toronto 'Hardware', Toronto 'North Ender', Windsor 'Record', Woodstock 'Sentinel-Review', Sarnia 'Observer', Sarnia 'Post', Milton 'Reformer', Simcoe 'Reformer', Mitchell 'Recorder', Niagara Falls 'Review', St. Mary's 'Argus', Listowel 'Banner', Essex 'Free Press', St. Catharines 'Journal', Comber 'Herald' Walkerton 'Telescope', Gore Bay 'Manitoulin Reformer', Dundas 'Wentworth Light'.

3. Yes, to the Pacific Construction Company, for the sum of $72,500.

4. Yes, from M. J. Haney and Roger Miller, $75,658; D. Conroy, $77,000; Randolph Macdonald, $79,000.

5. No, but it is understood that contractors are preparing to begin operations.

RONDEAU HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS.

Mr. MACDONELL—by Mr. Lancaster—asked:

1. Were tenders called for the harbour improvement works at Rondeau?
2. If so, when, and in what newspapers?
3. Has the work been let? If so, to whom, and at what price?
4. Were there any other tenders received? If so, from whom, and what were their amounts, respectively?
5. Has the work been commenced? If so, is it being proceeded with? If not, why not?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (for the Minister of Public Works):

1. Yes.

2. April 27, 1905. In following papers:—Blenheim 'News', Chatham 'News', Dresden 'Standard,' Ridgetown 'Plaindeader,' Wallaceburg 'Herald,' Woodstock 'Sentinel-Review,' Toronto 'Globe,' Toronto 'Star,' Toronto 'Catholic Register,' Toronto 'Truth,' London 'Echo,' London 'Advertiser,' Guelph 'Mercury,' Brantford 'Expositor,' Stratford 'Beacon,' Windsor 'Record,' Hamilton 'Times,' Hamilton 'Herald,' St. Thomas 'Journal,' Peterborough 'Examiner,' Peterborough 'Times,' Ottawa 'Free Press,' Ottawa 'Le Temps,' Ottawa 'Danebrog,' Ottawa 'Dominion Presbyterian,' Belleville 'Ontario,' 'Brockville 'Recorder,' Cornwall 'Freeholder,' Kingston 'Freeman,' Kingston 'Whig,' Amherstburg 'Echo,' Galt 'Reformer,' Ingersoll 'Chronicle,' Little Current 'Manitoulin Expositor,' Port Hope 'Guide,' Sault Ste. Marie 'Express,' Wiarton 'Echo,' Milton 'Reformer,' Acton 'Free Press.'

3. Yes, to the Pacific Construction Company, for the sum of $110,000.

4. Yes. From M. J. Haney and Roger Miller, $115,828; from Quinlan and Robertson, $115,911; from Joseph Battle, $158,464.

5. No, but it is understood contractors are preparing to begin operations.

PORT STANLEY HARBOUR.

Mr. MACDONELL—by Mr. Lancaster—asked:

1. Were tenders called for the harbour improvement works at Port Stanley
2. If so, when, and in what newspaper?
3. Has the work been let? If so, to whom, and at what price?
4. Were there any other tenders received? If so, from whom, and what were their amounts respectively?
5. Has the work been commenced? If so, is it being proceeded with? If not, why not?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (for the Minister of Public Works):

1. Yes.

2. May 5, 1905. In the following papers:—Aylmer 'Sun,' Dutton 'Advance,' St. Thomas 'Journal,' Galt 'Reformer,' St. Mary's 'Argus,' Ingersoll 'Chronicle,' Amherstburg 'Echo,' Sarnia 'Observer,' Sarnia 'Post,' Wiarton 'Echo,' Milton 'Reformer,' Belleville 'Ontario,' Brantford 'Expositor,' Brockville 'Recorder,' Chatham 'News,' Cornwall 'Freeholder,' Guelph 'Mercury,' Hamilton 'Times,' Kingston 'Freeman,' Kingston 'Whig,' London 'Advertiser,' London 'Echo,' Ottawa 'Free Press,' Ottawa 'Le Temps,' Peterborough 'Examiner,' Peterborough 'Times,' Stratford 'Beacon,' Toronto 'Globe,' Toronto 'Star,' Windsor 'Record,' Woodstock 'Sentinel-Review' Strathroy 'Age,' Ottawa 'Danebrog,' Cayuga 'Haldiman-Advocate,' Mitchell 'Recorder,' Walkerton 'Telescope,' Listowel 'Banner.,

3. Yes, to M. J. Haney and Roger Miller, for the sum of $105,828.

4. Yes, from the Pacific Construction Company, $111,000; Quinlan and Robertson, $115,000.

5. No, but it is understood contractors are preparing to begin operations.

COST OF OFFICIAL CARS.

Mr. WILMOT asked:

1. How many private cars are owned by the government, and what are the names of same?
2. What was the total cost of said cars?
3. What mileage did these cars travel during the year ending 30th June, 1905?
4. What was the cost of operating private cars during the year ending 30th June, 1905?
5. Was anything paid for haulage of private cars during the year ending June 30, 1905?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. Nine official cars are owned by the government, viz:—'Victoria,' car for the Governor General. 'Alexandria,' car for the Governor General purchased but never put

in commission. 'Acadia,' car for board of Railway Commissioners. 109, car for Minister of Railways and Canals. 'Ottawa,' 28. 75, car for General Manager Intercolonial (burnt in recent fire). 37, car for General Traffic Manager, Intercolonial. 34, Intercolonial Railway. 35, car for Paymaster Intercolonial Railway.

2. 'Victoria,' $11,938; year, 1889. 'Alexandria,' $18,000, built after public tender by Rhodes & Curry, Amherst. Acadia, $21,-266.35; year, 1904. 109, $18,850; year, 1901. Ottawa, $11,265; year, 1889. 28 $4,500; year, 1898. 75, $15,000; year; 1904. 37, have not information as to cost; year, 1876. 34, $5,977; year, 1880. 35, remodelled from first-class car; about year 1884.

3. Unable to give this information as no record is kept in department at Ottawa of mileage of the official cars.

4. 'Victoria,' operating expenses paid by Governor General. 'Acadia,' operating expenses, $1,610. 109, operating expenses, $1,222.36. 'Ottawa,' operating expenses, $1,-156.17. 28, operating expenses, $1,208.70. 75, operating expenses, $701.45. 37, operating expenses, $1,228. 34, operating expenses, $1,053.70. 35, operating expenses, $1,628.27.

5. No, there was not paid anything for haulage of official cars.

RE-INSURANCE RESERVE FUND.

Mr. HENDERSON asked:

1. What was the amount of re-insurance reserve fund required by the government to be held by the Canada Life Assurance Company according to the government standard, at the date of the latest valuation of the company's assets, and at what date was such latest valuation made by the proper officer of the government?

2. What is the same information, respectively, as to the Sun Life Assurance Company of Canada, the Manufacturers' Life Insurance Company, the Imperial Life Assurance Company of Canada, and the Confederation Life Association?

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

Canada Life (valuation as at December 31, 1904)	$23,852,411
Sun Life (valuation as at December 31, 1904)	10,608,719
Manufacturers Life (vaulation as at December 31, 1903)	4,452,857
Imperial Life (valuation as at December 31, 1901)	760,415
Confederation Life (valuation as at December 31, 1905)	9,803,086

EMPLOYMENT OF DANIEL WILEY.

Mr. ELSON asked:

1. Is Daniel Wiley in the employ of the government in any capacity?

2. If so, in what capacity, and at what salary?

3. What was the date of his appointment?

4. What are his duties?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs):

1. Yes.

2. As a clerk in the Customs at London, Ont., with a salary of $750 a year.

3. He was employed as an acting Customs officer on the 19th March, 1900, and appointed a clerk on 9th April, 1901.

4. His duties are to perform such clerical work in the Customs service as may be assigned to him from time to time by the collector or acting collector of Customs at the Port of London.

PURCHASE OF CARBIDE.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. What amount of money has been paid up to December 31, 1905, to the Ottawa Carbide Company, at what rate per ton for carbide, and how much on contract based on public tender?

2. What amount of money has been spent up to December 31, 1905, at Prescott, in connection with the depot at that point, and as aids to navigation?

3. What part of this expenditure has been made under contract based upon public tender?

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

1. $27,971.22 (including freight); $65 per ton freight added. For 1905 tenders were asked from the three Canadian Carbide Companies and the lowest tender that of the Ottawa Carbide Company accepted. Amount of carbide purchased in 1905-1906, $17,-485.97. I would ask that the second and third parts of the question stand as I have not the information.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the minister sure that his first answer includes all that has been paid, or is the amount simply what has been paid by his department? The question is, how much has been paid by the whole government?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am simply speaking for the Department of Marine and Fisheries, I do not know whether anything has been paid by some other department.

Mr. FOSTER. There should be some one who does know. Perhaps the Secretary of State has the information.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know that there is any other department.

Mr. FOSTER. Has not the Railways and Canals Department?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, there is none in the Railways and Canals Department.

THE STEAMER 'KESTREL.'

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. What is the tonnage of the steamer 'Kestrel'? Number of officers and crew?

2. What work does she ordinarily perform?

3. Was she engaged in any special work or mission last year?

4. What amount was expended on her maintenance from July 1, 1904, to December 31, 1905?
5. What amount of this was for provisions and were they purchased on contract?

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

1. 311 tons, gross. 5 officers and 17 crew.
2. Fisheries protection work on the Pacific Coast.
3. For answer to this question, I beg to refer the hon. member to the Fisheries Report, 1905, page 326. It is too long to include in the answer.
4. $48,709.42.
5. $13,173.96. No contract.

PURCHASE OF OIL.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

What amount has been paid up to December 31, 1905, to the Canadian Economic Lubricant Company, and what proportion of this has been paid per contract based upon public tender?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). $32,418.11. Under contract in accordance with tenders invited for illuminating and lubricating oil.

EMPLOYMENT OF W. H. NOBLE, B. H. FRASER AND J. F. FRASER.

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. What position is held by W. H. Noble, B. H. Fraser and J. F. Fraser, respectively?
2. What is the duty of each, what is the salary, and what are the travelling expenses for the last fiscal year?
3. How much money has been expended by each during the last fiscal year?

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

1. W. H. Noble is assistant commissioner of lights. B. H. Fraser is assistant chief engineer. J. F. Fraser is commissioner of lights.

W. H. Noble represents commissioner of lights on Lighthouse Board of Canada and acts for him generally whenever that officer may be absent from headquarters. B. H. Fraser represents chief engineer on the Lighthouse Board of Canada and acts for him generally whenever that officer is absent from headquarters. J. F. Fraser's duties are: 1st, To inspect, report and make recommendations concerning existing aids to navigation; 2nd, To have charge of and be responsible for the installation of all illuminating apparatus required for the lighthouse service; 3rd, To be responsible for the proper maintenance of all lighting apparatus buoys and beacons. Salaries: W. H. Noble, $1,700 per annum; B. H. Fraser, $2,500 per annum; J. F. Fraser, $2,500 per annum. Travelling expenses: W. H. Noble, $1,569.41 (including p.c.d.); B. H. Fraser, $1,729.10; J. F. Fraser, $1,700.35.

3. No money expended by each, except travelling expenses and petty cash disbursements, as follows: W. H. Noble, $1,569.41; B. H. Fraser, $1,729.10; J. F. Fraser, $2,000.35.

LIGHTHOUSES

Mr. FOSTER asked:

1. What lighthouses have been wholly or partially constructed during the last fiscal year?
2. What amount was expended on each?
3. As to those completed, what was the total cost of each?
4. How many of these have been constructed on contract based on public tender?

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

1. 1, Gravenhurst Narrows, Ont.; 2, Wilson Chanel, Ont.; 3, Stokes Bay, Ont.; 4, Niagara, Ont.; 5, Britannia, Ont.; 6, Belle Isle, Que.;7, Entry Island, Que.; 8, Sand Point, Que.; 9, Contrecœur, Que.; 10, Grondines, Que.; 11, Ile Ste Therese, Que.; 12, Vercheres, Que.; 13, Byron Island, Que.; 14, Ile aux Vaches, Que.; 15, Pte. aux Orignaux, Que.; 16, Bellerive Park, Que.; 17, Permanent light in ship channel, Que.; 18, Beaujeu bank, Que.; 19, Champlain, Que.; 20, Martin river, Que.; 21, Gaham's wharf, Que.; 22, Gaspé, Que.; 23, Roberval, Que.; 24 St. Andrews, New Brunswick; 25, Oak Point, N.B; 26, Douglas Island, N.B.; 27, Shippegan, N.B.; 28, Point Edward, N.S.; 29, Pictou Island, N.S.; 30, Ketch harbour, N.S.; 31, Digby pier, N.S.; 32, Thrumcap, N.S.; 33, West Arichat, N.S.; 34, Wallace harbour, N.S.; 35, McMillan's point, N.S.; 36, Gilbert Cove, N.S.; 37, Spencers Island, N.S.; 38, Canso, N.S.; 39, Munro Point, N.S.; 40, Bear River, N.S.; 41, Shulie harbour, N.S.; 42, Cape Tryon, P.E.I.; 43, Graeme Point, B.C.; 44, Lennard Island, B.C.; 45, Pilot Bay, B.C.; 46, Scarlett Point, B.C.

2. 1, $500; 2, $1,363; 3, 2,207; 4, $6,745; 5, $325; 6, $48,795; 7, $729; 8, $9,150; 9, $5,762; 10, $2,990; 11, $8,000; 12, $1,264; 13, $6,000; 14, $1,969; 15, $5,068; 16, $158; 17, $75,554; 18, $25,000; 19, $2,615; 20, $4,711; 21, $74; 22, $200; 23, $442; 24, $4,415; 25, $1,560; 26, $1,741; 27, $1, 500; 28, $2,134; 29, $1,600; 30, $500; 31, $443; 32, $1,900; 33, $857; 34, $2,541; 35, $349; 36, $189; 37,$645; 38, $3,240; 39, $594; 40, $500; 41, $1,314; 42, $1,663; 43, $2,167; 44, $10,691; 45, $1,012; 46, $7,542.

3. 2, $1,363; 3, $2,640; 4, $6,745; 5, $325; 7, $5,540; 8, $9,150; 9, $22,760; 10, $2,990; 11, $8,000; 12, $1,264; 13, $6,700; 14, $1,969; 15, $5,298; 16, 158; 18, $25,000; 19, $2,615; 21, $74; 22, $200; 23, 442; 24, $5,650; 25, $1,560; 26, $1,741; 27, $1,500; 28, 2,134; 29, $1,600; 31, $460; 32, $1,900; 33, $916; 34, $2,750; 36, $1,050; 37, $645; 38, $3,240; 40, $500; 41, $1,314; 42, $1,663; 44, $11,600; 45, $1,012; 46, $7, 542.

4. Twenty-three.

GERMAN TARIFF.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked:

Is the German tariff on Canadian goods similar to the German tariff on American goods ? If not, wherein does it differ ?

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). The government has no copy nor official knowledge of the provisions of the German tariff supposed to be in force since March 1.

Mr. FOSTER. Of this year?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

THORNDALE POST OFFICE.

Mr. ELSON asked:

1. In what building or in whose place of business is the post office situated in the town of Thorndale, Ontario ?
2. For what length of time has it been in that building or place of business ?
3. In what building or place of business was it formerly situated ?
4. If the post office has been moved, what are the reasons given for such removal, and upon whose recommendation was the change made ?
5. Who is the present postmaster at Thorndale ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Postmaster General):

1. In the Faulkner block.
2. Since March 2, 1906.
3. In a building about 25 rods west of the present site.
4. The post office inspector reported that the premises in the Faulkner block were superior in point of location and accommodation to the former site and the department acted on his recommendation.
5. James W. Evans.

GALOPS CANAL—CARDINAL SECTION.

Mr. STAPLES asked :

1. What was the original estimate of the government engineers for the total construction of the Cardinal section of Galops Canal, under William Davis & Son's contract ?
2. What has been paid by the government on said contract to date, and has final estimate been made up and paid ?
3. What was the original estimate of the government engineers for total completion of Galops Rapids contract by E. E. Gilbert & Sons ?
4. How much has been paid by the government on said work to date, and has final estimate been made and paid ?
5. What was the original estimate of government engineers for total completion of St. Lawrence River north channel contract, by M. A. Cleveland ?
6. How much has been paid by the government on said works to date, and has final estimate been made and paid ?
7. What was original estimate of government engineers for total construction of Farran's Point Canal, under contract with Canadian Construction Company ?
8. What has been paid by the government on contract to date, and has final estimate been made and paid ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. $1,362,140.
2. Total payments $1,672,784.85. Yes, final estimate has been paid.
3. $850,000.
4. Total payments $629,629.92. The final estimate has not been paid, but award of Exchequer Court has been made in final settlement with E. E. Gilbert & Sons. There is at present another contract with The Gilbert Brothers Engineering Company, which is not as yet completed.
5. $750,000.
6. Total payments $1,462,960. The final estimate has not been paid as the work is not completed.
7. $750,000.
8. Total payments $755,417.97. Yes, final estimate has been paid.

POST OFFICE, AMARANTH TOWNSHIP.

Mr. BARR asked :

1. Has the Postmaster General been asked by petition or otherwise to establish a post office on lot 26, 7th concession, township of Amaranth, county of Dufferin, province of Ontario ?
2. If so, what is their intention concerning said request ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Postmaster General) :

1. Application for the establishment of a new post office at the place mentioned was made in April, 1905, by Mr. John Park, accompanied by a petition to the like effect.
2. The circumstances were not considered such as to warrant the establishment of a new post office.

WHARF AT D'ESCOUSSE.

Mr. W. WRIGHT asked :

1. How much was expended in the construction of the government wharf at D'Escousse, Nova Scotia, in the year, 1903 ?
2. How much was expended in the repairs of said wharf in the years 1903, 1904 and 1905, respectively ?
3. Were the construction and repairs of said wharf let by public tender ? If not, why not ?
4. Who were the inspectors of the construction and repairs to said works, and how much was paid to each inspector in the years 1903, 1904 and 1905 ?
5. What was the revenue from said wharf in the years 1903, 1904 and 1905, respectively ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (for the Minister of Public Works):

1. $5,047.72.
2. In 1903.. .. .. Nil.
   1904.. .. ..$ 899 78
   1905.. .. .. 149 40
3. The construction of the wharf was let by public tender, but not the repairs, which were thought more advisable to have done by day work.

4. Inspector of construction: Thomas Morrison, amount paid him, $185.
Inspector of repairs: John Poirier;
Amounts paid him in 1904..$ 66 75
" " 1905.. 25 00
——$91 75

5. In 1903.. .. .. Nil.
1904.. .. .. $ 45 27
1905.. .. .. 56 31

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—CANADA EASTERN BRANCH.

Mr. CROCKET asked:

1. Has an order been issued for the removal of the train despatcher's office of the Canada Eastern branch of the Intercolonial Railway from Gibson, N.B., to Newcastle, N.B., or to any other point on the main line of the railway?

2. If so, to what point was the removal ordered, when was the order issued, and for what reason?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. Yes.

2. To Newcastle, N.B., and the change was authorized by the department on March 5, 1906, in furtherance of economical organization.

PAYMENTS TO MANITOBA 'FREE PRESS' AND 'DER NORDWESTER PUBLISHING COMPANIES.

Mr. LAKE asked:

What are the total sums that have been paid by the government to the Manitoba 'Free Press' and 'der Nordwester' Publishing Companies, for all services, for each of the financial years commencing 1st July, 1900, and ending 30th June, 1905, distinguishing between (a) copies of newspapers supplied; (b) advertising; (c) other printing

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Postmaster General). Payments have been made by the Post Office Department to the Manitoba 'Free Press' and der 'Nordwester' Publishing Companies since the 1st of July, 1900, as follows:

MANITOBA FREE PRESS.

Fiscal Year.	Copies of Newspapers supplied.	Advertising.	Other Printing.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1900-1901....	8 00	.....	
1901-1902....	8 00	27 75	
1902-1903....	8 00	13 20	
1903-1904....	6 00	3 60	
1904-1905....	4 00	10 50	

DER NORDWESTER.

1900-1901....	.....	10 50	
1901-1902....	.....	24 05	
1902-1903....	.....	10 80	
1903-1904....	.....	9 00	
1904-1905....	.....	18 30	

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Payments by the Department of the Interior to the companies named were as follows:

MANITOBA FREE PRESS.

Fiscal Year.	Copies of Newspapers supplied.	Advertising.	Other Printing.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1900-1901....	101 71	870 67	
1901-1902....	5,500 00	1,691 73	
1902-1903....	1 00	1,208 93	1,350 00
1903-1904....	4,000 00	2,233 57	750 00
1904-1905....	12,375 00	1,869 53	3,900 00

DER NORDWESTER.

1900-1901....	510 00	25 00	8 60
1901-1902....	2,500 00	1,033 53	
1902-1903....	1,625 00	787 50	
1903-1904....	2,566 67	2,154 81	
1904-1905....	1,633 33	1,314 10	5,030 00

NEW BRUNSWICK VACANCIES IN THE SENATE.

Mr. FOWLER—by Mr. Lancaster—asked:

1. How many vacancies are there now in the representation to the Senate from the province of New Brunswick?

2. When did they respectively occur?

3. When does the government propose to fill these vacancies?

4. Why were they not filled before the meeting of parliament?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). There are two vacancies in the representation in the Senate from the province of New Brunswick. One occurred in 1904, and the other in 1905. The government is considering the appointments.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) did not answer the last question.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The answer is, the government were then considering and are now considering.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY, BELMONT DISASTER.

Mr. LAURENCE asked:

1. Has any investigation been held by any commissioner or official of the government in relation to the disaster on the Intercolonial Railway, on December 6, 1902, at Belmont station, wherein seven persons lost their lives, with a view to ascertaining the cause of said disaster? If so, when, where, and by whom was said investigation held?

2. Have claims on behalf of the relatives and dependents of the persons killed in said disaster been presented to the government? If

so, has any action been taken in regard to such claims, and what action ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. Yes. On February 19, 1906, at Truro, by Geo. M. Jarvis, District Superintendent of the Intercolonial Railway.

2. Yes, claims have been received. The department considered in view of the circumstances, a test case should be submitted to the Exchequer Court for its adjudication, and has so advised the Department of Justice.

SEIGNIORY OF RIGAUD.

Mr. BOYER asked :

1. Has the government paid to the owners of the Rigaud Seigniory the sums that may be due to them under the Seigniorial Act of 1854, and its amendments ?

2. If so, what sums has it so paid, and when?

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

1. Yes.

2. $67,777 on December 23, 1874.

SAGUENAY RIVER—PIERS AND BOOMS ABOVE CHICOUTIMI.

Mr. PERLEY—by Mr. Martin—asked :

1. What is the estimate of the total cost of the piers and booms being built above Chicoutimi, on the Saguenay river ?

2. What is the estimated annual revenue from these works ?

3. Will these works be of service to any one except those engaged in the log and pulpwood business ? If so, to what class of persons ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (for the Minister of Public Works) :

1. $50,000.

2. $2,625 ; however, if the revenue falls short of the maintenance and operation, the Chicoutimi Pulp Company is bound by a written agreement to make good such deficit.

3. Though built to retain logs, these works will prevent timber from getting into the river below, where they would be a danger to navigation.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—ACCOMMODATION AT ST. PHILIPPE STATION.

Mr. LAPOINTE—by Mr. Johnston—asked:

1. What number of wood-cars were loaded and forwarded at St. Philippe station, in the county of Kamouraska, during the last fiscal year ?

2. Is the government aware that at the said station there is neither yard nor land accommodation in accord with the wood traffic carried on there ?

3. Is it the intention of the government to lease or to purchase land for that purpose ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. About ninety cars.

2. The yard and land at that station is 100 ft. wide, which is not deemed sufficient accommodation, but, as there was no parliamentary appropriation to enable purchase of additional land, the matter has had to stand.

3. The matter is having the consideration of the department.

GOVERNMENT VESSEL SERVICE.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. What is the complement of officers and crew, and employees, for each vessel, in the service of the government ?

2. What is the average months employment each year ?

3. What is the service on which each is employed ?

4. What is the number of vessels which carry passengers ?

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

1. Aberdeen, 37 ; Druid, 30 ; Montcalm, 62 ; Champlain, 22 ; Stanley, 40 ; Minto, 42 ; Lady Laurier, 44 ; Lansdowne, 33 ; Quadra, 24 ; Gulnare, 28 ; Shamrock, 13 ; Brant, 11 ; Bayfield, 24 ; Canada, 61 ; Kestrel, 22 ; Curlew, 19 ; Constance, 22 ; LaCanadienne, 27 ; Vigilant, 30 ; Petrel, 27 ; Osprey, 19.

2. Aberdeen, 8 months ; Druid, 8 months; Montcalm, 12 months ; Champlain, 12 months ; Stanley, 12 months ; Minto, 12 months ; Lady Laurier, 12 months ; Lansdowne, 12 months ; Quadra, 12 months ; Gulnare, 6 months ; Shamrock, 8 months ; Brant, 8 months ; Bayfield, 6 months ; Canada, 12 months ; Kestrel, 12 months ; Curlew, 8 months ; Constance, 8 months ; La Canadienne, 8 months ; Vigilant, 8 months ; Petrel, 8 months ; Osprey, 8 months.

3. Aberdeen, lighthouse and buoy ; Druid, lighthouse and buoy ; Montcalm, ice service in the St. Lawrence ; Champlain, ferry service between Murray Bay and Riviere Ouelle ; Stanley and Minto, winter mail service Prince Edward Island and mainland ; Lady Laurier, lighthouse and buoy ; Lansdowne, lighthouse and buoy ; Quadra, lighthouse and buoy ; Gulnare, tidal service ; Shamrock, buoy service ; Brant, lighthouse service ; Bayfield, hydographic service ; Canada, fisheries protection ; Kestrel, fisheries protection ; Curlew, fisheries protection ; Constance, revenue and customs in summer, generally employed in lighthouse or other services required ; La Canadienne, fisheries and protection ; Vigilant, fisheries and protection ; Petrel, fisheries and protection ; Osprey, fisheries and protection.

4. Three.

Mr. FOSTER. Which three ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have not that in the memorandum before me, but the three must be the Stanley, the Minto and the Champlain. Of course, I am not very sure about that.

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). The answer given includes the Constance. In addition, we have a little steam tug with a crew of three men at Halifax.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). Does the hon. gentleman care for the boats in the quarantine service at Grosse Isle, Halifax and British Columbia? Because if he does, I have not got them today, but I will get them.

Mr. FOSTER. Then let the question stand. Will the Minister of Marine and Fisheries kindly answer the fourth question.

Mr. BRODEUR. I gave the number as three.

Mr. FOSTER. But as to the names.

Mr. BRODEUR. That was not asked.

WINNIPEG IMMIGRATION AGENTS AND MINERS.

Mr. VERVILLE—by Mr. Ralph Smith—asked:

1. Has the government any information that these immigration agents in Winnipeg are said to be supplying miners to the mine owners?
2. If so, how many have been sent under such authority?

1. No.
2. Answered by No. 1.

THEFTS OF PROPERTY OF INTERCOLONIAL.

Mr. FOWLER—by Mr. Lancaster—asked:

1. Is the Department of Railways aware that certain employees of the department at Moncton have been publicly accused of stealing government property?
2. Is it aware that paragraphs have appeared in a newspaper published in St. John, New Brunswick, charging that employees were discovered stealing Intercolonial Railway property, and settled with the employee who discovered them, by paying him partly in cash and partly by a promissory note, to prevent exposure?
3. Has the department made any inquiries respecting this matter, or has any investigation been held?
4. Is the Department of Railways aware of any theft of any postage stamps from the railway offices at Moncton by employees?
5. Has any report been made by a detective officer in the service of the department implicating an employee of the department at Moncton?
6. Has there been any investigation as the result of such report?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. One of the employees at Moncton has been arrested and committed for trial for stealing scrap from the ruins of the burned buildings.
2. The paragraph referred to has been seen in the newspapers.
3. The matter is being investigated.

Mr. BRODEUR.

4. No, the department is not aware of any theft of postage stamps, but the department has been advised of irregularities respecting stamps, which irregularities gave rise to suspicions as to how the stamps were handled.
5. Yes, charges were made.
6. Yes, and the result indicated that irregularities had occurred; no particular persons were found to be guilty, but the result disclosed that the system in use was one that rendered it well nigh impossible to check the improper use of stamps; in consequence it was changed.

SETTLERS ON RIDING MOUNTAIN TIMBER RESERVE.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE asked:

1. Is it the intention of the government to prohibit settlers from locating in the Riding Mountain timber reserve?
2. Is it the intention of the government to allow those who have located within the reserve in township 19, range 19, west of principal meridian, including the half-breeds who are located near Clear lake, to remain on their present locations?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior).

1. Yes.
2. After full investigation which will be shortly made, this question will be carefully considered with a view to a decision being arrived at without avoidable delay.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For copies of all orders in council, or other authority, for the survey of a branch line of railway from the main line of the Prince Edward Island Railway to Stanley Bridge; also copies of all engineers' reports, memoranda, &c., correspondence, telegrams or other documents in relation thereto; including the claims of Austin J. Macneill and others for damages to property in connection with the said survey.—Mr. A. Martin.

For a return showing: (a) what quantities of fish of different classifications, naming them, were entered for export at the ports of Port Arthur, Fort William, Sault Ste. Marie, Manitoulin Island and all Georgian Bay ports, respectively, during the fiscal years ending June 30th, 1890, 1891, 1892, 1893, 1894, 1895, 1896, 1897, 1898, 1899, 1900, 1901, 1902, 1903, 1904 and 1905; (b) the value of such consignments so entered; (c) the amount of duty paid thereon; (d) the country or countries to which the said consignments were exported.—Mr. Boyce—by Mr. R. L. Borden.

For copies of (a) all plans showing proposals of any railway or other corporation, or person, or association of persons, for and with regard to expropriation of Whitefish island, in St. Mary's river, Ontario, or of portions thereof, and of water or land covered by water, surrounding the same; (b) of all correspondence between this government and the government of the province of Ontario, or any department thereof, and with any other person, firm

or corporation, relating thereto, and of all reports, decisions or findings upon such applications or proposals; (c) of all reports of and correspondence with the International Waterways Commission, with respect to erection, maintenance or alteration of dams, water powers, and other works or erections in St. Mary's River.—Mr. Boyce—by Mr. R. L. Borden.

For copies of all papers, letters, telegrams, or other correspondence with the government of Prince Edward Island, or any member thereof, and this government, or any department or official thereof, with reference to the ownership and control of the fisheries, and any proposals by this government to any member of the government of Prince Edward Island, relative to this government taking full charge of the oyster and other fisheries, pending a settlement of this question.—Mr. Lefurgey—by Mr. A. Martin.

For copies of all correspondence between the pilotage commissioners, the secretary of the Board of Pilot Commissioners, or any of the officials of that board, at Sydney, Cape Breton, and the Department of Marine and Fisheries, or any of the officials of the said department, and all orders in council, regulations, memoranda, books, documents and papers, showing: (1) the amount paid into the pilots' retiring fund in each year from the 31st December, 1896, to 31st December, 1905, respectively; (2) the amount paid into the pilots' widows' and orphans' relief fund from 31st December, 1896, to 31st December, 1905, respectively; (3) the disposition made of the said funds in each year during the above-mentioned period; the amount on hand on the 31st December, 1905; the interest it bears; where it is deposited; the security for its safety for the benefit of the widows and orphans of the pilots; (4) the amount on hand in these funds, respectively, on 31st December, 1896. Also, all other correspondence, if any, bearing on this matter.—Mr. Boyce—by Mr. R. L. Borden.

For copies of all reports and communications from the Superintendent of Insurance to the government, or to the Minister of Finance, during the years 1903, 1904 and 1905, relating or referring to the desirability or expediency of any further amendment or amendments to the Insurance Act, or relating or referring to any defects in the said Act.—Mr. R. L. Borden.

For copies of all correspondence and contracts, if any, list of payments to men employed by the Department of Marine and Fisheries in construction of Lake Ocebe lighthouse, on the Magnetawan river, district of Parry Sound.—Mr. Bennett.

For a copy of the order in council appointing Mr. W. A. Weeks to investigate certain matters in dispute respecting lands taken by the Prince Edward Island Railway, and certain other matters in dispute connected with that railway. Also a copy of the evidence and report of the said W. A. Weeks in the matter.—Mr. A. A. McLean—by Mr. A. Martin.

For copies of all correspondence, advertisements, tenders received, vouchers for all payments made, statements of progress of work, and any other papers relating to improvements on eastern entrance, Toronto harbour, since 1st July, 1904.—Mr. Macdonell—by Mr. Lancaster.

For copies of all correspondence, advertisements, tenders received, vouchers for all payments made, statements of progress of work, and any other papers relating to the extension of breakwater, Toronto harbour, since 1st July, 1904.—Mr. Macdonell—by Mr. Lancaster.

For copies of all correspondence with the government by any parties in Lethbridge, concerning any matters in connection with the Lethbridge coal miners' strike, and the calling out of the mounted police in connection with the same.—Mr. Ralph Smith—by Mr. Macpherson.

For copies of the correspondence passed between the imperial government upon the subject of the petition sent of a party of British printers, complaining that they were brought to this country under misrepresentation as to existing labour conditions in Canada, and for all papers on the subject.—Mr. Verville—by Mr. Macpherson.

For a copy of all correspondence, letters, telegrams, memorials, or other documents, between the Post Office Department, or any official thereof, and any person or persons, respecting the removal of the post office in the town of Thorndale, Ontario, from the place of business of Mr. S. Duffins to the place of business of Mr. J. Falconer.—Mr. Elson.

CERTIFICATES TO MASTERS AND MATES.

On the Order :

House again in Committee on Bill (No. 7) to amend the Act respecting certificates to masters and mates of ships.—Mr. Lancaster.

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

That the order be discharged and that the Bill be referred to a select committee to be composed of the following persons : Messrs. A. K. Maclean, R. Bickerdike, Pardee, Macpherson, L. G. McCarthy, Brodeur, Fitzpatrick, A. H. Clarke, Lancaster, Stockton, Bennett, Lefurgey, A. C. Macdonell, with power to send for persons and papers and to report from time to time.

Mr. LANCASTER. I have no objection. I suppose there will be no harm in letting this order stand until the report comes down.

Mr. BRODEUR. According to the rule of the House the Bill should be referred to the committee which will have to report during the session and when the report is made the Bill will go on the Order Paper again.

Mr. LANCASTER. Very well.

Motion agreed to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In case the debate should be concluded to-morrow in sufficient time to proceed with further business what may we expect ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The first order to-morrow will be to take up the Sunday Observance Bill, then we will resume the debate upon the motion of the hon. member

for Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) and if we go into Supply we will go on with the estimates of my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior.

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

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, April 3, 1906.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

CERTIFICATES TO MASTERS AND MATES.

Mr. LANCASTER moved:

That Mr. J. G. H. Bergeron be placed on the select committee to which Bill (No. 7) has been referred instead of Mr Lefurgey.

Motion agreed to.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC BRANCH LINES.

Mr. JOHN CRAWFORD (Portage la Prairie) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 75) to incorporate the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company. He said this Bill asks for a charter to construct certain branch lines in eastern Canada as well as in the west. Those lines would be used as part of the Grand Trunk Pacific system.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 76) respecting the Revillon Bros., Ltd.—Mr. McCool.

Bill (No. 77) respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—Mr. M. S McCarthy.

Bill (No. 78) respecting the Great Northwest Central Railway Company.—Mr. W. J. Roche.

Bill (No. 79) respecting certain patents of Chester Burnell Duryea.—Mr. Belcourt.

Bill (No. 80) respecting the Pacific Northern and Omenica Railway Company.—Mr. Leighton McCarthy.

Bill (No. 81) respecting the Bell Telephone Company of Canada.—Mr. Bureau—by Mr. Demers.

EXPRESS COMPANIES AND THE RAILWAY COMMISSION.

Mr. G. O. ALCORN (Prince Edward) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 82) respecting Express Companies. He said: The principle of the Bill is one which seems to meet with general approval, namely that express companies, in the conduct of their business and in the tolls they may charge for their services, shall be subject to the jurisdiction and control of the Railway Commissioners. Hon. gentlemen who will read this Bill in conjunction with the Railway Act of 1903 will see that I am not asking the House to adopt new legislation except so far as the principle is concerned, but that I simply take the clauses of the Railway Act that appear to be applicable and endeavour to mould and apply them to the case of express companies.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC—CHINESE LABOUR QUESTION.

Mr. RALPH SMITH (Nanaimo). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to direct the attention of the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to a very serious rumour afloat in the west as described by the telegram I hold in my hand—namely that the Grand Trunk Pacific Company are bringing pressure to bear upon the government at Ottawa to get a reduction upon the poll tax on Chinese from $500 to $50, for the purpose of utilizing that labour in the construction of the western section of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, on the plea, of course, that other labour cannot be had. I wish to ask the First Minister if there is any shadow of truth in the rumour, and if so, to what extent it is true.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). There is not a shadow of truth in the rumour. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company have made no such application whatever.

COAL LANDS IN THE NORTHWEST—Mr. C. F. CALDWELL.

Mr. J. D. REID (Grenville). Before the Orders of the Day are called I would like to call the attention of the government to an item in one of the local papers last evening; as follows:

Looking for a coal mine—Novel way of procuring claims—$1 paid for signed application.

Stranger at Russell House causes some mystification among bell boys and other employees.

A guest who rather astonished a large number of bell boys and other employees of the Russell House was registered there last week. He was giving them $1 each for what they considered rights to coal mines in the west, of which they had never heard and about which they were decidedly mystified.

The stranger gave his name as Mr. C. F. Caldwell, of Alberta, and explained his work to the 'Journal' readily enough. He said that there were, without doubt, many rich coal fields in Alberta. It was impossible, however, to buy a large block of land, or secure options upon it, from the government, as this is all being kept open for settlement. To overcome this

difficulty he was getting different parties to make application for a single section. This he buys from them for $1, and as he has not to finish the taking over of the section for six months, he will prospect each claim for coal in the meantime. If coal is found he completes the transaction with the government at a nominal fee.

Mr. Caldwell said that Mr. F. H. Clergue, of the Soo, was interested in his plans and that his work was being done by other parties in the west. Large blocks of land which have been held for speculative purposes have to be thrown open to settlers by April 1, said Mr. Caldwell, and many applications for sections are being made on these lots.

I would like to ask the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) if Mr. Caldwell has called upon him and if applications have been made in this way ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I have no knowledge of Mr. Caldwell or of his applications. Of course, such a gentleman may have called at the department and made application. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. J. D. Reid) desires it, I will make the necessary inquiry and be able to give him the information at a later day.

MILITIA CAMPS—SERVICE ROLLS.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria). I notice in the press that an order has been issued by the Militia Department requiring the officers in command of the various corps that are to proceed to camp in June to send in service rolls to the department, and these service rolls, I believe, are to be in ten days in advance of camp. I need hardly point out to the Minister of the Militia that that would be a hardship. I sent the minister notice that I was going to bring this matter forward to-day——

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). I did not receive it. But no matter ; I hope the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) will proceed.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I was about to say that to have these service rolls in the department ten days before camp would mean that they must be prepared, practically, fifteen days before camp. This would be a very considerable hardship. It is perfectly right that the service rolls should be worked up as far as possible by that time. But it would be a little hard on the officers of rural corps. In recent years, it has been hard to keep up the recruiting which went on before, and which I hope will be resumed in the near future. I would like to know the facts and what the intention of the minister is with regard to the matter.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is quite true that an order such as my hon. friend mentioned has been issued, but the time fixed is not ten days but one week. It was felt, in view of the large increase in the pay—practically double what it was formerly—that the officers in command of the units, companies and regiments should take more pains than they have done in the past. It was also thought desirable that the department should be in possession of information by which they could check the different pay rolls and see whether the different companies are being charged improperly for efficiency pay. It is absolutely impossible for us to do this unless we get the roll at least one week before camp. I do not think there will be any serious hardship in the case of officers who are interested in the work and anxious for the country to get the full benefit of the money that is paid.

Mr. H. A. WARD (Durham). I desire to say a word or two with regard to this matter, being personally interested. I am sorry that this order is about to go into force, because I know that the rural battalions will find it a very difficult thing to get a full muster. I do not think for a moment that the government in late years has intended to make it difficult for us to fill up our regiments. The skeleton battalions were a mistake. They were referred to by the hon. member for South Victoria (Mr. Sam. Hughes). They resulted in scattering the men who were in the habit of going into camp, and it was a very difficult thing to get them together again. Now that had a bad effect in regard to recruiting the regiments. Then again last year the same order was issued, that the service rolls should be handed into the district officers commanding on May 1; but I am glad to say that on representation to the minister that was done away with last year, and I hope that he may see his way to do away with the order that has been issued at the present time. I had an interview with one of my captains only last week, and he informed me that he had been travelling over fifteen miles from the headquarters of his company, and found great difficulty in recruiting his company for the camp that is to take place next month. If he is obliged to have his service roll in eight or nine days—I think that is the order—before camp, the result will be that every company will arrive very short, and probably only half strength. The last two or three years, several regiments, as my hon. friend knows, have not been up to strength. Another thing that has militated against the regiments in our district is that we have been required to go into camp a great deal later than the regiments in the west. I am glad to see the minister has listened to the representations that have been made to him with regard to that, and has placed the camp at Kingston on June 19 this year. But we have had a great deal of difficulty during the past year owing to that fact. Another thing I would like to point out to the minister, and

which I regard as an injustice to the officers commanding companies and to the officers commanding regiments, is that they only received pay last year for the men that actually drilled in camp. That is an injustice, because we have put forth every effort to get the men into camp and have failed for these reasons, in the first place, as I have pointed out, because the camp is so late, and next, the scattering through skeleton battalions. Now, it does seem an injustice that after commanding officers of companies have done their very best and spent their money in endeavouring to secure a full muster of their companies, they should only be allowed for the men taken into camp. They have a great deal to do all through the year in keeping up their companies, and they do it honestly and as far as they can. I would ask the minister not only to reconsider the order requiring service rolls to be produced at the date mentioned, but I would also ask him to reconsider the matter of pay as well.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton, N.B.). This is a matter in regard to which I have heard some complaints. I hold in my hand a copy of an order issued from the District Officer Commanding, Militia District No. 8, in which officers are required to send these service rolls to headquarters not less than ten days before the opening of the camp. According to legal decision that would mean twelve days, and besides it would take two days to get them to headquarters. Practically, these service rolls must be at headquarters a fortnight before the camp is opened. That will work a great hardship in the lower provinces, at least in the province of New Brunswick. If there are officers of the Canadian militia who are so dishonest that they will certify that men are entitled to efficiency pay who have not had the necessary training, then I say those officers should be got rid of. I fear this rule will not only demoralize the militia, but perhaps it will not be of much advantage after all. If these service rolls arrive at headquarters a fortnight or ten days before the opening of the camp, it will take an enormous staff in order to compare them with the rolls of three or four years previously, to see whether every man on those rolls is entitled to his efficiency pay. Now, I can assure the minister from practical experience, that the difficulty in rural districts lies very largely in this at least so far as we are concerned, not that we cannot get sufficient men to fill the corps, but that, as our militia are drawn largely from rural localities, it is often a very serious question whether a man who has belonged to the militia perhaps for two or three years can get away from his farm duties. Very often the best men we have in the militia do not know until perhaps two or three days before the opening of the camp, whether they can get away or not. It is not fair to ask a man to leave his important duties, the business perhaps in which he earns his living, to abandon his farm to his help, to go into a military camp. I apprehend the object of the department is to train the very best men in the country, not the floating population that have no permanent place of residence, not to pick up men who may be able to spend a few days in camp because they have nothing else to do, but to get men who are the bone and sinew of the country, and who have some stake in the country. While the minister says the time is changed to one week, the order I hold in my hand says ten days, which really means fourteen days, and I can assure the minister that it will work a great hardship to the militia in the province of New Brunswick. I hope he will see his way clear either to modify it or to abolish it entirely.

Mr. O. E. TALBOT (Bellechasse). A few days ago, I attended a meeting of the officers of my regiment to consider this very matter, and every one of my captains informed me that it was impossible for them to furnish a service roll any sooner than the opening of the camp. They all told me that the last week was the best recruiting week of all, that many men who would not attend fifteen days before camp, required to drill two or three day previously. Under the circumstances they considered it was very difficult for them to abide by this order. I am glad to endorse what has been said by other hon. gentlemen on this question, and to point out the difficulties that will arise in our rural districts in the way of recruiting if we have to furnish that roll in the time now asked for by the department.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to inquire of the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Chas. S. Hyman) when we may expect the printed report of the Transportation Commission. On March 14, the minister, in reply to a question from this side of the House, stated that the report was then in course of being printed, and he expected to have it brought down at a very early date. Unless the report is more voluminous than it should be, we might have had it before now. On March 16, I moved that the two reports of the Transcontinental Railway Commission should be printed. The order passed. I would think it time that these reports should also be on the table of the House for nearly three weeks have elapsed also in that case.

Mr. HYMAN. I desire to assure my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) that it is not the fault of the department. The orders were very promptly given in regard to the printing. I per-

sonally inquired several times and made an effort to hurry them up. There is a considerable amount of work in connection with the revision and everything, but I was promised them last Saturday and I am in hopes almost any day to have these reports.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. We are also without the report for the past year of the Department of Marine and Fisheries. Can the hon. minister (Mr. Brodeur) inform us when we may expect it ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It has not yet been received from the Secretary of State's Department.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No, we are well aware of that; but what we want to know is when we may expect the House will have it in possession.

Mr. BRODEUR. I hope it will be brought down in a few days.

BROCKVILLE CHEESE CURING ROOM.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR (Leeds). Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr Fisher) to some facts in relation to a statement made by him which appears in 'Hansard' of yesterday. The hon, minister acknowledged that the officers in his department had made a mistake in reference to the expenditure in connection with the cheese cool curing room at Brockville and that practically almost all the figures I gave were correct. I took my figures from the Auditor General's Report and in making my statement I gave the page and the amount of each item, but when 'Hansard' came out the page and the amount of each item was not given but only the gross amount. On March 26 I asked this question :

1. What has been the total expenditure in connection with cheese curing at the following places : Bagotville, Brockville, Chrontine, Cowansville, Drummondville, Hebertville, St. Alphonse, St. Felician, St. Hyacinthe, Victoriaville, Woodstock ?

2. What has been the total revenue received from the above named places?

When I asked what the total expenditure was I expected to get it, not from the Auditor General's Report, as the hon. minister told the House in his reply that these statements were made up from the Auditor General's Report, but I expected that this department, as every other department, would charge up every item of expenditure in connection with every account and that all the clerk would have to do would be to go to his ledger account and find out what the expenditure was under each heading so as to enable the minister to bring down a correct answer to the question. The hon. minister, in reply to the question as to what the total expenditure was in connection with all of these cheese curing stations, said that it was $107,886.14 and that the total revenue received was $32,451.51, showing a loss to the country of $75,434.63. The hon. Minister of Agriculture yesterday made the following statement :

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I wish, in justice to my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor), to refer to a matter which he brought up in the House on March 27. On that day he brought before the House an answer which had been given by me on the day before regarding the Brockville curing room, and he pointed out that there was an inaccuracy in my reply. I had the matter looked up, and I wish now to inform the House and my hon. friend that the clerk in the accountant's office, to whom was entrusted the making up of this expenditure did make an error in his computation. Here is the explanation which has been furnished me by my deputy :

I find that the clerk in the accountant's office who was entrusted with making up this expenditure, made an error in his computation. The figures which were furnished you as the expenditure were $18,661.34. They should have been $20,831.50.

A difference of $2,000 more loss to the country than the minister's original answer indicated.

These figures are made up from the Auditor General's Report for the year 1901-2, 1902-3, 1903-4, 1904-5, and for the current fiscal year up to the 1st March instant from the ledger of the department. The details are as follows :

He then goes on to give the details making up the $20,831.50. Then he says :

Mr. Taylor, according to 'Hansard' (page 710) undertook to give the expenditure from the Auditor General's Reports for the fiscal years ending respectively 1st July, 1903, 1904, 1905. For the first two years the accountant is unable to say what items Mr. Taylor included in his addition, as he does not, and the totals of any of the several items in the reports for those two years tally with Mr. Taylor's totals.

I may say that in making my statement I gave the items and the pages at which they are to be found in the Auditor General's Report but these were not reported, as I stated before, in 'Hansard'.

For the last fiscal year, however, it appears that to make up the total given by Mr. Taylor, viz.: $5,929, he took the expenditure shown at (D—67) under the heading 'cheese curing room, Brockville, $2,958.61,' the item 'Brockville cheese haulers, $660,' page (D—66), and also the item 'Brockville curing room, cheese purchased and cured,' under the heading 'cheese account,' at page (D—66), $1,732.72, and, lastly, the item 'services of N. G. Somerville, Brockville, to 30th April, 1905. under the heading 'cheese curing rooms, general,' at page (D—67), $578.38. These two latter items should not be included in making up the total expenditure in connection with the Brockville cheese curing room. It has happened that cheese have been purchased at some of the cool curing rooms and resold, but the transactions did not affect the expenditure, were not connected therewith, and had no connection with the operation of the cool curing room. These transactions have generally

resulted in a gain, but the losses, whenever they have occurred, have not been charged against the curing rooms, nor has any gain derived from such transactions been treated as revenue. The matter of such transactions has been considered quite separately and distinct from the operation of the curing room. The item of Mr. Somerville's salary, $578.38, should not be charged against the curing room, as during the time when his salary was earned, he was not working in connection with the curing room, but was doing the work of the department generally.

I make this explanation in justice to my hon. friend and the department.

I have gone over the accounts to ascertain the corrections of the reply in reference to the total expenditure in connection with the cheese curing rooms at the following places: Bagotville, Brockville, Chrontine, Cowansville, Drummondville, Hebertville, St. Alphonse, St. Felician, St. Hyacinthe, Victoriaville and Woodstock. The reply to the question was that the total expenditure was $107,886.14 up to March 1, 1906. I have no way of ascertaining what the expenditure from the 30th June, 1905, to the 1st March was, but I presume it was very nearly as much as that of the preceding year. I have gone carefully through the Auditor General's Report for the years 1901-1902, 1902-1903, 1903-1904, 1904-1905, and up to the 30th June and I make the total expenditure $108,623.74, to which should be added the expenditure from the 30th June last year to the 1st March, which would be in the neighbourhood of $20,000 or $25,000 more, and would make a total expenditure of $133,632.74, not taking into account, as the hon. minister said there must have been, the purchases of cheese at these places. I have left that out of the account altogether, and in regard to these places the revenue should be accounted for to ascertain the loss. I find that practically every year there has been a loss incurred by the government purchasing and reselling cheese. I want the minister to put his accountant to work to go through the ledger to verify the answer he gave me that the total expenditure was only one hundred and seven thousand odd dollars. I have the details here and could give the items of expenditure for each year, but the total amount is $108,623 not including from the first of July last year to the first of March, which measuring by what the expenditure in the same period of other years has been, will be between $20,000 or $25,000 more to add to the $108,000, making a total expenditure of $133,000 whereas the minister stated the total expenditure is only $107,000. Will the minister have his accountant go through the accounts again so as to give us the gross amount of expenditure in reply to the question I submitted, and the gross revenue, and let us see how much the country has lost? When these curing rooms were started I understood there were only to be four of them but now there are seven or eight. I want to know how much the country has lost by this sideshow of curing rooms for the benefit of political friends.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). I shall be very glad indeed to have the accountant go through these figures again. Perhaps, in order to facilitate, the hon. gentleman would be kind enough to let me have the details which he says he has and which have not been published in 'Hansard.' Of course my accountant only had the 'Hansard' report to go upon. My hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) speaks of what he calls the 'loss,' but he does not take into account the benefit which the experiments have reaped for the country and which far outbalance any apparent loss.

Mr. TAYLOR. I leave that to the cheese men in Brockville who say it is no benefit, and they have one of those curing rooms right under their nose.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend will have to leave it to the dairy men of the whole country.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton). On the 19th of March I asked the Minister of Customs for certain information, and he gave me to understand that if I asked for a return it would be placed on the table of the House immediately, and that he had the figures in his hand. I have not received that information.

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). I expected it would be down to-day; I will inquire about it.

RAINMAKING IN THE YUKON.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Have any steps been taken towards getting that order in council which was passed by the Yukon Council in reference to the contract with Hatfield. I have pressed for it two or three times in a good natured sort of way and have not got it, but I am afraid good nature has its limits.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I did not hear what the hon. gentleman was saying.

Mr. FOSTER. I referred to the rainmaking order in council.

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly not.

Mr. FOSTER. Certainly not, what?

Mr. OLIVER. Because the Department of the Interior has no jurisdiction over the action of the Yukon Council in matters in which it is locally concerned.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister mean to say that he does not propose to act between this House and the Yukon Council, as an intermediary to obtain that document? The commissioner of the Yukon was here at the

time this was being discussed. I have no doubt at all that the minister knows exactly what was done; if he does not he ought to. Does he mean to say that he is going to take no steps to satisfy the demands of parliament for the information required.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not aware that parliament made any demand. As soon as parliament makes any demand I will accede to it, but not until—

Mr. FOSTER. The other day I asked the minister whether he would bring that contract down without the formality of asking parliament to call for a return. I expected no other answer but that he would. I did not hear him say that he would not, and I certainly expected he would do that without being compelled to do it.

Mr. OLIVER. I beg to say that I have no recollection of hearing the hon. gentleman ask for it. If I had heard him ask for it I certainly would have given him the courtesy of an answer at the time. As the matter stands at present I am not aware that I, as administering the Interior Department, have any authority to call upon the Yukon Council to lay that document before this House.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister kindly make inquiry from the proper source as to whether he has that authority or not; as to whether there is any obligation upon him? When he gets that information will he kindly tell me whether or not he will do what I have very courteously requested him to do?

Mr. OLIVER. As I have no curiosity in the matter I will not make the inquiry. If the hon. member has knowledge of the matter he may bring to bear his knowledge on the country and the House to secure the information he requires.

Mr. FOSTER. Now we have a straight answer.

DOMINION GOVERNMENT STEAMERS.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR. The hon. member for Toronto asked me yesterday as to the government steamers that carry passengers, and I told him that only the 'Minto,' the 'Stanley' and the 'Champlain,' carried passengers. I inquired this morning and I find my statement is correct.

HALIFAX ARSENAL.

Mr. SAM HUGHES (Victoria). I have in my hand a very excellent journal seemingly, called 'Le Canada' and in it I find the statement that the maritime arsenal at Halifax has been taken over by the Canadian government, and that they are now in possession of it. What are the facts?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I would expect my hon. friend before he quotes a newspaper report and bases a request on it, would give some notice.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. This is dated April the 2nd and it says that at a cabinet meeting 'to-day,' the government has considered the offer made by the Imperial authorities to hand over to Canada the maritime arsenal at Halifax, and then it gives the details. If it was only done so lately as yesterday surely the cabinet ought to have some recollection of it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, there is no such thing.

LORD'S DAY OBSERVANCE.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 12) respecting the Lord's Day. He said: On moving the second reading of this Bill, I deem it necessary to offer some few brief words in explanation of its provisions. If I may judge by the criticism offered by some public bodies, by the press, by anonymous correspondents; it appears to me quite evident that the Bill has not been very generally read, or if read has been misunderstood. The Bill is entitled 'An Act respecting the Lord's Day'. From this it must not be inferred that it is intended to regulate or in any way to affect the question of the religious observance of the Sabbath. Religious freedom, legal equality amongst all religious denominations is an admitted principle of legislation in all the colonies of Great Britain, and is consecrated by the terms of the Consolidated Statutes of Canada, 1859, chapter 74, reproduced from the earlier statutes where it is especially declared that:

> In the state and condition of this province (Canada), to which such a principle is peculiarly applicable, it is desirable that the same shall receive the sanction of direct legislative authority, recognizing and declaring the same as a fundamental principle of our civil policy.

This Bill is really intended to provide a day of rest for all, so that each man may be free to abstain from labour, and if he so desires, to give one day in the week to the service of his Creator. In my judgment it is always desirable to abstain from placing an individual in the position of being obliged to choose between his honest religious convictions and his personal gain. There are, of course, in this country great commercial interests which have to be considered, and we have also to bear in mind the needs of the great consuming class, and I feel that a careful examination of this Bill will show that they have not been overlooked; and as hasty legislation is not to be desired, it is my intention to ask that this Bill be referred to a special committee, so that we may have ample opportunity to discuss it in all its details, to hear all the honest criticism that may be offered of any

of its provisions and to meet the reasonable needs of the community.

I know that among all classes Sunday is becoming more and more an accepted period for expeditions of some sort in pursuit of pleasure. I cannot say that personally I agree very much with that view of the day. This Bill is not intended in any way to facilitate or encourage these Sunday amusements. On the contrary it is intended to increase our regard for Sunday observance. It will be found, however, that its provisions in no way affect the right of any man to spend his Sunday in the open, in the fields or in the woods under the broad dome of Heaven, or in the public parks; and facilities which now exist by way of steam or electric railway or by ferry may still be utilized for that purpose. But that which the Bill is intended to prevent, that which I sincerely hope it will prevent, is the open shop, the exploitation of the public by the organizers of excursions, which, in too many instances, are little less than carousals, and also the opening of places of public amusement for entrance to which a fee is charged. Legitimate recreation and amusement are in no way interfered with, but the business of amusement will be prevented and I am not aware that such business deserves greater consideration than any other business. Ferries such as that to St. Helen's Island, in the neighbourhood of Montreal, to the Island of Orleans, in the neighbourhood of Quebec, and to Toronto Island, in the neighbourhood of Toronto, or other similarly situated localities, are protected, but if there is any doubt on that point the terms of the Bill may be amended in committee so as to make this provision absolutely clear.

With respect to amusements, ball, lacrosse, or any other game will be just as lawful as it is now, and pleasure parks as such, not run as a business and for gain, can be utilized to the same extent as under the existing law.

Perhaps I had better take up the clauses of the Bill.

Section 1 deals with definitions.

Section 2 provides that no sales are to be made, or business or work done, on the Lord's Day. Some such provision is to be found in the legislation of all nations, from, I think the very earliest times.

Section 3 makes an exception with respect to Quebec, and provides that in so far as that province is concerned, those sales that now take place on Sundays at the church door of small articles, the proceeds of the sale of which are intended for charitable purposes, may still continue to be held. Perhaps I may offer a word of explanation of the custom in our province in that regard. As members of the House are aware we have no such thing as a poor-house or a poor rate in the province of Quebec. Under our system the people of our parishes, making provision for the share of their worldly goods, which in their estimation belongs to the poor, bring these goods to the church door, and there they are auctioned by some one connected with the church. The proceeds of the sale are applied to the poor of the parish, and it is merely for that laudable object that these sales are held. It may also be necessary to amend that provision so as to enable us in our province to continue what we are now doing, that is to pass notarial deeds on the Sabbath by common consent between the two parties. As hon. gentlemen who come from our province are aware, there is provision in our Revised Statutes that on Sundays when the farmer comes down to church, if he desires to pass a deed with respect to a sale of property on that day, and both parties agree, they may go before a notary and if the deed is passed on that day, the sale is effective.

Mr. FOSTER. For a sale on that day?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Not for a sale on that day but the passing of the deed giving effect to the sale. As hon. gentlemen are aware, with us, a deed is only an evidence of a sale. The sale is perfected by the simple agreement between the parties. The title passes by the simple agreement and the document is only the evidence of the agreement.

The next provision, section 4, provides for works of necessity and makes other exceptions to the operation of section 2. It provides for exception:

(a). With respect to all necessary or customary work in connection with divine worship,

(b) For the sale of drugs and medicines. I think it will be necessary to amend that section, so as to make it applicable exclusively to sales by retail, because in the words used here might be found an excuse for the sale by wholesale of drugs and medicines on Sunday.

(c). The work of physicians and surgeons for the relief of sickness and suffering. I think in committee we might amend that so as to make that exception read:

Work for the relief of sickness and suffering.

without limiting it to the work of physicians and surgeons.

Then I think it might be necessary to make provision for the production of food for human subsistence. That would apply to the baker more especially. However, that is simply a suggestion.

(d) Receiving, transmitting or delivering telegraph or telephone messages.

(e) The conveying of travellers and His Majesty's mails.

(f) Maintaining fires or doing urgent repairs, in cases of emergency or other work of a like incidental character in connection with manufacturing processes.

(g) The continuance to their destination of railway trains in transit when the Lord's Day begins, which are loaded exclusively either with live stock, destined for immediate shipment at any ocean port or with perishable goods or both. I intend to amend that so as to provide for the shipment of grain at certain seasons of the year. It is equally important in order to avoid congestion, that grain should go forward to the ocean port, as it is that perishable goods should go forward.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you need the word 'exclusively' as it now reads?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No, I intend to amend that, and before the word 'both' at the end of subsection insert 'or with grain or with any of these articles.'

(h) The carriage to the next divisional point on any railway, or to the next regular port of call of any vessel, of any freight, which is in transit by any railway or vessel when the Lord's Day begins.

I think it will be necessary to add another subsection to provide for the hiring of horses and conveyances for any purpose that is not forbidden by the Act.

Section 5 prohibits games and performances where an admission fee is charged, and subsection 2 has reference to the charges for conveyance to performances to which an admission fee is charged, when the proprietors or managers of such performances, or their agents provide such conveyances.

Section 6 applies to excursions by conveyance where a fee is charged. It will be under that section that ferries will operate, and if the section is not broad enough to allow existing ferries to continue operating as they have done in the past, we will have to broaden it. Section 7 applies to pleasure grounds where a fee is charged and section 8 deals with advertisements of prohibited performances. Section 9 says:

> It shall not be lawful for any person on that day to shoot at any target, mark or other object, or to use any gun, rifle or other engine for that purpose.

That section is narrower than the section in the Sunday laws of the United Kingdom and those of the various provinces. Under these laws shooting game is prohibited. In none of them is the prohibition limited to target practice as here. It may be a question whether or not we should broaden the wording of that section.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the margin you would leave for a miss?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I am not competent to give an opinion on that point. Section 10 requires very careful consideration. It is exceedingly inquisitorial, and it will be necessary to consider how far we ought to permit encroachment on a man's private property or domicile. My hon. friends are aware that in our Criminal Code, in sections 570 and 572, provision is made whereby any constable or peace officer may search any vessel or vehicle or any of His Majesty's ships or any mill yard, &c., for public stores, intoxicating liquor or lumber. In these cases a search may be made without a warrant, but they are all cases of a special character, and this provision will have to be examined very closely so as to see whether or not it is open to abuse.

Section 11 provides for a penalty. Section 15 is an important section to which I ask particular attention, because it provides for the continuance of the Lord's Day Acts in force in the provinces. My hon. friends, who are familiar with provincial enactments, will admit that there are in the majority of the provinces, if not in all of them, laws much more stringent in their character than the Bill I have introduced.

Mr. FOSTER. Shall we have a synopsis of these provincial laws?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I have one here at the disposal of any hon. gentleman who wishes to consult it. It has been suggested in some quarters that this is a mere parsons' Bill. Well, all right thinking people admit that the parsons are an important element in this community, who have an undoubted title to be heard and are in a position to speak with authority on legislation such as we are now considering. And I am free to admit that I was glad to solicit and obtain from that element the benefit of their views and advice on this matter, But this Bill does not proceed from a mere puritanical desire to maintain the strictly sabbatarian view or, as I have already pointed out, to rigidly prohibit legitimate forms of amusement. Apart altogether from the question of religion, the observance of one rest day in seven is a matter of great physiological advantage to all who are leading a strenuous life, and there can be no reasonable doubt that it would largely contribute to maintain and improve the physical and intellectual vigour of our people. One of the first obstacles in the way of legislation will be the religious convictions of some elements in our community; but, as the Archbishop of Canterbury pointed out during the course of a recent debate in the English House of Lords, it is not desirable for us to be too considerate of the wishes of alien immigrants who, as he justly said, while they are obtaining the benefits which this country is affording them, will not be subjected to undue hardship if they are obliged, in the public interests, to obey any rules which we, as a Christian community, find it necessary to lay down for the observance of the Sunday.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

Mr. FITZPATRICK moved that the Bill be referred to a select committee to be composed of members to be named hereafter.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY—RAILWAY LAND GRANTS.

House resumed adjourned debate on the motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair for the House to go into Committee of Supply and the motion of Mr. W. J. Roche in amendment thereto.

Mr. THOS. GREENWAY (Lisgar). As hon. members are aware, Mr. Speaker, my position has hitherto been that of a listener rather than a participant in debate; and if I depart somewhat on this occasion from my usual course, the importance of the subject, which my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) has brought before us, must plead my excuse. Ever since my first recollection of the province from which I hail, land for the settler has been the most serious question we have been called upon to consider. The lack of knowledge perhaps in the early days of the value of the lands of that western country, led to very grievous mistakes. One of the worst of these mistakes was in the first organizations of the province of Manitoba. A little province, of a very few square miles, extending as far west as range 12, west of the first principal meridian, was mapped out. Some ten or eleven years later that province was enlarged, but it is still not as large as the large minded westerner would like to have it. Some of our friends have been calling in derision, the province of Manitoba, especially since the erection of the two sister prairie provinces, a postage stamp upon the map. I am free to admit that it is entirely too small, and I hope that in the very near future the government will see their way clear, in the negotiations which they shall have with the other provinces, to make Manitoba a good deal larger, but I must say that, on account of the mistakes to which I have referred, the province of Manitoba can never be the size it ought to be. That province was in the early days the victim of a policy which was entirely the opposite of that which my hon. friend has enunciated in his amendment. I have said that the province was too small, but the area, so far as the settlers were concerned, was very much limited by the action of the government in granting large tracts of land to railway and other corporations; and I speak with a knowledge of the land regulations which I have acquired during many years during which I have been intimately associated with the work of developing the province of Manitoba and from having been for more than a quarter of a century intimately connected with the development more especially of a part of it.

I know that there were large areas that, through the action of the government, fell into the hands of speculators, and many of them still remain there. I referred a moment ago to the smallness of the province. Perhaps I could better illustrate the effect of the policy of the early days upon the province of Manitoba by giving a comparison of the area under crop of last year. The total cultivated area in the province of Manitoba last year was 4,140,898 acres. There were 42,320 farmers cultivating that area, and they produced 55,761,416 bushels of wheat, 45,424,000 bushels of oats, 14,064,175 bushels of barley, 173,075 bushels of rye and 53,706 bushels of peas—a total of 115,863,361 bushels of grain produced on something over four million acres of land by something over forty-two thousand farmers. It appears to me that the question of the land for the settlers is most important in that province, for a careful calculation which I have frequently made shows a fact —of which I would ask some hon. members who do not seem to have a clear idea of the resources of that great country to take careful note—that this cultivated area which would now be much larger but for the old land policy can be multiplied by at least five in the little province of Manitoba, to say nothing of the province of Saskatchewan, that magnificent province, or the province of Alberta. And, in passing, I may say that I was pleased to notice that Saskatchewan outdid in production the older province of Manitoba, so far as the average yield was concerned. I refer to these matters principally for the purpose of showing the importance of this subject and to bring out more clearly the fact that this area, which is not now cultivated, has been locked up by a policy pursued in reference to Manitoba a good many years ago. Now, I was much pleased that my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) had brought this resolution before the House; because, Sir, I like to have members like that hon. gentleman assisting us in this work of securing the land for the settlers. It shall be my aim, so long as I have a seat in this House, or so long as I have a place of influence anywhere, to do anything I can to help any proposal, no matter from where it may emanate, to promote the interest of the people of the west. And, Sir, I do not think that the western man can be fairly accused of taking a sectional view of affairs when he voices such a determination. Foremost in my mind, the guiding star of my action in public affairs, is the interest of the west; and in that I believe I am best promoting the interest of Canada, because of the great possibilities of that splendid western country.

It appears to me that the principal object of the hon. gentleman (Mr. W. J. Roche) in bringing this question before this House was to discredit the scheme inaugurated

some years ago, that of the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company. Now, perhaps, it would be well for us to consider this scheme. I have a list here of the land companies that have been formed to handle the lands of that western country. There are twenty-six of them. And, Mr. Speaker, this is the first company that has ever carried out what it undertook to do.

As has been already remarked by some gentlemen who have spoken upon this subject, the land which this company took over was considered to be not of much use for settlement purposes. Years ago we held it to be true that the 'American Desert,' as we called it, ran up into the Northwest and extended east as far as the present Soo line of railway and west to take in the country now under discussion. The Qu'Appelle and Long Lake Railway was built in 1890 and ran up through this country. The Qu'Appelle and Long Lake land grant, which these gentlemen took over, they purchased from Messrs. Osler, Hammond and Nanton, who represented that company—good business men. For part which they acquired from the company they paid $1.25 per acre. Messrs. Osler, Hammond and Nanton, representing the railway company, had sent their examiner over this land and he had come back with the report that the land did not come within the terms of the contract which had been made with the government, in that it was not fit for settlement.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When was that?

Mr. GREENWAY. It was some time before the company of which I am speaking bought from the railway company.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. About 1899 or 1900?

Mr. GREENWAY. Somewhere along there. I do not recollect the date; I am merely relating the circumstance.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of course, the date is important.

Mr. GREENWAY. I presume that we can get the date. But, as I have said, this examiner came back and said that this land was not fit for settlement. The company then asked the government for leave to bring an action against the government for the purpose of showing that he land was not fit for settlement and to have the terms varied. While this suit was pending this company came forward and bought the land from the railway company, relieving the government of the suit, and entered upon the work they proposed to do. The leading spirits of the company of which I am speaking—immigration company, if you choose to call it so—had been engaged in similar work in Minnesota for years. They had purchased from the Northern Pacific people—who are business people and do things in a business like way—some 670,000 acres $1.07 per acre some of which land was within 100 miles of the cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If I do not interrupt the hon. gentleman (Mr. Greenway), I would like to ask a question?

Mr. GREENWAY. Certainly.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman calls this an 'immigration company.' Was there any provision in the agreement between this company and the government that the persons to be settled on these lands should be immigrants? Were not the conditions perfectly satisfied if residents were settled on these lands?

Mr. GREENWAY. Yes, I think so, but the company brought in large numbers from the United States as a result of the contract with the government. I am reminded that my hon. friend undertook the other day to make what he thought a point out of an interjection he made while my hon. friend from East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) was speaking, saying that this company had brought in large numbers of immigrants saying he understood we upon this side of the House claimed the government had brought in the people. I will give him some examples before I have done, I will give him some illustrations of what has been done upon this land where a gopher could not live. The hon. gentleman thought he had made a point against my hon. friend from East Assiniboia when he said that the government had been bringing these people into the country, and had made a bargain with the company. Well, if the government made a bargain with the company the result of which was to bring people into the country, are not the government entitled to credit for it?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Certainly. But will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him this for information: Did the government make a bargain with the company that the latter should bring immigrants into the country, or was it not the bargain that certain people either from other points in Canada or out of Canada, should be settled on that land?

Mr. GREENWAY. I think the bargain made with the government was that the company should put settlers on these lands.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Whether coming from outside Canada or not?

Mr. GREENWAY. Yes, I think so, I do not exactly remember the details of the bargain. But I promised to give the hon. gentleman some of the results obtained on this land concerning which we are told that after these people had gone over the lands and examined them they came to the conclusion that they were unfit for settlement, and that they would

take steps to get rid of the load which had been put upon them. As I remarked a while ago, the railway was built in 1890. It ran for ten or twelve years before this bargain was made, from Lumsden to Saskatoon, a distance of 140 miles. I believe I am speaking within bounds when I say that there was not a single agent along the line ; there was not a furrow turned in sight of the railway, there was not a homestead, properly so-called, for cultivation purposes. What is the result now ? Along that same line there are a number of towns with a population varying from 300 to 600, where a large amount of business is done, supplied with schools, churches elevators and all the other advantages which our little towns in the west enjoy. Our hon. friends opposite seem especially to object to the manner of advertising that was employed, and they read extracts from advertisements of the land company which they considered objectionable. These gentlemen came to the government and wanted to get the even numbered sections in order that they might do what they had done on the other side of the line where they had run large farms, and they wanted the even numbered sections to be allotted. They came to the government and wanted to buy. They were told, so I am informed in the department, that the government would not sell. They went away, and came back again, and said: We will undertake to buy and settle these lands. That was another proposition. Now here was the difference between the manner in which this government did business and the manner in which the former government did business with colonization companies. When these men made that promise the government said : We do not know whether you will keep your promise or not, and we want you put up security that you will. The government demanded a security of $50,000, which the company put up. Now that looked to me like a business transaction. But I was going to refer to the mode of advertising which this company adopted, but which the government could not adopt. The first thing they did after acquiring the land was to go south—and I call especially to this the attention of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, because it seems that a great part of the people came in from the south, I know most of them did. Well, these men went south, they chartered a train with eight sleepers, a dining car and other cars, and travelled from Chicago to Prince Albert, with four hundred guests, among whom were some very prominent citizens. For instance, there was the president of the First National Bank of Chicago, Mr. James Fargin, as one of the delegation ; Governor Lynn, of Minnesota, was one of the delegation ; ex-Governor Miller, of Dakota, was one of the delegation. So this company determined at the beginning what they would do. They brought in 400 guests, including leading business men, leading farmers, all men who knew what the country was when they saw it, because they were acquainted with a similar country on the other side of the line. The company took these men in there to be witnesses of what they had seen. They took them in there and entertained them, and the result was that they did bring people in from the south of the line.

I will give my hon. friend another illustration, another evidence of what has been done ; I will give him the names of two gentlemen who have been farming in this district since 1902. One of them lived near one of the towns I referred to a while ago, and I will mention some of those towns now : Craig, Girvan, Davidson, Bladworth, Hanley, Dundurn, and there are half a dozen others along the line of 140 miles which was a desert previously. Well, Sir, these gentlemen brought in one man that is worthy of notice. He came from the state of Illinois, Mr. Detcheu, who lives near Davidson. He came in in 1902, four years ago next June. He grew last year from this desert over 3,000 acres of wheat, and from 500 to 600 acres of oats and barley. He had over 100,000 bushels of grain. Was not such a result worth the effort that was made? There is another gentleman, Mr. Meilike, of Dundurn, he had last year 46,540 bushels of wheat.

There are those who know that this gentleman after his season's operations, after he had threshed his grain and after he had marketed it, placed in the bank $31,000—the result of an effort to reclaim a portion of the desert. Now, Sir, it does appear to me that it was not a very good subject for my hon. friends to speak of. I see my hon. friend from one of the divisions of Montreal laughing. He amused me the other day, in view of what I know has been done in that country up there and how our progress was retarded in years gone by, when he set up the wail : What are we going to do for land ? It is nearly all gone, he says. It has occurred to me and I will repeat now that if my hon. friend's political friends had remained in power he would have died of old age before he could have made that wail, and Sir, I have here an evidence of that to which I would also refer. I have here a list of the homestead entries since the year 1874 down to the last day of last December. Let us look at it for a moment. I am sure it will be interesting to my hon. friend. Homestead entries varied a little, not very much, from 1,000 to 2,000, and in one of the years when there was a little movement they went to 4,000 and in another to 6,000, and so on down to the last year of Conservative rule. We had dark days in Manitoba at that time. I remember them and one of the most dismal was the last year of Conservative rule. The homestead entries for 1896 numbered

1,857. So that my hon. friend will see that if that had gone on there would have been plenty of land for generations so come. What has been the result since ? The vigorous immigration policy my hon. friends adopted on taking office, the vigorous work that was done in the Department of the Interior, the knowledge that was spread of the capabilities of the country resulted in this that there was about a doubling in the next year, then the number went to 4,000 odd, then, in 1899, it went to nearly 7,000 in 1900 to 7,426, in 1901 to 8,167, in 1902, when this movement of which I have been speaking began, to 14,673, in 1903 to 31,383, in 1904 to 26,073, in 1905 to 30,819 and in the six months ended 31st December 1905 it was 17,771. From the reports which we get now these homesteads entries are increasing every month. I know we shall require to look around for some more land. I know it will be a good thing by and by if we can get the odd numbered sections, but that reminds me of another little matter that I must point out especially for the benefit of my hon. friends who moved and seconded this resolution. In 1899 the government of Manitoba acquired from the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company, for the purpose of discharging a debt that they owed to the government, 542,000 acres of land and they acquired from Messrs. Mackenzie and Mann, who had themselves acquired the Hudson's Bay Railway charter, 256,000 acres of land in settlement of an old claim which the government had against them, or in round numbers 800,000 acres of land, or about half the area which is under consideration in the motion of my hon. friend. These were odd numbered sections. The government of that day, in that year, formulated a policy in reference to this land. They said : Now the time has come when we want to make an impression upon the other side of the line because we all recognize that if we are to get a large influx of population it must come from the south and we want to interest those people. We knew that their lands were pretty scarce and we said that we would take this plan. We said : We will advertise in the papers to the south of us that the government hold in the province of Manitoba 800,000 acres of land which they propose to sell with settlement duties to the actual settler for $3 an acre on easy terms of payment. There was, to my mind, a grand opportunity to give the people a chance to get land—land for the settler. Where were my hon. friends when this was being done ? They were all denouncing the government for having made such a bargain which turned out to be a grand one in the interest of their own friends. They opposed the government. A government came into power of the political stripe of my hon. friends. What did they do ? I have before me a copy of a return which was brought down to the legislature of Manitoba some time ago. I do not propose to weary the House by reading it but I propose to take two or three specimen bricks out of this return and show the admirable manner in which these gentlemen undertook to give the land to the settler. For instance, some of this land of which I have been speaking was sold to Mr. J. M. Savage, a gentleman who, at one time, I believe, was a Conservative candidate. I think he lived outside of our province. In any case it was not a quarter section but it was 14,748 acres and it was sold at $2.50 an acre. They sold to the brother-in-law of the late treasurer—my hon. friend who comes from that country will know him—a Mr. Hamilton—Hamilton and Forrest were the firm—and by the way they made up firms for the purpose of disposing of these lands—41,305 acres at $2.50 an acre.

Mr. CONMEE. Were there settlement duties attached ?

Mr. GREENWAY. No, not that kind of settlement we are talking about. I might give a long list of such transactions; but sufficient to say they sold to Robert Ridd an employee of the government working for $700 a year a tract of land comprising 6,841 acres at $2,40 an acre. This gentleman immediately transferred it to another friend of his who was working in the same department, and he in turn sold it to some capitalist at $10 per acre. The lands for the settler indeed. Then Sir, we have a gentleman, a Conservative organizer I am told. I think he is at Portage La Prairie, named W. Richardson, I shall only give this one other illustration, and the only surprise is where in the world this man got the money to buy the land even at that price; they sold him 80,386 acres at $3 an acre ; then the 25,000 acres were sold in one lot at $1.56 an acre That is the kind of policy my hon. friends opposite have been supporting and are supporting, because I cannot conceive that under any possible circumstances they would do anything else than support the gentleman of whom I am speaking. If they did, it would be a very great surprise to me, and it is this sort of thing that leads me to think my hon. friend is not quite sincere and has not got quite converted to the idea that the land ought to be conserved for the settler. I said a while ago that it was because of a want of appreciation that lands were wasted as they were years ago, and I am willing that it should go that way. But that is not the case now. Our western lands are so much appreciated now that every one wants a piece of Manitoba land, a piece of Saskatchewan land, a piece of Alberta land; it is the best thing, Mr. Speaker, in which to invest that there is under the sun. And people are beginning to realize that. And the reason of that is that the land in

that country is intrinsically worth more money than it is valued for to-day because of the amount that can be produced from it. That is what makes it valuable. Why Sir, in the old days of 1879 when the regulations came in reserving the odd numbered sections which made our settlement very sparse, we went in there and we got 320 acres of land (half a mile by a mile) and the settlement looked very sparse to the former Ontario man. But when you came to take out of that the odd numbered sections as was done on the first of August, 1879, that made the matter so much worse. Then, the Canadian Pacific Railway bargain was made and lands were belted A, B, C, D, E. I happened luckily to live near the international boundary in belt E. When that regulation came in we could buy these lands in belt E at one dollar an acre. We could do more than that, and that helped to make settlements still more sparse; men who had taken previous to that the odd numbered sections as homesteads and pre-emption, could abandon them and could what was called railroad them. That is what I did myself. I abandoned my homestead and pre-emption and bought it as a railway half section at a dollar an acre. And, Sir, notwithstanding the present rush to the west, and a great many are going from our district to the west, land in that vicinity is to-day worth from $30 to $40 an acre. So that the whole land question is changed; the value of land has changed. I went into Manitoba in 1878, I was engaged by the way in immigration work, in running solid trains via Chicago to Manitoba from western Ontario, and I took in the first party that was taken to the southern Manitoba town of Emerson. We came in conflict with the Americans who were trying to settle Dakota and Minnesota; they would continually board our train along the line and try to induce our people not to go up into the frozen country as they called it. My first year there was in 1879 and when we were getting nicely at work, what was done by the government? While people were looking for land and anxious to get all the land they could, because the moment a man saw it he knew what it was going to be. The Conservative government was then in power, and I think my hon. friend from North Toronto was in the government at the time, and the Conservative government who were giving away large areas to colonization companies and all that sort of thing; the Conservative government provided that the homestead and pre-emption should be reduced from 160 each to 80 acres; 80 acres for a homestead and 80 acres for a pre-emption. That regulation was in existence for several months and it did more to settle up Northern Dakota with Canadians, of which there are a very large number there, than anything else that was ever done. That is the way the Conservative government was keeping the land for the settler in those days. I shall not refer to the colonization companies of these days in detail, I shall not weary the House. I have here a list of the colonization companies which were formed and dealt with, in the eighties. There are over 20 of them—Armstrong and Cook, The Montreal Western Land Company, The Dominion Lands Colonization Company, The Edmonton and Saskatchewan Land Company, The Farmer's Northwest Land and Colonization Company, The Prince Albert Colonization Company, The Primitive Methodist Colonization Company, The Temperance Colonization Society and a number of others. Now, what was the result of that policy of the Conservative government; what did it accomplish? The whole box and dice of the colonization societies paid the government $731,783.93.

Mr. GAUVREAU. For how much land?

Mr. GREENWAY. I was going to tell the hon. gentleman that; for 438,208 acres of land and 375,518 acres of scrip, in all 813,726 acres and for all that land and scrip all they paid was 85 cents an acre, and they accomplished the magnificient work of settling 1,243 people. That was the whole result of that great scheme of colonization under the Conservative government. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the present government had been remiss in its duty in not having the lands selected as they ought to have been, I for one would have voted against the government. What is the actual result. The late Conservative government, patented to railway companies on account of land grants up to the first of July, 1896, 1,965,191 acres or less than 2,000,000 acres. Since July 1896 this government have patented 22,338,259 acres. There remain to be patented 6,319,024 acres, and there remain to be selected, on account of railway land subsidies less than 1,750,000 acres. It does appear to me that the government have had in view what was in the best interests of the west, and I believe that if my hon. friend lives for another ten years, and I hope he will live longer than that, and pursues the same policy that he has been doing in reference to the work—and our friends opposite ought not to forget the west, the west is going to be the great country——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. GREENWAY. Lord Dufferin said upon the occasion of his visit to that country that Winnipeg was the hub. I believe, Sir, that by the year 1916, ten years from to-day, we will have as many people west of the Great Lakes in Canada as we have east of them, and that, Sir, is due, it must be due, and it ought to be credited to the vigorous or individual work that has been done; and no one single agency has had more to do with that than the agency to which

I was referring a little while ago, that land company, which took hold of the thing, as Americans usually do, in a vigorous manner. I said we had dark days in Manitoba, I remember them very distinctly, and I remember, Sir, the struggles in which I was engaged, and I recall this in passing, just to refresh the minds of the hon. gentlemen who are now so much interested in the far west. It may be remembered that we had a Canadian Pacific Railway contract, passed I think in 1881. It contained a monopoly clause and notwithstanding that very little was known of that country it began to develop and they saw that they needed other railways and they chartered them but as fast as they were chartered the charters were sent down here and disallowed. We could not have other railways, and one of the most strenuous periods of my life was a period of about five years during which I undertook to speak and to agitate the people of Manitoba on that question until the people looked at it in the proper light and they elected men to office who would look after their interest in that regard. And where was my hon. friend then ? Was he up helping to take off the shackles and the weights that were preventing the progress of Manitoba? No, he was helping to make them tighter. The people of Manitoba changed, they elected other representatives and I had the honour in 1888 of being requested to come to Ottawa by the then premier, Sir John A. Macdonald, and in a few weeks we got that re-adjusted, we got the shackles taken off and now my friend can get up and say : We can get the Great Northern to Boissevain, we can get the Great Northern to any other place. Why ? Because of the change that was made in the policy at that time.

My friends have one and all spoken of the Hudson's Bay Railway. I shall turn from no one in my advocacy of the Hudson's Bay Railway. I look on it as the natural outlet of that great country and no matter how many railways we may get we shall need them all when these millions of acres are under cultivation. And we want the Hudson's Bay Railway if it were for nothing else than as an outlet for our cattle and dairy products. The shorter line to tide water the shorter line upon the ocean, the line that has been traversed by the old Hudson's Bay craft for over 200 years, will you tell me that with the improved ice going steamers and all that sort of thing it cannot be successfully operated now ? I have never had any doubt about that for years. I agree with some gentlemen who have spoken that we ought to have this railway free of any cost to the provinces, that ought to be built because of the vast interests which Canada has there, the largest asset that she has—it ought to be undertaken from here. But Sir, in the light of what I have been saying about land and the change that has come over the value of land, I beg to submit to my hon. friend that the land grant for the Hudson's Bay Railway is entirely too large and it is in this position : The land grant north of the Saskatchewan river, lapsed last January. The land grant south, from Erwood, to the Saskatchewan 90 miles, is still in force, and will be for two years, so on account of the state of that land grant I think my hon. friends might well consider whether or not some other bargain cannot be made for the building of the Hudson's Bay Railway. I presume that after the experience of the Minister of Railways in reference to railway operations he would not care to build it as a Dominion work ; that would be perhaps a very good way of doing it. But it does appear to me that the whole question, now that the land grant has lapsed to that extent, may be revived and it may be considered what it is worth to build that railway. I believe that the railway can be built and equipped for one half the proceeds of that land grant. Believing that, Sir, I join with my friend in trying to do what we can to save as much land as possible for the actual settler.

Let me say a word in conclusion to illustrate what I believe to be the policy of the government—and it appears now to be the policy of our friends on the other side--that the land is for the settler. I am quite sure I am speaking within bounds when I say that half of the correspondence which I get is from gentlemen who have become possessed of knowledge of the Northwest and want to buy a piece of land. Well, Sir, I have now got it in this shape that I have a stereotyped answer : No matter what may have been the policy of the governments of Canada in the past, the policy of this government now is to sell no land except the school lands which are sold at public auction, so that you cannot buy land, you have to go and settle upon it, become an ordinary settler, develop it, and that is the only way that it can be acquired. I do not know whether that was the matter with my hon. friend when he went to the west and saw the scarcity of land, saw that it was not possible to buy from the government at a cheap rate. I believe there are companies that can supply land of that class and their charges are not to be considered as exorbitant. All the best companies, the Hudson's Bay Company, for instance, a little while ago, before I left home, increased the price of land very largely. I forget the percentage of advance, but they did more than that ; they said, we will only sell one half of any parcel that we have in any particular district. If we have a section there we will sell one half ; if we have a half section we will sell one half of it. If we have a section, we will sell one half and wait to reap a greater profit out of the efforts of the settlers before we part with the balance. That was the condition years ago. People went in and settled that country in those days under arduous circumstances. Many of us had to

drive a hundred miles before we could reach a railway, and we were not allowed to construct railways there for a good many years. I have only to say again that I hope hon. members will take a broad view of the question affecting the Northwest, in the interest, not only of the Northwest, but of the whole Dominion, I was pleased to see to-day that our Governor General spoke of us as a nation.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. GREENWAY. He dropped the word 'colony.' We ought to be a nation. But how would you build your nation if you had not the west? Somewhere in this building I have noticed a minature reproduction of the arch which we had in London some years ago and upon which the designer had printed the words 'Canada, Britain's Granary.' What was it that led him to put that inscription over that arch? Was it the grand old provinces of Ontario and Quebec? No, it was because of the vast wheat fields of the west, capable of producing food for the whole British empire.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). I have listened with a great deal of interest to my hon. friend (Mr. Greenway) who has just taken his seat and so no doubt has every hon. member in this House. I always like to hear from the pioneers, and we all recognize in the hon. gentleman one of the pioneers of our great western country, and I believe one of its successful pioneers. But whilst listening to him with much interest. I could not help thinking how strangely sometimes the best of people will confuse cause with effect and how effectively in one part of his argument, a man may efface the point made in an earlier part of it. Let me analyse some of the arguments that have been made and some of the expressions used by my hon. friend and others who have spoken on that side. I thought I discerned, in the expressions used by many of them, a kind of sneer. I thought they indulged in a sneering reflection on the sincerity of hon. gentlemen on this side regarding the interest they take in the Northwest. I hope I was mistaken.

Mr. GREENWAY. Does the hon. gentleman refer to me?

Mr. FOSTER. I did not particularly refer to my hon. friend, but I was merely pointing out what I thought was discernable in some of the speeches that have been made on his side. Might I ask if that attitude is not rather misplaced? Is it wise or consistent with common sense? Supposing hon. gentlemen opposite should think that the political party to which they are opposed was at one time mistaken in its policy for the development of the Northwest, is it wise on their part, if they think that party has come around to their views, to warn it off? My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) was a particular sinner in that regard. He declared, in his opening sentences, that we on this side had come to think exactly with hon. gentlemen opposite, and then he proceeded to empty the vials of his wrath on our devoted heads for having done so. He went back to ancient history and pulled out of its musty records—not what he thought he was pulling out. He wanted an argument but all he got was a catch-cry. That cry however captivated him. It was 'the land for the settler.' That he said was the motto of the Liberals, and in contrast with that was 'the land for the speculator,' which he declared was the motto of the Liberal Conservatives. Well, I am quite ready to admit that the cry was a capital one if it only had some basis. But let us see if there was any basis for this catch-cry taken up by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) and repeated by subsequent speakers on that side, including my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Greenway).

In his first sentence my hon. friend (Mr. Greenway) who has just sat down declared that the only reason for this motion of my hon. friend (Mr. Roche) is a desire to discredit the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company. Well, that may be his opinion, but I venture to say that it is not a correct one. No doubt, however, he will cling to his own opinion whether it be correct or not. And in defence of the government my hon. friend said that that company was one of the most beneficent agencies—and in saying this he parodied something which Lord Rosebery had said before with reference to a greater subject—that had ever been employed in order to rouse up and settle the Northwest. Heaven help us if that was the most beneficient of all the agencies in the development of that country. But into that question we shall look a little later.

But my hon. friend went on the same tack as the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) in conjuring up his historic conflict between the speculators and the settlers and in charging the Liberal Conservative party with having been the aiders and abettors of the former. Let me ask the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) and my hon. friend (Mr. Greenway) to go back and follow the course of legislation in 1871, 1872, 1874, 1879, 1880 and up to the present, and let me put to him this question. When the two parties ranged themselves up on this question—much more difficult then, when we were looking forward into the mist and dimness, than it appears now when we are looking backwards, after twenty-five years have elapsed—let me ask these hon. gentlemen if this was not true. Was it not true that when the two parties ranged themselves up on the great question of building a railway to the Pacific coast in order to open up the great Northwest, there was absolutely not a shadow of difference between them as to how that railway was to be built from the point of view of ways and means? The plans and the routes were different but the ways and means

were absolutely the same. In 1871 the Canadian Pacific Railway Act was passed—the first one. It was passed by Sir John Macdonald and his government and the party which supported him.

What was the basis, financial and otherwise that lay under that Act ? It was three fold : First, that the existing rate of taxation, the burden of taxes upon the people, should not be increased ; second, that there should be a money subsidy ; third, that the lands of Manitoba and the Northwest lying along side the road should be used to build the road. On these points in the legislation of 1871 both parties, one led by Sir John Macdonald and the other by Alexander Mackenzie, were agreed. After the failure to secure capital for the building of the road under the Act of 1871, the Act of 1872 was passed. This Act, in so many words, laid down the very same three essential principles. And there was no difference of opinion as between the two sides of the House. The government of Sir John Macdonald went out, and the government of Alexander Mackenzie came in. In 1874, under the direction of the new government, a new Canadian Pacific Railway Act was passed. What do we find in that Act ? My hon. friend had something unfavourable to say about devoting alternate blocks of land fronting the railway to the building of the road. Yet the same three principles as before were laid down. The tariff had been somewhat increased making the rate of taxation slightly higher; but it was laid down in the Act that the country should not be unnecessarily burdened ; that there was to be a cash subsidy of $10,000 a mile ; and that there was to be a land subsidy not exceeding 20,000 acres per mile, to be taken from lands lying alongside the railway through Manitoba and the Northwest. In 1879, after the Mackenzie government had gone out and when Sir John Macdonald was again in power, there was still substantial agreement between the parties on the question of the money subsidy and the land subsidy.

Now, Sir, if it was the accepted principle in 1871, in 1872, in 1874 and 1879, that the road was to built without unnecessarily burdening the country, that a money grant was to be given, and that a land grant was to be given, laid out in alternate sections in a belt of from three to six miles along the whole line of the road, how does the Minister of the Interior, or how does any other man, substantiate this figment of the imagination that there was a continuous battle between the two parties with reference to the land grant of the Canadian Pacific Railway ? How, were the lands to be utilized in the legislation of 1874 ? Two-thirds of them were to be sold by the government, after agreeing with the contractor upon a price, and the money was to go to the contractor ; and one-third was to be granted to the contractor direct. In either case the land would be in the hands of speculators, would it not ? Did Mr. Mackenzie suppose, when he was penning that legislation and putting it through parliament, that if two-thirds of the land set aside for the benefit of the contractors were sold, it would be sold exclusively to settlers ? Would it not be sold to whoever would buy at the price agreed upon and the proceeds handed over to the contractors ? And the buyers would properly be speculators, would they not ? And the one-third was to go directly into the hands of the contractors. Well, were they to settle upon it themselves, or were they to speculate ? They would sell out at the best price they could get. What, then becomes of this figment of the imagination, of the Minister of the Interior ? He saw what looked like the end of a strong argument ; he seized it and pulled it out, but it turns out that it is something far different from what he expected.

'The land for the settlers,' says the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) : 'I stand by the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company ; I stand by the government that made that deal with the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company. Why ? Because I love the settler, and I stand for the principle the land for the settler.' The Saskatchewan Vallley Land Company bought 250,000 acres of land at $1 per acre ; the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company sold out every acre of that land at prices which will yield to them on the average more than $7 per acre. Will anybody deny it ? Why it is absolutely undeniable. If the government had adopted the rule of the land for the settler, and not the land for the speculator, they would have sold that land to the settler at from $1 to $3 per acre. But, to-day, when the settler goes to get the land, he does not face a beneficent and paternal government anxious for his welfare. He faces the stern visage of the speculator, who says : 'You can have that land, but you shall pay me $8, $10 or $12 an acre.' 'And who are you?' inquires the settler. 'We are the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company.' 'And where did you get your land ?' 'From the government.' 'What did you pay the government for it ?' 'We paid a dollar an acre.'

But, says the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway), they made the land. Why, what an idea for a sensible, good looking man like my hon. friend to put forth to a reasonable assembly. The hon. gentleman declares that this land was a desert before the company bought it. Yet this land which he says was a desert in 1902 had upon it in 1904 one man who raised, according to the hon. gentleman's own statement, 100,000 bushels of grain and another who raised 46,540 bushels of wheat ;—a desert one year, a garden the next, all brought about by the wonder-working Saskatchewan Valley Land

Company. The speech of the hon. member for West Assiniboia (Mr. Knowles), we did not take seriously, because it was not meant to be a serious speech. But one passage in it was quite pathetic. He said that that great tract was known as 'no man's land.' The poor freighter groaned when he approached it and he heaved a great sigh of relief when he had passed successfully through it. It was a great salt desert; it was shunned by humanity and was left to the disputed, or divided, sovereignty of the gopher and the prairie chicken. And the Minister of the Interior, in 1902, said the land was absolutely valueless. Mr. Speaker, what a wonderful country we live in, and in what a wonderful age. Here is a tract of half a million acres: On December 15, 1902, it is a salt desert, it is 'no man's land,' shunned by humanity and taken possession of only by the gopher and the prairie chicken. In 1903, one year afterward it is a veritable paradise, a land growing any quantity of wheat, with smiling farms in every direction, villages growing as though by magic and a town rising fair and stately at every other station along the line of railway which passes through it. And what brought about the change? The Saskatchewan Valley Land Company. Where is Hatfield's magic now? Why it pales into insignificance before the wonderful alchemy which is directed by the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company. But is there not another reason? Where were these officers and employees of the government? Asleep, as they declared, over a desert, when, in reality they were sleeping upon a garden of wonderful of inexhaustible capacity. Where were they that they found out none of the richness, none of the fertility of this great section of land, when, within six months after they made the sale, it was found to be all that could be desired, and has since proven itself to be of wonderful richness, and fertility and producing power.

Well, my hon. friend says that the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company brought this about. They immediately went to work and got 400 guests together, and a splendid train of bankers, business men, magnates of every kind, ex-governors and governors, and they took them all up there, fed them well, and showed them the country. These, Mr. Speaker, were the settlers that came into that country, each one of them taking up his 160 acres and settling down to till the soil, under the aegis of that benevolent government which always stands for the settler and never for the speculator. Is it not allowable for us to think that this Saskatchewan Land Company went down with malice prepense and aforethought into the southern country, and that they there gathered together bankers, business men, magnates, potentates and powers, and took them up, showed them the richness of this promised land, then kindly took them back again, back as the buyers of wholesale blocks, and as men who would recommend the buying by other speculators, and perhaps in some cases, by settlers as well in that great northern country? But be it remarked, Mr. Speaker, that when a settler purchased one of these sections of land, he did not get it at a dollar an acre from the government that represented the settlers, but he had to pay $7, $8 or $10 an acre to these dear gentlemen who, I think, were little else than speculators. Less than one year after the company got that purchase they said in their own literature that they had sold every bit of it out. To settlers? Not at all. They were speculators, and they sold it out to the speculators who came in to make their profit again. Since the 1st day of September of last year the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company has sold more than one million acres of land, of the land that they possessed in that territory. Have they sold it to settlers or to speculators? My hon. friend from East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) declared himself as very much in favour of the settler as against the speculator, and then again in the most amusing manner he undertook to upset his own contention. Here is the way he described these gentlemen:

> A good many of the members of that company were Americans, and the settlers they brought in were practically all Americans. The way that they disposed of the land was this: They sell a man 10,000 acres at wholesale prices, this man goes back to the part of the country where he was known, and he would arrange a sale of that land to settlers and bring them in and put them on the land.

It was not the government that sold to the settlers at $1 an acre, it was the speculator who received the land at $1 an acre, and then sold it to other speculators in 10,000 acre lots, and when this at last got to the settler, they made him pay a round price per acre of $7, $8, $9 or $10 before he could till a single acre of that soil. My hon friend absolutely answered himself.

But my hon. friend who spoke this afternoon (Mr. Greenway) seemed to make it a grievance that the present Manitoba government sold lands at $2.50 and $3 per acre. Why did he so condemn them, and at the same time why did he so strenuously argue in favour of the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company and the present government that sold to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company at $1 per acre? Surely, the Manitoba government selling at $2.50 or $3 must stand in a better position than the present government selling land in the valley and garden of the country at $1 per acre. He condemns the one, and yet he stands up for the other. Where is the consistency of the hon. gentleman? But again he says: There were dark days in those times. What days were those in Manitoba, the days when my hon. friend was in power in Manitoba? Things have changed since then. Another government is in power, and may I ask my

hon. friend to note what has taken place. During those days that his government was in power and their malign influence was, so to speak, over the country, how few homesteads were taken up in Manitoba, what a very small number of settlers went into Manitoba, what a small area of land was sold to settlers in Manitoba. Presto change, he and his malign influences went out, the present government and brighter days came in. Take the records that he read himself —how the homesteads leaped up, how settlers crowded in. The number of homesteads sold mounted up and mounted up as on eagle's wings. That is an argument as good in this case as his argument was. I am only treating him to an argument of his own, and I believe from the way he looks that he considers it is a conclusive argument. Why, my hon. friend said we always believed that country to be the granary of this continent. I am thinking he was right in his belief, but a statement he made directly after is worthy of attention.

He believed that our great influx of population was to come from the south. So do I; so did I then and long before. Since I have studied the question in reference to the Northwest I have stated it more than once that our population would come when the tide of immigration, from certain causes turned from the United States of America and its broad, cheap lands, and, compelled by land hunger, overflowed into the great country to the north. You cannot change the ways of Providence, nor very much the course of the world, and no matter how rich a country you may have north of the 49th parallel of latitude until land hunger could not find its fair and reasonable appeasement in the United States and therefore compelled its hosts of land seekers to look elsewhere, Canada's opportunity had not come, and when that time came Canada's opportunity had come. Another thing. Need we spend hours in arguing as to the conditions from 1874 to 1880 and as to the conditions from 1880 to 1905? Is not the whole face of things changed? Where was your transport in the Northwest Territories and what could you do in the settlement of lands or in bringing in immigrants in any large way until you had your country opened up by railway systems? But was there not a preparation period? Was there not that long period of strenuous work which taxed to the utmost the best qualities of two governments and of two parties in this country before we became successful in interesting capital and using it to the extent of opening up that country so that people could get into it and get out of it, and so that it might become some man's land instead of no man's land as it was previous to the opening up of the country? Is it right or fair to compare the progress for that twenty years with the ten or twelve years which have succeeded with the country gridironed by railways, with a transportation system which vies fairly well with the transportation system of the great country to the south? Surely, it is unreasonable to institute the comparison, to press the contrast, between these two periods.

Now, I will put a common sense question and let each man answer it for himself. Suppose that in 1900 the fortunes of political warfare in this country had consigned my right hon. friend to the opposition and had placed a Liberal-Conservative government in power and that for the last five years the Liberal-Conservative government had had the direction of affairs; answer this question, each man in his own heart: Does he believe that there would have been any less progress shown in that five years under the Liberal-Conservative management than there has been shown under Liberal management during the last five years? That is a question which I do not expect hon. gentlemen to get up and talk much about before the Speaker or before this House. Every man knows when he asks himself that question that there are conditions and circumstances outside and above parties and that these conditions, changing and being different, the results that springs therefrom are different as well. But, let no man on either side of this House forget that for many long years and in dark periods the Liberal-Conservative party, doing its best and looking out into the future, which was not well seen at that time, but which was obscure, never wavered once in its faith in the Northwest and never left over for one single day its efforts—be they misdirected in some cases or not—to achieve that one great object of opening up by way of railway communication and transportation the great middle country which is to be so much the basis and strength and power of this great Canada of ours.

I am not going to import the discussion of partisan politics in it. I am not going to state how much the Liberal-Conservatives were impeded and fought during that time by the Liberal party; I am not going to state what tardy confessions have been made by some Liberals since that time, notably the Hon. G. W. Ross, who admitted that he was mistaken in that fight and he owned it up manfully and truthfully. We do not expect my right hon. friend to own it up; that is not good politics for him in his view, but there are men occasionally who not only took the course that he did, but who had the manliness to get up and abjure what they had said.

Let me take up another point. The hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) did not meet the points that were raised by my hon. friend who moved this motion and by my hon. friend who so ably seconded and supported it. He was asked some very pertinent questions. He has not answered these questions. I propose to call

some of these questions to the attention of the House in order that either he or some one who speaks on that side of the House may meet them and meet them, if possible, fairly. One of the questions asked by my hon. friend from Marquette was this: Why is it that nine months ago the hon. minister made the statement in this House that at that time 149,450 acres were patented to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, that he has been carrying on his policy of quickly getting these lands patented since and that just a few days ago, in answer to a question, he stated that up to the present time 142,808 acres only had been patented? That was worthy of the hon. minister's attention, and if he had devoted just a little time to that instead of pulling up these alluring tufts from the old resolution of 1880 he would have satisfied us on this side of the House a good deal better, and I think he would have shown himself to just as much advantage. Then there is another question that has not been answered: Why has an extended area been given to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company as at present constituted in which to select its lands? Has an extended area been given? Why has an extended area been given and what is it to be? Our information is—and we got it from the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company itself—that the area has been widely extended from which they now have the opportunity of securing and selecting their land. Under no terms of the contract is it made exigible or necessary. Why has it been done and to what extent has it been done ? Another question. I have been groping in the dark, putting question after question on the order paper to get at the rights of the transfer of certain lands of the Canadian Northern Railway Company for certain other lands in another section of the provinces. I asked question after question. On some technical point I received the answer that there had been no such transfer as asked about.

Now, when the minister was confronted with the statement that there had been a transfer, and was asked what that transfer was and why, we got no answer from the minister. The Manitoba 'Free Press' answered it or pretended to, in some of its editorials. The member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) answered it in a way, and gave certain explanations with reference to it, but we have not been able to get an authoritative answer from the minister of the department. He has dodged that question, he has not met it, he has not met the spirit of my inquiry, which was this: Has there been a transfer, why has it been, and to what extent has it been ? The member for East Assiniboia says there has been a transfer of some 200,000 to 300,000 acres ; that they have been allowed to select 200,000 or 300,000 acres in this great Saskatchewan Valley ; that a transfer was made for some reason or other and he gives two of the reasons—the Doukhobor reservation and the Riding Mountain timber reservation. But why can we not get a plain statement of fact from the Minister of the Interior ? Ought we not have it and the reasons for it by some member of the government inasmuch as the Minister of the Interior has already spoken ? Another question that was asked was; why was the promise of the late Minister of the Interior given some three years ago : That he was on the direct road towards liberating from 50,000,000 to 60,000,000 acres of land, that he was about to bring in legislation in order to deal with that liberated land, and that he saw no reason at all why this could not be done within a reasonably short space of time ; why was not that promise carried out ? I have the minister's words here. He said :

> We have had in the Northwest Territories ever since the government has been in power a state of affairs under which the great bulk of odd numbered sections of public lands have been held locked up by our obligations to furnish large quantities to railway companies. Many years ago the system was adopted of surveying the country into odd numbered and even numbered sections and holding the odd numbered sections for railway purposes, to be given to the railways as government land grant, the even numbered sections were kept as homesteads. We have not been able to deal with the odd numbered sections in the Territories or in Manitoba because of the fact that we have large obligations outstanding, binding us to furnish certain specified quantities of land to various railway companies under arrangements made by the previous government.

Now, that was a minister who had been in power for several years ; he knew the Northwest from beginning to end if any minister knew his department, and he said this :

> I am not expressing any opinion as to whether this was wise or not, but that was our position.

He was more reasonable and a little more wise and considerate than the present Minister of the Interior. He did not launch out into a revival of old discussions of old policies ; he did not express an opinion as to whether this was wise or not at the time. But he says :

> We are now arriving at the position when I fancy within the next two or three weeks a final arrangement will be closed under which the railway companies which have claims for land grants, including the Canadian Pacific Railway, will have these claims finally settled. I am pleased to say that as a result of this an enormous quantity of odd numbered sections will come back to the government and be available for disposal in any way which the government may be authorized by parliament to adopt. We shall no doubt have in the neighbourhood of 50,000,000 acres of odd numbered sections to dispose of in such manner as parliament may authorize. I trust at an early date to submit a measure providing for the disposal of these lands.

That is the statement made by the then Minister of the Interior some three or four years ago. We on this side of the House asked why that minister's promise had not been implemented, and what reasons had arisen which made it impossible to carry out during three long years what the minister then thought it possible to have carried out within the space of a few weeks. But we got no answer to that. Now then, comes the main point in question. Here you are with 13,000,000 acres of odd sections of land actually tied up from sale or from settlement, and against that you have about 1,750,000 acres of land to be selected. Let all the past gone controversies lie still for a moment; let us address ourselves to just this condition of things as it is now. There is no reason why this condition of things should continue for a single month longer; for a single year longer at the most. Why should it not be brought to a sudden and quick ending? What reasonableness is there that 13,000,000 acres of odd numbered sections of land in one of the best parts of the Northwest should be kept from the homesteader and from the settler simply because there is to be a selection of 1,750,000 to be made in order to satisfy, one company only; that is the present Saskatchewan Valley Land Company. That is the point. And what answer has the minister given to that? He talks about indemnity lands. I have read what he said over and over again and I have read the contracts under which these indemnity lands as he calls them are held, and I can see no reason in any way why that selection cannot at once be made. And if the Dominion government has an obligation against it let the selection be made, but, let the lien stand against that one-third of the selected lands until the government obligation is met. Then you have only 1,750,000 acres of land which are in the hands of the company or covered by the indemnity of the government; you have the other 11,000,000 acres of land free for disposal in the best possible way towards the up building and the settlement of this country. That is the question at issue and the only question at issue just now. Permit this side of the House to have some convictions and some opinions on that question; opinions which are honest and which are frankly held and which are frankly put before this House. It is utter folly and childishness to say to us: Your principles are bad, you are doing it just to discredit the government, you are not sincere at all. Cannot the two sides of the House approach this great question which has very vital connection with what is the most important part of this Dominion; cannot they face that question together and come to a sensible and reasonable conclusion with reference to the best policy just now and under the present conditions? I think they could. The opposition have put forth their reasons. Have they said a wise thing or not when they said that we should get that 12,000,000 acres of land where it can be utilized for the up building of the nation, or is it wiser that it should be locked up for years and years still. What is the insuperable difficulty of setting aside that 1,750,000 acres of land and putting your government obligation against one-third of it if you wish, but at the same time liberating the 11,000,000 or 12,000,000 acres which are left.

That is something for sensible men to canvass, and to give their opinion about instead of throwing bombs and darts at each other across the House and impugning motives. I warn the government as strongly as my hon. friends behind me have warned the government that there may come upon them the same whirlwind that came upon them in 1902. Why did the government sell that land in 1902 to a speculator company for $1 an acre? Because they were importuned to do it. That is the reason, because they were importuned to do it by men who stood close to the minister and to the government, because relatives and close friends of the Commissioner of the Interior joined in that pressure. I can understand it and I can see it all. It was a partnership, somebody was to get the franchise, somebody else was to work the oracle financially and otherwise, and the proceeds were to be divided. 'Against the speculators' said the member for East Assiniboia. Would the member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) be as well off as he is to-day if it was not for speculators? Will he do us the favour to rise in his place in the House and say that he has not now and never had any connection with that company? Where is the Mr. Adamson, the strong henchman and follower of the Minister of the Interior, a brother-in-law of the man who was your Commissioner in the Interior Department when the deal was put through? My hon. friend slates the local government because some land was sold to relatives of that government; put the boot on the other foot and see if it fits any easier or not. I can see the pressure brought on the Minister of the Interior by his friends, not by Col. Davidson, for that franchise. I can see very clearly how they worked together: You get us the land, we are old land men, and we will make this so-called desert, a teeming garden. Within four years they have done what?

Mr. ADAMSON. Will my hon. friend allow me to make a remark.

Mr. FOSTER. Subtract 1902 from 1905.

Mr. ADAMSON. Will my hon. friend allow me to make a remark? The Saskatchewan Valley Land Company did not buy the land at $1 an acre and never sold any at $7 an acre. I never had any consultation at any time with regard to this deal with the member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff).

Mr. FOSTER. I will take the hon. gentleman's denial exactly as he gave it, and yet

my argument stands just as true. 250,000 acres of land were sold. Will the Minister of the Interior tell us to what company it was sold ?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot tell the hon. member just now; I will give him the information later.

Mr. FOSTER. Always unready.

Mr. TURRIFF. The land was not sold to any company; it was sold to some individuals who later on formed the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh ! oh !

Mr. TURRIFF. One moment; as you have mentioned the Commissioner of Dominion Lands; I was commissioner, at that time, and I make the statement now that I never saw Col. Davidson, I never spoke to Mr. Adamson, who happens to be my brother-in-law. I never knew about it in any shape, form or manner, good, bad or indifferent, until several days, until two weeks after the deal was made, because I was not in this part of the country at the time. I knew nothing about it.

Mr. FOSTER. Are there any others now who want to make confessions ?

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. FOSTER. At six o'clock, Mr. Speaker, I had pretty nearly finished the few remarks that I had proposed to address to the House, and just at that time was engaged in a pretty animated conversation with several of my hon. friends on the other side. I do not just now see them here, which I regret because I had intended to renew that conversation. And it is a distinct disappointment for me that, owing to the absence of one of the parties, I cannot proceed in the same way. I notice that several of these gentlemen were somewhat sensitive regarding some remarks that I had made. Of course these remarks were entirely innocent on my part. They were provoked by what the hon. gentleman who spoke this afternoon had said in his strictures upon the Roblin government for having sold lands to persons who were more or less related to them by ties of blood. And just on the spur of the moment I had to allude to the fact that the same thing took place in this transaction. That it was which led to the momentary excitement. If the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) were here, I would, in order to give him the fullest and freest opportunity for making a statement, ask him whether or not he would rise in the House and deny that he had in any way profited by the sale of this 250,000 acres of land by the government to the first parties to whom the government sold them. If he had not, he could so state in the House, and there would be no further controversy between him and me in that connection. If the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Adamson) were here, I would say to him that it is of course very difficult for one on the outside to trace exactly how negotiations start and proceed to fulfilment between parties with whom he is not conversant, and the denial of my hon. friend is absolutely taken by me as correct with regard to his not having had interviews with certain persons. But if my hon. friend from Humboldt (Mr. Adamson) were here, I would like to ask him whether or not, in the original transaction and in the various transfers from one company to the other up to the present, he has or has not profited largely by reason of this original sale of 250,000 acres of land by the government by private contract. That would enable the hon. member to entirely dissociate himself from those persons against whom the hon. the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) is actuated by the most stern and righteous indignation, namely, the speculators. All this reminds me very much of the old nursery rhyme, the caption of which is 'The house that Jack built.' We were led through a formidable succession of events, one occurrence took place after another, but all joined together in the one end, which was the destruction of the house that Jack built. In like manner, whether the 250,000 acres at $1 per acre, part scrip, was sold originally to a syndicate or not, or to a company or not, or sold to a company of one certain name or a company of another certain name, the fact remains that the government got but a dollar an acre, and that all these sales and transfers piled up the price of the land until in the end the ultimate price came out of the settler and not out of the speculator. That is the conclusive fact to which I would invite the attention of this hater of speculators, the Minister of Interior (Mr. Oliver). He is not so dense as not to see that fact which stares him in the face and he cannot be so careless as not to apprehend it. He cannot fail to see that the government sold the land at $1 an acre but not to the settlers ; that it went through series after series of speculating syndicates or companies until ultimately it was almost entirely sold out, and the man upon whom it was unloaded at the last was the settler. That is the self-evident fact out of which there can be no crawling, and no subterfuge will enable any person to parry the force of that conclusion. The government did not sell to a company, says my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), but to a syndicate. Ah! but who paid the money to the government? To that question there is an answer given by a man who knows—Mr. James A. Smart, the deputy minister. What does he say ?

Dear Mr. Clancy,—Referring to your question of yesterday——

A question put him in the immigration committee.

I beg to say that the company——

Not a syndicate——

—paid $58,000 in cash and about $92,000 in scrip covering their application for a patent.

Now, I take the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) on his own ground. Does it make the thing better or worse for the government? They did not sell to a company? No, they sold to a syndicate. The syndicate unloaded on a company and never put up a dollar of money, for the company paid the shot. There you had a speculator in the most happy circumstances, where he can buy on credit without paying interest and unload before the cash has to pass from his pocket. I would ask my hon. friend from Humboldt (Mr. Adamson) whether he belonged to that original syndicate or not. I would ask him whether he belonged to each of these companies which, like the turns of a kaleidoscope, have assumed name after name, but always kept the substance and pocketed the profits. And if he has stock in that company, whether he were in the original syndicate or not, every dollar of appreciation of that stock, every step made firm by a preceding speculation, which enabled him and other members of the company to stretch out for another million of acres out of which to make another round profit—every dollar of that advantage was given him because this government, which abhors speculators, sold in private 250,000 acres of the best land in the country for $1 an acre.

There the evidence of Mr. Smart, I think, is very conclusive. So, the turn sought to be given this matter by the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) has not proved a very happy one for the government. What, then, were these relations between the government and the minister on one hand, the syndicate keeping in the dark and the company which took over from the syndicate what it had filched from the government at so small a price? I cannot tell what those relations were; we can only imagine. But they were relations—relations which resulted in loss to the government of hundreds of thousands of dollars as compared with what might have been obtained, and in great gain to the speculators, who could not have had a footing for their scheme if it had not been that they got on the soft side of the government, and obtained the lands supposed to be a desert but which they knew well to be a garden. Look at Col. Davidson, look at his partners, look at the hon. member for Humboldt and other participants in this matter. Do they look like men who would plant $250,000 in a salt desert, a country that only the gopher and the prairie chicken would contend for? They were alive. But how about the government? Why was the Minister of the Interior asleep? My hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) lauded himself by saying that in Manitoba, just before he went out of office, they proposed to take 800,000 acres of land and sell it at $3 an acre to the settlers. A good plan; a laudable plan. He afterwards scored the Roblin government because they sold it at half a dollar less in some cases, though for $3 in other cases, and did not sell it to the settlers but to the middleman. Yet he stands up and lauds and praises and fights for a government that took 250,000 acres of the best lands of the country and sold them at $1 an acre to speculators who have made out of them about $2,000,000. And made it out of whom? Out of other speculators? No, Mr. Speaker, one end of this chain may be in the speculator's hands, but the other end tugs at the wealth, almost at the very soul of the settler. Let us make a calculation. The speculator bought 250,000 acres of land at $1 per acre. Much of the pay was in scrip filched from the poor half-breed or any others who could be forced to discount. The government did not even ask fair cash for the land, but gave these friends of theirs power to dog the foot-steps of the half-breed, to take him at a disadvantage and buy at a small percentage what was worth cash at par in this land deal. These friends of the government had the privilege of paying half or even more if they pleased, in scrip. This $250,000 in cash and scrip went into the coffers of the government. And now look at the other side. I make the assertion here, knowing something about the lands in the Northwest, their prices and their sales, that the land handed over to this company the company would turn over at an average of not less than an even $8 per acre. It has averaged that, and it is not all sold yet. Multiply 250,000 by $8 and you get $2,000,000. Subtract $250,000 paid to the government, and you have $1,750,000 left, for the company. Out of whose pockets did that money come? Out of the pockets of the settlers, the men in whom the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) has such a deep and sympathetic interest. Had this money been taken from other speculators I should not mind. But pile up the profits, advance upon advance, and who must meet the bill in the end? Your settler and nobody but the settler. Put your settler on 640 acres of land and give him that at $1 an acre—a total of $640. How he would be ready for the work of subduing that land and making it blossom like a rose garden, reaping wealth for himself and his family. But under this regime, if he wants to get 640 acres of land, he must pay $5,000 and more. That is where it pinches the settler. Yet the hon. gentlemen opposite weep crocodile tears over the settler, the man for whom they have such sympathetic regard. There never was a bolder, more brazen scheme

of speculation than that of this Saskatchewan Valley Land deal by the government that sits opposite.

And they did it in the light of the present day. When colonization companies were formed twenty years ago they were formed in the time of the dim beginnings of things, when there was no access to the Northwest worthy of the name, when men who undertook the work of bringing in settlers had to face immense difficulties making success almost impossible. And these companies failed. But the land came back to the Crown and at least these companies were an honest attempt on the part of the government of that day to settle that country. But the present deal was made in 1902, when the full capacity of that country had been proved to the hilt. It was done after this government had, for five years, been spending over half a million dollars a year in an immigration propaganda in the United States, to turn the tide of homeseekers in that land to our great Northwest. As a result of this five year's work the seed had been sown. And, at the psychological moment along come Col. Davidson, and syndicate, along come Mr. Adamson and his syndicate. They catch the government sound asleep—or worse—and they make a bargain then and there. And five months had not passed by before they had their settlers streaming in. All due to two things, the fact that the fertility and desirability of the soil had been all uncovered, uncovered to the home seekers of the United States; and that these men fresh from long and varied land experience in that country, simply took advantage of the whole propaganda of the government and directed the immigrants, paid for, hunted up, sought out by the exertions of the government, directed twenty of them to every township they had in those lands where they were able to select. Now we are told the company did all that, the government's efforts counted for nothing. They were shrewd but in proportion as they showed their shrewdness they also showed the suppineness and inability of the government. Why had not the government shown the garden that lay there instead of going around and justifying their course by declaring that it was a desert, and a salt desert at that?

Well, Sir, let us ask the question. What is a speculator, and let us make a little analysis of this company. Oh, says my hon. friend who spoke this afternoon (Mr. Greenway), that company did a great work, they were great pioneers in settlement in the Northwest; it is from their beginnings and their work that we may date our prosperity in the Northwest. What an absurd statement to make is that. Now, then, what was this company, what was it to do, and what was it to get? You imposed hardships on that company? What was the first hardship? You compelled them to pay a dollar an acre for land that they sold out at $8, that is a hardship. What was the second one? You allowed them two years without interest. That is a hardship. A man who goes two years on an obligation without paying interest—oh, it is a hard-hearted taskmaster that will impose that on him. That is the second hardship you imposed on him. What more did you do? You said to him, before you go in there—oh, how shrewdly this was thought out in order to blind the thoughtless—before you go in there and get an opportunity to take a single acre of that land, you have got to put twenty homesteaders into a township. What a hardship it was—twenty homesteaders—on whose land? The government's land. It cost little to put in twenty homesteaders on that district when, for four or five years, your money and your men have been exciting every homeseeker, nearly, in the northwestern states to go up into that country and take homesteads and buy lands. A terrible hardship. But here is where the special hardship comes in. That company was to have the odd-numbered sections in that township—just keep that in mind—it was to have the odd-numbered sections in that township; the hardship imposed on that company was to compel them to put twenty men on the government free homesteads as future buyers for their own odd sections that lay right side by side with these homestead sections. When a homesteader goes in on the 160 acres, he cannot pick that up and run off with it somewhere else, he cannot pick up a portion of land out of some other quarter of the Northwest and dump it down alongside of his homestead. He is shut up to the quarter that is next to him, he has got to buy it, no matter at what price, he has got to have it; and when they were obliged to put twenty prospective customers on each of the government's homesteads in each township, translated into English, it was simply that they took time and a great opportunity by the forelock, and they put in twenty customers who, in the course of one, two, three or four years, would buy their adjoining sections at $7, $8, $9 or $12 an acre. That is the third hardship you impose on this company.

But you went further, I think you went further. We have not had a denial, we have the statement of the company on the other hand. You gave them sixty-three townships out of which to select their 250,000 acres on those conditions. Thirty-five would be quite sufficient in which to get every acre of that 250,000. Did you or did you not let them range over those sixty-three townships, and thereby have almost a double choice, to pick and choose, so that they could leave the poorer and get the better and richer land in the whole range of 63 townships? The company says you let them do that. Did you? The minister has not denied it. We will see if the First Minister

denies it to-night. No company in Canada, no land company I believe in the world, none in my experience, has ever had the position that company has held for the last five years in the Northwest. They could simply come down to a town in Ontario or anywhere else and gather together a number of friends and say : Would you like to buy some land?—Yes, we would—Well, we can suit you.—Yes, but there are other companies who can suit us too.—We can suit you better than any other company.—Tell us how.—Do you see that great block of land there, hundreds of thousands, millions of acres. Now if you want 10,000 acres of land you can range over that whole area and pick out just what you like. Make your own choice and selection, come to us and pay us the price and you get those lands. No other company in Canada could do that. That is why that company has been able to make such enormous sales in so short a space of time? The first syndicate—if we take the syndicate idea of the member of East Assiniboia—unloaded without passing a dollar to the company. That company within a year unloaded every acre of its land to another company at a very fine price. Then they buy another million, two millions of land from the Canadian Northern, and then they got an extension from this government, and they transferred the lands which, in a certain area, could not have been sold but for a very small price, to the government, and they were given an equal quantity of land in the garden of the Northwest along the line of the Grand Trunk Pacific which they have since almost entirely sold out, sold out to companies and to speculators who to-day are taking $8, $9, $10 and $12 per acre for these same lands, and I know it. Now that is what has been going on. These are the tremendous hardships that these gentlemen have placed upon the shoulders of that poor syndicate or first land company, whatever you may choose to call it.

Oh, but says the Minister of the Interior, we did something else. We compelled them to put twelve settlers on their own land. Do you see what a hardship that is, Mr. Speaker ? The company owns twelve quarter sections, and the government is actually so inhuman as to impose upon them the duty of selling to settlers twelve of those quarter sections of their own land at a price of $5, $7 and $8 per acre while they only paid $1 per acre for it. See how we make them settle the land. These gentlemen say : This is not a speculator's company, it is an immigration company. Why, did they not get a train load of bankers, governors and potentates to go right up there at once with hoes, and mattocks, reapers and sickles, to become settlers on quarter sections ? An immigration society ! No, they were a grand army of speculators who went up to view the richness of a garden, turned into a garden from a desert within a space of three months, and to buy it at low prices and go back and sell it at higher prices, and so make their little pile. Does anybody find fault with the syndicate ? No. Anybody find fault with the land company ? No. Anybody find fault with the bankers ? No. If they can make a bit of money, let them make it. That is not where the fault is, the fault is with the gentlemen opposite who put such an immense franchise into the hands of these speculators, the whole cost of which, I repeat for the twentieth time, comes absolutely and entirely from the pockets of the settlers.

Well, were there any other favours ? Yes, there were. The member for East Assiniboia is not here to-night, if he were I would ask him another question. When Mr. Sifton, the former Minister of the Interior, was asked in the House as to this sale what did he say? 'During my absence an examination was made by my officers of 250,000 acres of land, and it was sold at $1 an acre.' What were the conditions? Two-fifths of the settlement that I have spoken of had to be done before they got one acre of land. Was it done ? Call Mr. Sifton and ask him, and what will he tell you ? That when he was out of office, without his knowledge, or without his assent, or that of his deputy, somebody in that office, patented 150,000 acres of land to that company without an inspection, and before they were entitled to a single acre.

I would ask the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) if he was the land commissioner in the department at that time. In spite of every question we have put to the government we have not found the clerk, the officer, who had the almost colossal audacity to dispose of 150,000 acres of the public domain without leave or license, illegally, unlawfully. Who was he ? Has he been punished ? Has he been reprimanded ? Now what took place ? Two-fifths of it had to be settled before they got a patent. What was done ? They have a man who is an inspector, Mr. Spears, I think. They came and asked 150,000 acres of land to be patented to them. They said : Look at our entries ; there—count them up. We have the proper number. They were all put in and Mr. Speers closed both ears, and I suppose closed his eyes and every other officer did the same, and he simply wrote down: Yes, there are more entries than are sufficient to make their claim good. On that the lands were patented. Does not anybody know that there is a vast difference between a homestead entry and a homesteader settled on a homestead ? I charge the Department of the Interior and this governmnt of which it is a part with having alienated 150,000 acres of land by patent without ever having had an officer go on that land and report to them the number of homesteaders actually in possession of the homesteads taken and to this day no censure and no punishment have been meted out to the officer who took the burden upon

himself of disposing of that portion of the patrimony of this country.

Any more favours—no, hardships, I mean, imposed upon that company ? Yes. They were allowed to range around over 63 townships to get what they could have satisfied in 35. They were allowed to range all around year after year. Then came a time at last when the minister said : I must be stern and I will only allow you twenty-eight and a half months to make your selections and close this thing out. That twenty-eight and a half months would have closed it out on the 31st December, 1905. But, it is not closed out yet. They are on the next twelve months and the year will probably expire before it is closed out. Why this hardship of allowing them to go on—first twenty and a half months and afterwards on to a third year—without making their selection and thereby keeping 13,000,000 acres of land absolutely tied up from sale or settlement or disposal by the government in any way ? What a hardship that imposes upon them ! How long is this hardship going to be kept up ? All the rest of this year ? We wish to be reasonable. We wish to limit it to November of this year but the government oppose us in that. Why ? Why ? Does the company want more land? Is it here to-day seeking more land ? Is it is a fact that it is now nearly sold out, that it wants another million and that it proposes to get it. Keep this open and very likely it will get it.

I said before six o'clock that the keeping of this open any longer in this way was a peril to the government. Another syndicate, backed by another Saskatchewan Valley land company, may come to the minister in an unguarded moment and offer him for a liability that this government has of $1,400,000 against these lands for subsidy purposes to take over 500,000 acres of land and while wiping off that liability get their land at a small amount per acre ? What security has this parliament, what security has this country for believing that the government, the ministry, which sold privately 250,000 acres for $1 an acre will not under the same pressure sell 500,000 acres more for $2 or $2.50 in order, as they may say, to liquidate their indebtedness under an old subsidy arrangement ? What they have done once they may do again. What is to prevent some railway company in a time of political or party stress sitting right straight down on the government as they so often have done before and making them do just what they want them to do ? The Prime Minister knows what that means. He has swallowed the leek many, many a time before—swallowed it always with a good grace, without making a very wry countenance and always in such a way as to get some political or party gain out of it for his followers. The Grand Trunk Pacific is a case in point. The Grand Trunk Railway Company asked you for nothing else than a franchise from the lakes west saying that they would build the whole of the road at their own costs and charges and if you would give them a little subsidy for the hard portion of it until they got to Winnipeg. Well and good, but the partisans sat down on you and they said to you : You will not do that unless you also build on the back lands of Ontario and go down to Quebec. You yielded and you may yield again under pressure in this case. But when you got to Quebec you were not out of the woods. Then another crowd lit down on you and they said : No, sir, neither the great west nor the back lands unless you give a parallel line to the Intercolonial Railway down to Moncton. Again the Prime Minister yielded. Will he be more strong, will he be more able to resist the demand for a little more of this land at the hands of some powerful partisan or at the hands of some strong railway company ? Now, we seek to make the government strong. If we cannot make them strong we want to relieve them from further moments of weakness.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOSTER. My right hon. friend is fond of using that phrase and I make him a present of it on this occasion, for moments of weakness my right hon. friend certainly has. We would like to help you to take these lands out of that category in which they would be liable to these pressures which the Prime Minister in his good nature is the last man to withstand. We think you would be relieved if you would simply have these lands selected and then do something with them in the way of public policy and in the line of good for the settler. One thing has puzzled me. It is well known that the government cannot alienate from the Crown any great or small portion of what belongs to the Crown without the assent of parliament ; yet you have a department of this government which, can tomorrow, if it can persuade the government to assent to it, sell 50,000,000 or 60,000,000 acres of land in the Northwest Territories at whatever price it pleases over and above a certain minimum, and we in the country know nothing about it until we are informed through the press or when the next parliament opens. That ought to be changed. No minister has the right to sell the territory of this country in that way without the sanction of parliament to the special transaction, or without the most rigid conditions as to the policy and the terms of the sale. These gentlemen over there hate the speculator and love the settler.

Yes, I have endeavoured to show to-night the manner in which they demonstrate their love for the settler. They loved the settler, the poor half breed especially ; and yet they sat down after parliament had had the stated policy of this government for years, and had approved of it ; they sat down and

went against all the precedents of parliament, all the conventions of parliament, and their Minister of the Interior just before an election issued a secret order in council, news of which went to his own friends by the connivance of the department, and made possible what was not possible before, what had been reported against by their own commissioners whose reports were laid before parliament and sanctioned by parliament. They reopened that scrip matter and they set every partisan of theirs to whom the news went on the heels of these poor half breeds until they had them all or nearly all tied up with agreements, and in the end their friend Macdonald and other friends got a vast amount of scrip at an average of less than $2 per acre which is worth to them $10 and $12 an acre in the markets to-day. That is the way you love the half breed; that is the way you hate the speculator. Why, Sir, during the last ten years the day has not dawned in this country when some of your friends in the Senate, in the House, in the country, somewhere, have not been constantly on the scent for half breed scrip, following them up, herding them up in tens and twenties and getting the transfers of their scrip at a mere pittance, and then buying with it the best lands of Canada, and so getting a value of $8 or $10 or $12 for $1 or $1.50 or $2. That is what has been going on. Men must be blind not to see it. You cannot speak to a household in the Northwest that does not know it. That is the way this government proves its sympathy for the settler and its abhorence for the speculator.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have just one or two points to make and it is in reference to the future. I subscribe absolutely to the sentiment uttered with so much feeling by my hon. friend (Mr. Greenway); he is one of the old and worthy pioneers of that country, he has seen its hard days and he contemplates it now in its palmy day of prosperity. He says: You must not expect me to forget the west. We do not expect him to forget the west. It is an unhappy thing for any public man, any reading man, any thinking man, to forget the great Northwest and its possibilities at this stage of our country's development. When we say: What provision is the government making for the settler of the future, for the homesteader of the future; we are met with this most logical and convincing argument from the other side: Oh, you are perturbed about whether there will be any lands in the course of three or four years; why, if you and your government had been in power you never would have any perturbation of that kind for there would be millions of acres of free lands for hundreds of years to come. That is the cogent argument, that is the irresistible logic with which they meet our proposition. And, what is the government doing in the face of the crisis that is approaching. Six millions of homesteads last year, six or seven millions this year, seven to eight millions next year, eight to nine millions the year after; how long can you go in that course without exhausting every homestead you have to-day. What then, and what provision are you making for it. So far as we see you are making no provision to get other lands to replace those, and in less years than you can think, the footpath of the homesteader will be seeking free lands, going further and further out from nearness to railway transit from the better and more open lands of the country, trudging further out into the scrub, into the broken areas where he will have poor land, less society, less comfort, less wealth, and ultimately—and that not very long hence—when the foot of the homesteader will find for itself no acre of free land in this great wide Dominion of ours. And what is the government doing? Absolutely nothing. Something ought to be done. The first thing that ought to be done is to clean out these arrearages of selections and get that 40,000,000 or 50,000,000 acres of land, if it is that much, within the power of the government and of this parliament, and then sit down here and formulate a policy which this government shall carry out with relation to it. It is not our part to outline that policy. Whether more free lands or homesteads are to be made, or whether it is not the best policy from this time out when our present free homesteads shall have gone to the diminishing point, to then, (instead of free homesteads,) encourage the better element of immigration which can afford to pay $3 or $4 or $5 or $6 per acre. And whilst we can no longer say: Absolutely free land; we will have the step over the world in saying: Free land we gave them with a lavish hand, we have no more free lands but we have good lands and cheap lands for the settler and the settler alone; we have millions of acres for them; we have no very great temptation for the neer-do-well and the spend-thrift and the man of little worth and of little energy, but we have a constant and alluring attraction to the man of small means who is able to pay for good lands at a cheap rate and who will come with his stake in the country, and an energy dominant and strong to make of that stake the best thing for himself and for Canada.

We have got to face two questions, Mr. Speaker, we have got to face this question of immigration and the mixture of populations in this country of ours, and we have got to face it quickly. We have got to face the land question also, and these two are bound up with each other. No longer has Canada necessity for going out in this broad world of ours anywhere hat in hand to beg for men to come, and take up their abode in Canada. No longer has she the necessity for seeking out in the hidden

purlieus of middle and southern Europe for men of other races, men of different ideals, men of other status in civilization, men of other concepts of constitutional government.

Hereafter the best will seek Canada and will seek it at their own expense, and if at first we do not get quite the number of hundreds of thousands, let us come to the conclusion quickly that it is not a multitude that makes a country, it is the virtue and worth and homogeneity of the people in a country that makes it great and prosperous. The word 'foreigner' is a relative word. To the man in France we are foreigners; to the man in Italy we and the French are both foreigners; it bears with it no disgrace. We welcome foreigners to this county, but I do say, Mr. Speaker, that the time has come when we ought to be most discriminating as to those whom we bring into this country. What have we just before us? $294,000 of the people's money paid out up to July 1, 1905, for Buckowinians and Galicians and men from all parts of that area of Europe—$294,000 for bonuses alone, and staring us in the face a contract, with whom we know not, and with whom we cannot find out, which will involve this country in $100,000 and more each year for eight succeeding years. To bring in the best classes ? No not the best classes, and we all know it. This year see the sentiment of the people. Every paper says: Why this looks better. There is a jubilant tone. What is the difference? The class of immigrants coming in this year is better than ever, more northern blood, more British blood has been infused, more of those who know our conditions and have something of the genius of our civilization; and everybody, every paper is jubilant because of it. Does that not point the way to the hon. gentlemen opposite? With their heads down and a sullen air they drive ahead in an unknown and unproductive contract that will land us in an expenditure of a million dollars, and that not for the best class of immigrants such as we ought to have and will have in this country.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The speech to which we have just listened is a very fair illustration of the spirit in which the motion now before the House, this innocent motion, as my hon. friend characterizes it, was conceived. My hon. friend has travelled all over creation this evening. He was not satisfied to review the motion upon which we have to pronounce, but he has talked about everything connected with the administration of the government, the policy of the government upon the Grand Trunk Pacific, the scrip business, immigration, and not only that, but my hon. friend thought it in good taste, at a certain moment, to invite us in tones of sweetness and honey to give up all our differences and agree upon the land policy. All this was very well in its way, if my hon. friend had only persevered in these very dulcet tones, but in the very next breath my hon. friend did not hesitate to insult, in so far as he could, two members of this House just as honourable as he is himself. What in the world has the position of Mr. Adamson to do with the question that we have at the present time to deal with? And if Mr. Adamson could not be a member of the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company why in the name of common sense could the member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) be a member of the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Land Company? If one could be a seller why could not the other be a buyer, and if one were a buyer why could not the other be a seller? Sir, my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) must be driven to very hard lines indeed to so far forget himself as to introduce a matter of this kind into a debate of this importance. But, Sir, before we proceed with this debate perhaps it is better I should read to the House the motion on which we have to pronounce and see exactly where we are. This is the motion moved by the hon. member for Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche):

> The public lands of Canada, situated in the provinces and territories west of the Great Lakes, should be made available for settlement with the least possible delay ;
>
> That to this end all railway companies, corporations and persons now entitled to select any lands earned by way of subsidy should be obliged to complete their selection of such lands within the earliest possible period, and not later than the first day of November, 1906 ;
>
> That in arranging for the disposal of the odd numbered sections not so selected and which will thus be released from all such subsidy claims, provision should be made to preserve them solely for the bona fide settler and to protect them from the exploitation of the speculator ;
>
> That the government should take such administrative measures and introduce into parliament such legislative enactments as may be necessary fully to carry into effect the terms of this resolution.

If my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) were sincere when he introduced this resolution and if he expected that the government could adopt the policy which was there indicated, I may say to him that it was a singular method to introduce a resolution of want of confidence in order to carry out a policy of this kind. But I would pass this over altogether and I would have no hesitation at all in accepting the motion of my hon. friend (Mr. W. J. Roche) were it not for the insinuation contained in it that the government has been guilty of favouring the speculators at the expense of the settlers. Upon this the hon. gentleman has thought fit to introduce a resolution of this kind coupled with an insinuation against the honour and integrity of the government and it goes without saying that we cannot adopt any such resolution. But, Sir, as to the policy which is here indicated, I have no hesitation in

saying that we have no fault to find with this policy. It is the policy of the government. It is another example of the wonderful agility which has been displayed by the hon. gentlemen on the other side at turning somersaults. They have shown more than once a wonderful acrobatic genius in turning a sharp corner, and this is another instance of it. My hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) knows that the policy there indicated is the absolute denial of the policy he has been supporting for the past twenty years. He knows that the policy there stated, that the government should take care of the settler and taboo the speculator, is the policy that has been maintained by this side of the House ever since we have had a land policy in the west. My hon. friend is familiar with that, but, Sir, what has taken place since that we should have such a departure at the present time? Let us examine this question of public lands in the new provinces, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. The lands are divided into sections and these sections are of course odd-numbered and even-numbered sections. For the last 20 years or more the only land that has been open to settlement has been the even-numbered sections. A settler might go into the Northwest Territories, he might select a plot of land that suited his fancy, but he was told by the agent: You cannot have this land, it is an odd-numbered section. You can make your selection only out of the even numbered sections. That was not always so. It was not so in the earlier years. In the earlier years the even numbered sections were reserved for homesteading and the odd numbered for pre-emption. The settler, after taking a homestead, could buy an odd numbered section by way of pre-emption and pay a dollar an acre for it. This was done away with twenty years ago. Twenty years ago all the efforts of the settlers were confined to the even numbered sections alone. They were not allowed to settle on the odd numbered sections. What was the reason for this? The reason was that the government had blanketed the whole extent of that territory, from the Lake of the Woods up to the Rocky mountains, with subsidies to railway companies and land companies; and in order to allow these companies to make their selections, a blanket was placed over every odd numbered section from the limits of Manitoba to the foot of the Rockies. The railways could not earn their lands all at once, and therefore in order that they might be sure of their selection, when they had earned it, the government of hon. gentlemen opposite put every odd numbered section out of the reach of the settler. That government gave 25,000,000 acres to the Canadian Pacific Railway, 2,000,000 acres to the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway Company, 2,000,000 acres or a little less, to the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company and about a million acres to some twenty-six colonization companies which were formed in the eighties. In order therefore to be able to furnish each its selection, the government prevented settlement on the odd numbered sections. This has been going on for twenty years, and it is still going on. Yet now, on this late day, at this last moment, these hon. gentlemen opposite, who were the authors of that policy, who initiated and forced it upon the country, all of a sudden appeal to us with the gravest solemnity to save the country at large from their own folly. Do not lose a day, they exclaim, but without further ado clean out all the subsidies of the railway and land companies and leave the land to the settlers. Well, I do not object to that policy. Why, that is the very policy we have been endeavouring to carry out for the last ten years. We have been clearing up many of these land subsidies as my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Roche) well knows. We have closed out our land subsidy with the Canadian Pacific Railway so that company cannot blanket any more lands on the prairie. It has been forced to make its selection and has made it and the book is closed. We have closed the Calgary and Edmonton Railway subsidy. We have at last made an arrangement with that company and the book is closed. We have closed with most of the land companies but there are a few yet remaining. We have not closed with the Canadian Northern for the good reason that it has not yet earned its subsidy. We have not completed closing with the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway Company, but are negotiating with it and hope in a few weeks, perhaps in a few days, to be able to close with it and fix an area from which it must select its land. We hope shortly to close with the Canadian Northern also and then throw the rest of the land open to settlement. We hope to do this within perhaps a few days, certainly within a few weeks, and probably before the session closes. We are engaged in cleaning up these old arrears, we are engaged in trying to put an end to the folly of these hon. gentlemen, but it takes a longer time to do that than they imagine. It is always an easy thing to do mischief, but it takes sometimes pretty long to undo it. And we are engaged at this moment in putting an end to the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite. How long that will take I cannot say yet, but I believe that we shall be able to do so before the session closes. My hon. colleague the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) knows that I have discussed this matter with him more than once since he has taken office. He knows that I have pressed him again and again to have this state of things put an end to as soon as possible, and he is doing his best, but at this moment, with this Qu'Appelle,

Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway Company complications have again arisen—not of our making—which we have to settle. That may take a few days, perhaps a few weeks longer, but we shall not cease our efforts until we have closed that last deal and have set aside a few hundred thousand acres for their selection and then release the thirty million and more acres which were blanketed by the former government. But, as I said a moment ago, these hon. gentlemen opposite will not give us any time. They say this thing must be done immediately, and what is the reason they give? We heard it again a moment ago disclaimed with great emphasis by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). He put it in patriotic tones and pathetic tones and indignant tones and in all sorts of tones. And the reason he gave us why we should make haste was simply that he wanted to remove temptation from our path. Because, as he says, we sold a certain number of acres of land to a land company. And this charge comes from this gentleman who did not hesitate to sell lands to no less than twenty-six companies. Our one company shakes his sense—what shall I say?—not of righteousness—I cannot well define it.

Mr. FOSTER. Propriety.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. He says he wants to shield us from our own weakness. Well, go cover yourself with sack cloth you daughter of Jerusalem. Deplore your own sins and cease shedding tears over our possible delinquencies. We are doing the best we can in this matter, and now let me go further into the merits of this motion of my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Roche). What is its object? Is it to define a policy and ask us to adopt that policy? Not at all. There was no necessity for this motion because the policy it indicates is our policy. Its sole object was to give my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) an opportunity to ventilate what he has been leading up to, this Saskatchewan Valley Land Company grant. I have no objection to discuss that with my hon. friend, but I am sorry that I cannot discuss it to the same advantage. My hon. friend was prepared. He knew his brief well. He went into it very minutely. But I could not see that what he really intended to discuss, by means of this motion, was the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, and therefore I am not in a position to go into all the details. But I do know something of the transaction and am quite prepared to discuss it with my hon. friend and take issue with him and put myself and the conduct of the government in this matter in the judgment of friend and foe—not only in this House but out of it also.

Just what accusation has my hon. friend lodged against the government? It is that in the year 1902 the government sold to a certain syndicate 250,000 acres of land at $1 an acre. Sir, the statement is true. It was done above board it was done without concealment. It was brought to the notice of this House in that year, or certainly the year after. And when the fact was discussed that the government had sold 250,000 acres of land at $1 an acre, nobody found fault with the transaction; there was not a single man on the other side of the House who told the government that the price was too low. Why, on the contrary, everybody at that time thought that the government had made an exceedingly good bargain. The lands had not then the value that they have now. Consider what my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) said a moment ago. The pre-emption lands, in the early days were sold at $1 an acre. Nobody found fault with that price; it was as high a price as could be got at that time. My hon. friend has outlined a policy for us—that we should open the new lands that are released from the incubus upon them and sell them at $3, $4 and $5 an acre. He is right. The price of land has appreciated. But I leave it to any hon. member of this House, I leave it to the members west of Lake Superior particularly, to say if in 1902 these arid lands were worth more than $1 an acre.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I say, no; I take issue with my hon. friend upon the point, and the evidence is very clear. Why, if these lands had been worth more in 1902 when the transaction took place, we should have been denounced for making the sale at $1 an acre. But time has gone on, immigrants have rushed from all over the world, and especially from the United States, and land has appreciated in value. Here is another evidence that the land was not worth more than we got for it at the time when it was sold. About the same time that the company bought from us they bought from the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway Company a block of land in the vicinity. They got it without conditions of settlement and they paid for it, how much? Five dollars an acre? Seven dollars an acre? No, but $1.50 an acre. This sale was made by this railway company; and, if I am correctly informed—and I think I am—one of the directors of that company, if not its president, was the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) as good a business man as sits in this House. And why was the land sold to this company, instead of being sold to the settler? It has always been our policy not to sell land in large blocks to speculators, but to sell to the settler alone. And I say that when we sold this land, we did not depart from that policy. How do I prove that? Everybody knows that the lands of the prairie country are divided into three classes—fertile lands, grazing lands

and arid lands. Everybody knows that, as the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) said this afternoon the American Desert projects into our territory giving us a certain proportion of arid land. This block of 250,000 acres was along the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway, and, when the road was built, and for some time afterwards this land was reputed to be unfit for settlement. I say that advisedly. Because the railway had been built across that track, and when the road was put in operation, up to 1902, there had not been a single homestead located upon the land. The territory was tabooed by the settler. The railway company which had built the road and earned the subsidy was offered the land as a part of its subsidy, but refused on the ground that the land was not fairly fit for settlement according to the terms of the contract. We even had a lawsuit with the company, they seeking to force us to give them not these lands but other lands. I do not know what became of that lawsuit. But one thing is sure: Certain people from the United States 'land speculators', my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) calls them—that does not matter, they were dealers in land—made an offer to the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway Company to take these lands at $1.50 an acre, and the company was glad to sell the lands at that price. This was clear proof that the lands were not worth more than that up to that moment. After that these people came to us, and we agreed to give them another block of land contiguous to the block they had bought from the railway company so as to round out their holdings. Then, these dealers went to work to settle the land—for we had sold subject to terms of settlement; we had accepted 50 cents an acre less than the railway company had sold for on condition that the lands should be sold to settlers. Then came the revelation. This land had been refused by the settler from the older provinces of Canada, by the settler from England, by every class going into that country. It was supposed that, owing to lack of moisture, these lands would not grow cereals. But Colonel Davidson and his associates, went to Dakota, Montana, and other sections of the United States even more arid, and brought from there settlers who found means of cultivating this land, and making it yield crops. And the moment it was done, everybody rushed for these lands. People came from the United States, forty thousand, fifty thousand in a year. And from that moment the lands appreciated more and more until they are worth to-day $7 an acre and upwards. What makes the value of that land? Intrinsically it is what it was before—neither better nor worse than it was twenty-five or fifty years ago. That which makes it high in price to-day is the fact that it is sought by the settler, the fact that people are coming in thousands and hundreds of thousands seeking to get possession of it. We should never have heard of this transaction in this House if the conditions of 1906 were what the conditions of 1902 had been. As I have said, during the session following this transaction we heard not a single word of criticism. But now the lands are sought for and they have a value which they never had before; and hon. gentlemen opposite, finding land selling to-day at $5 and $6 an acre and more which, in 1902, was worth only $1 an acre, attack the government. But it is altogether too thin; we see through it easily. It would be a thing for the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) to thank heaven for if he could find us involved in some scandal equal to one of the many of his own time; if he could see us tarnished as the government to which he belonged was tarnished in the old days. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been looking for a scandal, and they would like to believe that they have found it. But I leave it to the honest judgment of every man in this House. If the conditions are what I have stated; if these lands could not find a purchaser in 1902; if the railway company that was offered them would not take them, and even went to law against us to prevent us forcing the lands upon them, what blame can attach to us for selling the lands under such conditions as $1 an acre?

Sir, the conditions are changed, and because the conditions are changed my hon. friend and his friends try to create a scandal against us. But it is one of those scandals which, like a bubble, is dissipated into thin air as soon as it is touched. The position is clear, and we shall hear more of it, I hope. There are certain features of this transaction which I cannot discuss with my hon. friend. He says there were certain conditions, certain advantages given to this company which they should not have had. To that I cannot say yes or no, because I have had no notice at all up to this moment, nor has my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior, that we were to be called upon to discuss that question. But it is something that can keep, and we shall discuss it again in all its bearings, without any concealment at all. I think I can leave that question to the judgment of the House on both sides, we can leave it to every man to say whether he thinks there has been any wrong doing in any sale which has been made to this land company.

But the discussion took a very wide range. The hon. member for Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) went into a disquisition upon other matters. The hon. gentleman who seconded that motion (Mr. Lake) the hon. member for Souris, who I think is not here now, brought up another question which it is perhaps just as well that I should say a word about in passing. The hon. member for Souris spoke of the Hudson's Bay Railway, and he said, and said truly, that the people

west of Lake Superior attached great importance to the construction of that railway. Let me say to him that the people of the Northwest, not one of them, do not attach greater importance to the construction of that railway to the Hudson's bay than I do myself. But the hon. gentleman said that if they did not get that railway he feared it was due to the prejudices of eastern Canada, he thought that the people of Montreal, the people of the St. Lawrence valley, would not agree to have another outlet to the sea north of the St. Lawrence. Sir, let me say to him, I hope and believe that he misjudges the people of Montreal and of the St. Lawrence valley. If I thought that opinion prevailed in the city of Montreal, I would be glad to accompany my hon. friend from Souris to Montreal and tell the people of that city and of the valley of St. Lawrence that the Canada of to-day is not to be confined within the valley of the St. Lawrence, but it must be pushed northwards as far as we can go. Sir, I hope that I shall live to see a city at the terminus of a Hudson's bay railway at the mouth of the Churchill river. It is not enough for us to confine our views to the Canada that is now settled, we must look ahead, we must push northward as far as colonization can go. I have great confidence that before many years are passed we shall see towns and villages on the shores of Hudson's bay, as we see on the shores of Norway, where the people will be prosperously engaged in the lumbering business, the pulp industry, the fishing industry, the mining industry, and others. This is what I hope Canadians will see ere long.

I have only to say to my hon. friend from Marquette that if he had brought in his motion without introducing into it an insinuation, an innuendo of wrongdoing I would have been glad to accept it, because that is our policy, and the evidence thereof will be brought before the House in a few days. But with the insinuation that is made in the motion against the government, it is not possible for us to accept it, and I hope the friends of the government will simply vote it down.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). A rather remarkable contrast is to be observed between the remarks of the right honourable gentleman and his Minister of the Interior. We understood from the Minister of the Interior in a very forcible way, and from the right honourable gentleman in a somewhat milder way, that the Conservative party in days gone by had been the friends of the speculator. A motion emanating from this side of the House is directed against the exploitation of the speculator, and these gentlemen who have always been opposed to the claims of the speculator find themselves insulted by the words of that resolution. That is the logic of the right honourable gentleman, that is the ground upon which he asks his followers to vote down a proposition which he himself has declared to be in the best interests of the country, and upon which his Minister of the Interior declares that both sides of the House are unanimous. Well, I will tell the right honourable gentleman, not in my own words which he will appreciate as coming from a better source than myself, why is he asking his friends to vote down this resolution. In 1895 an hon. gentleman in this House was discussing a resolution of a very much more controversial nature than the one which is now being considered, and he used these words :

> But I dispute altogether the proposition that this is such a motion as to involve want of confidence.

Here is a motion upon which both sides of the House are unanimous, and which admittedly, from the very words of the Prime Minister and of his Minister of the Interior, is in the best interests of the country. The gentleman to whom I referred continued as follows :

> I know this is a weapon often resorted to by the administration in order to defend a rather dubious course where the existence of the administration is dependent on such a vote, and I remember more than one occasion when hon. members have been placed between their conscience on the one side, and giving support to the administration on the other, and as a rule their conscience has given away to their confidence in the administration.

Those are the words of Mr. Laurier in 1895, the present Prime Minister and leader of this government. The right honourable gentleman complains that the Saskatchewan Land Company has been discussed, and that he had no notice of it. Did not his chief whip come to this side of the House early on Friday evening and ask that this motion should be adjourned ? Have not three days elapsed since, and has not the right honourable gentleman had an opportunity in that time to make himself familiar with the details of which he professes ignorance to-night ? This discussion has taken a wide range. Immigration has been discussed. Who discussed it first ? His Minister of the Interior. And this afternoon he put up an hon. gentleman who indulged in what I call a misuse of the English language when he ventured to describe this company as an immigration company. An immigration company, and not one word in the contract from beginning to end, as the hon. gentleman must have known, or ought to have known, before he undertook to discuss it, not one word regarding a single immigrant to be brought in from the United States or elsewhere for the purpose of settlement upon these lands. The Prime Minister finds the government insulted because forsooth there is a sentence in this motion which declares that there should be no exploitation of public lands in the interest of the speculator. If this government is so

pure and so innocent, if that has been its policy in all times past, why is it insulted ? My right honourable friend did not make that very clear. Insulted because my hon. friend from Marquette declares by a motion on which the hon. the Minister of the Interior says that both sides of the House are unanimous that there has been in the past an exploitation of the public lands in the interest of speculators ! My right honourable friend is supersensitive. He finds himself insulted and that is the only reason that he is able to give to his friends to whom he made a frantic appeal to vote down this resolution which is admittedly in the best interests of the Northwest and of this country as a whole.

He not only finds himself insulted but he finds the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Adamson) insulted and he finds the hon. member for East Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) insulted. Why, forsooth ? There was a reference to the fact that these two gentlemen were brothers-in-law. Was that the insult ? I do not know. What was the insult, I repeat ? The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway), this afternoon, did refer to a certain relationship between two gentlemen in Manitoba, and the right hon. gentleman applauded and looked remarkably well pleased. There was no insult in that, but reference to a certain relationship between two of his supporters, a close relationship under very peculiar conditions, causes the right hon. gentleman to be extremely sensitive on behalf of these two hon. gentlemen neither one of whom has been in the House since six o'clock. There was a little cross examination going on when the House rose at six o'clock and one would have supposed that in the interest of good taste, if good taste is to be called in question, these two hon. gentlemen would not have absented themselves during the progress of this debate. What was the insult ? There was no insult. There was a statement of fact. The statement of fact was that when the hon. member for East Assiniboia was land commissioner of this government, when he should have known, as many men did know, that these lands were not arid but that they were valuable, he remained silent or ignorant, one or the other, when his brother-in-law became a member of a syndicate which acquired these lands at $1 an acre and sold them at $8 an acre. That is not an insult—only a plain statement of fact. The right hon. gentleman will have to accept such insults because I do not think that any taunt of that kind will prevent any hon. gentleman on this side of the House from asserting on the floors of parliament face to face with the right hon. gentleman any facts of that kind which are of peculiar significance and which affect the public interest of this country. Not sincere ! That is getting to be the watchword on the other side of the House. If anything is proposed from this side of the House from the right hon. gentleman at the head to the newest backbencher the cry is : Oh, they are not sincere. Does the right hon. gentleman think he is the one to throw that taunt across the floor to any man in this House ? I am not going over old history. I just put the question to him. Not sincere ? These hon. gentlemen who were going to cut off the head of protection and trample on its body, who were going to give us prohibition, who were going to reduce the expenditure and who were going to lighten the burden of taxation, who were going to reform the Senate and who were going to do a number of other things that have not been done and never will be done, when they have no other answer to what is proposed from this side of the House, when they have no other answer to any motion which they declare to be in the true interest of the people of the country, call upon their followers to vote it down because the government is insulted and because hon. gentlemen on this side of the House are not sincere. They blanketed every other section, said the right hon. gentlemen of the Conservative government in the past. Does he recollect that he was a member of Mr. Mackenzie's government from 1874 to 1878 ?

An hon. MEMBER. From 1876.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, he was in the House in 1874 and supporting the government; from 1876 he was a member of the government, and during all that time there was upon the statute-books of this country a statute which blanketed every other ten miles along that railway. Is it worse to blanket every alternate ten miles or every alternate section? Has the right hon. gentleman ever given much consideration to it ? I venture to think that there has been a conversion from the opinions of the old days when the right hon. gentleman says that it is not easy for this government, even after the ten years during which they have been in power, to rid themselves of the effects of the folly of the government of the late Sir John A. Macdonald in 1881. Folly ! Does he know that the government of which he was a member made and continued a standing offer of 50,800,000 acres of public lands which were to be given by way of subsidy to build a railway to the Pacific coast? Does he apply the term 'folly' to that ? In view of that how does he distinguish between the proposition made by the government of which he was a member and the proposition which was carried into effect by the government of Sir John A. Macdonald ? There was no criticism, he says, of the price in 1902. Not a word of criticism in this House in regard to the price at which this land was sold to this company. No criticism? There was no criticism of the deal—well named a deal—in this House in 1902 because not one gentleman in this

House knew a single thing about it and if by cross examination in 1903 we got at a few of the facts we were not able to go very far. We went on again at the first meeting of the Committee on Agriculture in 1904 and before we were able to get at these facts—yes, the year before we were able to get at the facts in regard to this deal—this company had disposed of these lands at $8 an acre. No criticism of the price! Would they have brought more—asks the right hon. gentleman. Would these lands have brought more?—and he gave a very easy and a very comforting answer in so far as he is concerned by the bold assertion that they would not. What is his warrant for that? I asked the question in the House the other day and I got the answer that the government made no attempt whatever to value these lands before they sold them. Why did they not value them? Why did they not make some effort to ascertain what the lands were worth? If they had proposed to bring these so-called arid lands which suddenly blossomed into a garden within a year after the lands had been sold, if they had proposed to bring them to the attention of the country why did they not do this thing openly, put these lands up for tender, have an examination made of them, satisfy themselves that the lands were good and let any profit out of the sale of these lands be realized by the settlers or by the people of the country as a whole instead of giving them to the extent of $2,000,000 into the hands of these gentlemen some of whom have been insulted to-night by the remarks made by my hon. friend beside me (Mr. Foster). Would they have brought more? Well, I think it is extremely probable that they would have brought more if the government had not been either ignorant or guilty of a gross dereliction of duty. We are paying a good deal of money for the Department of the Interior; we are paying a good deal of money for immigration. If Col. Davidson, in one or two years preceding 1902, was able to go into the so-called barren or arid lands of Nebraska and ascertain with very little effort and very little research that these does it happen that this government, spending hundreds of thousands of dollars for the work of the Department of the Interior, was unable to obtain exactly the same information.

The right hon. gentleman pleads ignorance and incapacity in order that he may save some of his friends from the charge or imputation of fraud and corruption. Ignorance and incapacity had to be pleaded in order to save the government from something worse. Colonel Davidson, a citizen of this country, is put forward as a man able to go into the United States and obtain information which, if it had been available to this government, would have justified them in selling these lands for

double or treble the money which they did sell them for by private contract and behind the back of the people of this country. The right hon. gentleman is strongly convinced that these lands were worth no more than one dollar per acre in 1902. He promises us a further discussion; we shall welcome a further discussion; we shall welcome an inquiry. Perhaps the right hon. gentleman is willing to go that far—not only to have a further discussion, but to have an inquiry into this whole question. The assaults that have been hurled at his friends behind him to-night would justify an inquiry. I have not heard it denied that Mr. Adamson was a member of that company. I find the name 'A. J. Adamson' among the gentlemen who made this contract with the government in the first instance—Mr. A. J. Adamson who rose in his seat before 6 o'clock and endeavoured to escape the logic of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) by the unworthy quibble that these lands had not been sold to a company at all. They had not been sold to a company; they had been sold to Colonel Davidson and six or seven other gentlemen, and among these gentlemen was Mr. A. J. Adamson, a brother-in-law of the land commissioner, who ought to have known some thing about the value of these lands in 1902. I will tell the right hon. gentleman what he will find if he examines the public documents of Canada, and I will tell him a part of what he will find if he makes some inquiry, or if this House makes some inquiry into this matter. He will find that the value of these lands was pretty well known to certain men who were going around the Northwest at that time gathering up scrip and using that scrip to secure the best lands. And if any inquiry is made I think I shall be able to give the right hon. gentleman the name of a gentleman who acquired some of these lands in that vicinity in 1901, and who purchased a very large amount of scrip and went back in 1902 to secure some more of it and found he had been forestalled by the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company.

The right hon. gentleman says land is only worth money when there is a demand for it. That is quite true. Has he investigated the statistics to see how the demand was increasing in the very year in which he gave these lands away for a dollar an acre? The sales of the Canadian Pacific Railway lands increased a little in 1899; they increased a little more in 1900; they fell off a little in 1901; in 1901 the sales aggregated 339,985 acres; in 1902, the very year in which these lands were given away for the benefit of the syndicate among whom and with whom were these prominent friends of the government; in that very year the sales of the Canadian Pacific Railway sprang to 1,362,478 acres. You could hardly expect an incapable government would see fit to make an investigation with regard to

land of similar quality in the United States; you could hardly expect them, perhaps, to know how Canadian Pacific Railway lands were selling in 1902, but you might expect them to know something about their own statistics. In 1901 the homestead entries at the Regina agency were 1,318; in 1902 they had jumped to 4,158, more than treble. That year was the beginning of the boom in Northwest lands, when this government, this pure government above any suspicion or any scandal, gave these lands away to its political friends. The homestead entries in Prince Albert in 1901 were 601, and in 1902 1,637, showing practically the same story. Why, the right hon. gentleman surely knows the facts. He knows that before the Northwest was advertised by two or three bumper crops—not by the immigration policy of this government, but far more by two or three bumper crops—it was almost impossible to find a demand for lands anywhere in the Northwest. But when the bumper crops came, when the export of wheat from Canada began to be known all over the world, then the lands of the Northwest acquired a marked and increasing value; and if the government had not been as ignorant and as incapable as the Prime Minister has confessed it to be to-night, it would have known well enough that these lands which sold afterwards for from $8 to $12 an acre should not have been given away behind the backs of the people of this country at $1 per acre to the political friends of this administration.

Now, the Minister of the Interior has wonderful confidence in the Department of the Interior. He did not always share that confidence. I recollect on one occasion when a certain inquiry was proposed into the affairs of the department in respect to the Yukon, and when this government voted down that inquiry as it proposes to vote down this motion to-night, when it covered up as best it could the iniquities that were perpetrated year after year in that part of the country, I recollect that that was too strong even for the present Minister of the Interior, and he rose in his place and voted against the government of which he is now a member. I do not know whether he is now proposing to make the inquiry which he thought should have been made then. There have been some disclosures; I will not read them; they are almost too bad to read in any public assembly. But if my hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) will turn his attention to an interview published in the Winnipeg Tribune of October 9, 1903, perhaps he may find some occasion for opening up that subject again, and among other things he may notice that it was publicly charged that the report of a certain officer of the government had been suppressed and never brought down to parliament. I do not know whether that be true or not, but I would venture to think that that circumstance may very well invite the attention of the Minister of the Interior if he proposes to carry out when he is in office these principles which he professed on the occasion to which I refer.

But, Mr. Speaker, there are one or two matters upon which the Minister of the Interior based some argument in reply to my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. Roche) to which I would like to allude for a moment. Before doing so may I be permitted to say that the Minister of the Interior is remarkably discursive when he debates such questions before the House, and he always succeeds in dragging in irrelevant issues. He saw fit to attack the policy of Mr. Haultain in the recent campaign in the Northwest, and to make certain observations in regard to that gentleman which I would very much like to have him substantiate if he can. The other day when he was asked for the proof he told us he did not carry the proof about with him. He has had three days since. Might I venture to inquire of the hon. gentleman whether or not he has succeeded in finding the proof of the statement, or at least the impression he endeavoured to convey to this House that Mr. Haultain had declared himself in favour of granting no more homesteads and selling all lands if they should be passed over to the provincial government? Has the hon. gentleman found any proof of that statement which he made the other day?

Mr. OLIVER. If I have the privilege of making a statement on that matter after the hon. gentleman is through, I shall be very glad to do so.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Good, very good——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Now.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No, the hon. gentleman is not prepared to make that statement now, he is still unready.

Mr. OLIVER. I am something like my hon. friends the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and his lieutenant, I am very cautious.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, I do not think he is very cautious; on the other hand I would say the hon. gentleman shows a remarkable recklessness, and an unequalled facility for making statements which he cannot substantiate. I may tell him that I have in my hand his statement and I have the statement of Mr. Haultain made upon a public platform in the west. The hon. gentleman's insinuation against Mr. Haultain, if it meant anything, conveyed the impression to which I have just referred. He said that Mr. Haultain had declared himself in favour of selling many millions of acres of land. I pointed out that his predecessor in the Department of the Interior had declared the policy of this government

to be a policy which would bring into the market not less than 50,000,000 acres—but they were not homesteads nor were the lands to which Mr. Haultain referred. Here is the language of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) :

> The leader of what has turned out to be the opposition in Saskatchewan announced from platform after platform that their policy was to sell the lands of the west to the highest bidder in order to secure money for expenditures in that country. They spoke of the sale of millions of acres of land, they issued literature in which they declared that the policy of this government in giving the land free to settlers was robbery of these provinces, and they headed their document 'public lands robbery.'

Here is Mr. Haultain's statement at Arcola, on November 21, 1905:

> Mr. Haultain then spoke at great length on the public lands question, quoting the most eminent authorities on the subject and proving conclusively the loss the province would sustain by the so-called compensation allowed by the Laurier government. He showed the absurdity of Mr. Scott's statement that by having the lands, the province would run into direct taxation. By figures and facts he proved that if the province had the lands in its own hands, by only selling a small proportion at a very low figure, it would be more than $4,000,000 a year better off. He had been accused of wanting to do away with the homesteads. This was not a fact, for it was his opinion that they must continue. He pointed out that much money might be saved in regard to the land by making the staff employed do their duty and not spend their time electioneering.

I am sure that whatever other part of Mr. Haultain's policy the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) might concur in, he would be absolutely and irrevocably opposed to that contained in the sentence which I have just read.

The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) seemed to consider that there was some technical difficulty in the way of carrying out this resolution. He referred to certain agreements which he called 'indemnity agreements', and I asked the hon. gentleman to be furnished with copies of them. I have in the meantime made the best inquiry and the best examination I could in this matter. I have read over the agreement, and there is not one word in it, from beginning to end, that justifies any position such as that hon. gentleman took. This company had a certain land grant. They found themselves in financial difficulties, and it was on account of the very financial difficulties in which they were involved that they sold this land for the sum of $1.53 per acre in the year 1902. The Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) was perfectly aware of that fact I am sure. Every one knew that that road was practically in bankruptcy, and they took the opportunity of selling nearly a million acres of land for $1.53 an acre, although they did not secure the advantages which they secured from the government by means of homestead rights under the agreement made between the Minister of the Interior and Mr. Adamson and his friends. This company was in difficulties ; it undertook to carry the mails and it received from the government $80,000 a year. It was considered that that sum would be in excess of the sum earned each year by the carriage of mails, and it was provided that in respect of such excess the government of this country should have a lien upon the land grant of the company as security for that purpose. The taking of that lien did not give the company any right to postpone the selection of its land grant. It is easy enough to see what the situation would have been if the company had made a mortgage to a third person instead of to the government. Suppose this company had secured an advance of $80,000 a year from a third person or corporation, that corporation would have a charge or lien upon the land grant of the company under the terms of the charging document, but the fact that that charge was created could not possibly give that company any right as between itself and the government to postpone the selection of this land ; and so when the advance is obtained, not from a third person but from the government, there is no postponement of selection unless you find it within the four corners of the agreement. I have examined that agreement, and I say it contains no clause and no provision which to my mind brings about any such result as that which is claimed by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver). If there had been otherwise any force in the suggestion of the Minister of the Interior it would be swept away as the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) points out by the statement of the Prime Minister this afternoon that this matter is to be dealt with in a very few weeks. In 1903 the then Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) said that all these land grants would be closed up within a very few weeks, within three weeks, if I remember his language correctly, and he said that the government would introduce legislation at an early day to bring into the market 50,000,000 acres of land and he expected that the government would be able to sell 20,000,000 acres of these lands within a reasonable period, bringing into the treasury of this country $60,000,000 which would recoup the country for all the pecuniary outlay involved in the construction of the Transcontinental Railway.

For these reasons I do not find anything in the remarks of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) which would justify the House in not supporting this motion. It is admittedly a motion along right lines, a motion on which both sides should be unanimous, and the only reason assigned by the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Lau-

rier) for asking his followers to vote it down is one which should not commend itself to any hon. gentleman in this House ; it is the trivial excuse that the government of this country is insulted by some reference in the motion to the exploitation of the speculator. The exploitation of the speculator has taken place ; it may have taken place under previous administrations, but undoubtedly under this administration, and notably in the very case so fully gone into by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) not one of whose arguments the Prime Minister when he rose to reply was able to confute. For this reason I find myself entirely in accord with the motion of my hon. friend from Marquette (Mr. W. J. Roche) and I shall have a very great deal of pleasure in voting for the amendment which he has proposed.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Mr. Speaker, I should not trespass upon the House by asking for the privilege of speaking again on this subject but the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) has discussed a certain part of the remarks which I made in connection with certain documents which I placed in his hand ; and as his reading of those documents radically differs from mine, if he will be good enough to hand them back to me, I shall try to make clear the interpretation clear which I put before the House. The position, as I stated it the other night, with regard to the closing out of the railway land grants is this, that every land grant made to any railway in the Northwest, which has been earned by that railway, has been closed out absolutely by a selection of the land, except in those cases where the terms of the grant absolutely prevented the government from compelling a selection. The three instances of which I spoke were the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway, the Canadian Northern and the Manitoba and Southeastern. What I meant to say was this, that the land subsidies to the Qu'Appelle Railway and the Canadian Northern were connected with an agreement called a transport contract, under which the selection of one-third of the total subsidies could not be compelled by the government or required by the company until the period of twenty years, for which the transport contract was to run, had expired. The selection of that one-third of the subsidy might be made by mutual agreement before the expiry of the twenty years but not otherwise.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will the hon. gentleman read that portion of the agreement ?

Mr. OLIVER. That is what I propose to do. In respect to the Qu'Appelle Company, the reading is this :

Section 6.— By way of indemnity to the government in case the amount earned by the company for such service should not amount to the sum paid by the government in any year, the government, as the land grant of the company is earned from time to time, shall retain one-third of the land so earned, which shall be held by the government as a first charge or lien securing the repayment of any such deficiency, and shall issue to the company patents for the remaining two-thirds thereof.

Section 8.—If during the said period of twenty years, the government sell any land included in the land grant so retained, or if the same is sold by the company with the consent of the government, patents therefore shall be issued to the purchaser upon payment to the government of the prices for which said land has been sold : it being distinctly understood and agreed that the government, in the event of any deficiency, shall retain the whole proceeds of the sale of any portion of the said one-third acres so retained until the expiration of the said period of twenty years, allowing interest thereon at the rate of four per cent per annum; but in the event of no deficiency the government may, if they see fit, cause to be returned to the company a pro rata proportion of the land so retained.

My reading of that section is that there is no authority, by virtue of which the government can compel the company to select that land or the company can compel the government to come to a conclusion with regard to it, as long as the transport contract is in operation. This applies to the Canadian Northern as well as the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railway.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. They are all practically the same.

Mr. OLIVER. I said with regard to the Manitoba and Southeastern Company that the conditions of the land grant—there being no transport contract in that connection—were such that, owing to a conflict between the company and the Manitoba government as to the right to the land, the company had not selected its land, nor could it do so, for the good and sufficient reason that the land was not there to select.

The position I repeat is this, that of the vast land grants which were made in the Northwest to railway companies, which had been earned by the companies or should have been earned (except a part of the Hudson's Bay Railway grant, amounting to some six and a half million acres), all these have been closed out, so far as the government could compel that to be done. The balance can only be closed out immediately by mutual agreement between the companies and the government. Such a mutual agreement is being negotiated and we are in hopes of a satisfactory conclusion being reached within a very short time.

As regards the other matter, concerning which my hon. friend was so very anxious, the position of his friend Mr. Haultain, my hon. friends were so eager that I should give evidence of what I said that I took the trouble to obtain some of the documents on the subject and I happen to have probably a report of the very speech of Mr. Haultain which my hon. friend has just read.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of the 21st November.

Mr. OLIVER. This is a report of the meeting at Arcola which is published in the Arcola 'Star' of November 24. In the course of his remarks, Mr. Haultain is reported to have said :

For himself he considered $4 an acre a low estimate, which for a basis of calculation he would adopt for his illustrations. He maintained that by sale of 5,000,000 acres at $4 an acre the province at three per cent would realize $600,000 per annum.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is good arithmetic.

Mr. OLIVER. No doubt, but Mr. Haultain was there suggesting to the people of Arcola that his policy was to sell this land.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What land ?

Mr. HAGGART. Is there anything about homesteads there ?

Mr. OLIVER. I did not suggest that Mr. Haultain had ever said he would not grant homesteads. What I said and repeat is that he and his friends distinctly declared themselves in favour of selling the land to the speculator. That is the principle set forth in this speech and in other speeches by Mr. Haultain.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does he use the word 'speculators' ?

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly not, he is too prudent for that, but at a meeting at Weyburn, reported in the Winnipeg 'Telegram,' he said :

Suppose that of the 73,000,000 acres yet remaining, half was put aside for homesteads,——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. OLIVER (reading),

—a principle he heartily endorsed,——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. OLIVER (reading)

—and the provincial government took 5,000,0000 acres of the 36,500,000 and offered them for sale at the low price of $4 per acre, with long terms of payment, preference being given to contiguous or actual settlers,——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. OLIVER (reading)

—and four per cent being charged on the capital sum. Then the provincial government would have a further fund of $800,000 at its disposal annually, which, with the $650,000 mentioned above, would amount to more than the total compensation the federal government offered when the province reached a population of 1,200,000. While 31,500,000 acres would still remain for the people of Saskatchewan.

Again, I find the report of Mr. Haultain's Arcola meeting in the Winnipeg 'Telegram' where he is reported to have said :

Mr. OLIVER.

By figures and facts he proved that if the province had the lands in its own hands, by only selling a small proportion at a very low figure, it would be more than $4,000,000 a year better off.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, Oh.

Mr. OLIVER. I notice that my hon. friends opposite are very enthusiastic over the land for the speculator.

Mr. NORTHRUP. The speculator is not mentioned at all.

Mr. OLIVER. He does not need to be mentioned.

Mr. NORTHRUP. But the settler is mentioned.

Mr. OLIVER. I took the liberty of alluding to the literature issued by our friends on the other side in that campaign—

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Issued by the provincial rights party.

Mr. OLIVER. In Alberta they were called Conservatives. But they need not be called anything now—there is not enough of them left to carry a name. This is the appeal that the Conservative party made in Alberta on this question. 'The Land Question' is the title of the document, and here is a sample paragraph :

There is no reason why a good-sized block of lands in the province should not be sold. They are in great demand now ; colonization companies are willing to purchase them, and the best of settlers are willing to buy them at good prices. Settlement would probably take place faster, and the province would be at little, if any expense, yet obtain a handsome income for immediate wants as regards roads and bridges.

It can't be disputed that if the province of Alberta had its lands to-morrow, it could sell 6,000,000 acres for $5 per acre cash, and the buyers would do the colonization. This invested at the small rate of four per cent, would give us $1,200,000 annually or $75,000 a year more than the maximum we will ever get from the Dominion, and still we would have millions of acres left for settlers.

But this was to be for the speculator.

Mr. LALOR. Would the hon. gentleman allow me to read the statement which he read in the House on the occasion—

Mr. OLIVER. I am speaking under the privilege accorded me by the House. Of course, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lalor) objects I shall have to take my seat.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Oh, no; no one objects.

Mr. OLIVER. In the province of Saskatchewan, where the friend of the hon. leader of the opposition was the leader of the Conservative party and where he was delivering these magnificent addresses in favour of the land for the settler, this is what he was publishing as campaign literature. The document is headed 'The

Public Lands Robbery!' 'How the New Provinces are Plundered Under the Compensation Clauses.' 'Are You Going to Endorse it?'

If the lands were turned over to the absolute control and disposition of the province, an immediate realization would be possible. By advertising these lands for sale in the financial centres of the world an abundance of liberal offers could be obtained. The sale of the entire lot at a figure not less than $4 per acre would be easily affected. This would mean that a sum of $200,000,000 would be immediately available. By investing this sum at three and a half per cent, a matter of little difficulty, a perpetual income of no less than $7,000,000 would be secured. In comparison to this, what is the pittance of $375,000 allowed by the Dominion government? The province could, if it chose, afford to wait until the value of the lands increased, and then sell them piece-meal, at great advantage. An even larger return would be assured by following this method. The objection that the Dominion needs the lands in order to promote immigration and settlement is a trifling one. Full allowance for this purpose is made in deducting 50,000,000 acres before the share remaining to the province is calculated All the immigrants who will be brought to this country by the active agency of the Dominion government will be here by the time the 50,000,000 acres are exhausted. . . . The rate of interest allowed by the Dominion is ridiculously low. If the increase of population should come at the rate of 50,000 per annum it would take about nineteen years to reach the level, 1,200,000 where the maximum rate, three per cent is to be allowed. During all that time the average payment to the province by the Dominion on account will be $562,500 per annum. If Saskatchewan were permitted to realize on her lands at once, an annual income of several millions would be secured. Why may the province not have the lands?

Mr. Haultain had a number of candidates supporting him. There was a rather small percentage of them elected. One of these candidates was Mr. W. D. Dunlop, who announced his views on the land question to an expectant world.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What was his name?

Mr. OLIVER. His name was Dunlop. He was not elected. In fact, I might mention he lost his deposit. And this was his policy of the land for the settler, speaking as one of the candidates on behalf of the Conservative party:

We need every dollar that can be made out of our lands to be expended for public purposes in our province, to keep taxation as low as possible; let those who develop the country get the increase in the value of our lands which increased settlement will bring. If the lands are not worth more to the Dominion government than it offers for them, why does it keep them?

To add to the evidence which I have offered to hon. gentlemen opposite as to the policy which they have pursued for so long, I would refer my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) to the speech which he himself made last session in this House, in which he spoke of setting apart certain millions of acres of land for the purpose of selling to whom? To speculators. Anybody who had the money was good enough for him to sell these lands to. But today he weeps crocodile tears over the settler. It is the poor settler who occupies his whole attention. I am obliged to hon. gentlemen opposite for their courtesy in permitting me to reply to the demand made by their hon. leader.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. As a part of this is in the nature of a controversy between the hon. minister and myself as to the effect of this document perhaps I may be permitted a word. The sections which the hon. minister has read do not, so far as I understand them bear out in the least what he bases upon them. Section 6 says:

By way of indemnity to the government in case the amount earned by the company for such service should not amount to the sum paid by the government in any year—

He is speaking not of the earning of the lands, but of the earning of the mail subsidy.

—the government, as the land grant of the company is earned, from time to time, shall retain one-third of the land grant so earned on the line between Lake Dauphin or thereabouts at the point aforementioned to the Saskatchewan river, which shall be held by the government as a first charge or lien securing the repayment of any such deficiency, and the government shall issue to the company patents for the remaining two-thirds thereof.

All that means is that after the lands are selected the government shall not issue a patent for that one-third. Perfectly plain if any one takes the trouble to read it.

Mr. OLIVER. There is no word in that section about selecting land.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of course there is not, and therefore it does not affect the selection of land.

Mr. OLIVER. I used the word because my hon. friend used it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I used it too because it is the proper word to use. For the very reason that this section is not dealing with the selection of land; it mentions the issue of patents of lands which have been selected. I would think that the veriest tyro in construction of documents could not make such a mistake as that into which the Minister of the Interior has apparently fallen. And the other section does not alter it at all, and even if it did alter it, the privilege is not a privilege of the company but of the government, and the government could waive the privilege whenever it requires these lands to be selected.

Mr. OLIVER. What privilege.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The privilege of having these lands remain unselected.

Mr. OLIVER. Why could they waive the privilege ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Because any person who has a right or privilege under the law of this country has the option of waiving that right or privilege. The government of this country has that option in common with all persons. Any party to a contract who has a right or privilege thereunder can waive it to the advantage and in favour of the other party.

Mr. OLIVER. Was the privilege the hon. gentleman speaks of the privilege of the company or the privilege of the government ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am trying to point out to the hon. gentleman that if this is a privilege—assuming his argument is correct, though there is not the shadow of a foundation for it—but assuming it is correct, then it would be a privilege not of the company but of the government, and the government possessing that privilege could waive it. Therefore there is no legal or technical difficulty in the way. I will not pursue the matter further, it is so simple and plain that it is difficult to argue about it.

Mr. FOSTER. The difficulty is that the Minister of the Interior has got the opinion of the law officer of the government upon it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have only one word to say about the very interesting extracts which the minister read at great length. Permit me to say that I was particularly struck with the remarks of Mr. Dunlop, I never heard of that gentleman before, but I thought his remarks contained a good deal of good sense : and if the minister would propound his future policy based largely upon what he has read to us to-night, I am sure the department will be much better administered in the future than it has been in the past.

Mr. H. BOURASSA (Labelle). Before the question is put I wish to explain the vote I propose giving on this motion. I will not go over all the ground that has been opened up, but will simply take the advice given by the Prime Minister and consider this motion on its merits. With the general principle contained in that motion, we must accept the word of the Prime Minister as well as the word of hon. members on that side of the House, that the House is unanimous in the opinion that the public lands should be sold to the people directly by the government without the interference of the speculator. As regards subsidies to railways, I am not going to follow the line of discussion which has been adopted by both sides of the House. To my mind this House indulges too often the habit of trying to escape the straight discussion of an issue by throwing stones at each other, and by trying to excuse one party by the faults of the other, I am not going to inquire either, the justification the last government may have had for their railway policy. I think that railway policy was wrong, but perhaps if I had been a member of the House at the time it was adopted and applied, I might have made the same mistake as the men of that time made. Moreover, the circumstances were not the same then as they are to-day. Now the reason given by the Prime Minister why his friends should resist this motion is that it contains an insinuation that this government acted wrongly in selling land to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company. I think the government have proven by their acts that they wish to repair the mistake committed in the past by other governments. But it seems to me it is rather a strange way to repair past mistakes by committing another one of the same kind. Therefore if the fact that this motion implies blame on the government for granting land to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, is the only reason for opposing this motion, I cannot agree with the leader of the government. I think that the actual transaction which took place according to the facts we have before us, will justify me in voting in favour of this motion.

Although I am only a comparatively young member of parliament, I have learned by experience that it is not always possible for a government or a party in power to apply all the principles it professed in opposition. I have left in abeyance some of the ideas I have preached in former days because experience has taught me that there is a long way between propounding a policy and executing it. But as I have said on a previous occasion, there are a few principles that I preached when in opposition when opposing the Conservative party, to which I still adhere. I am ready to lay aside my own judgment, and have done so many times in the past, and have supported the government on some question that I did not approve. But I think it is a poor excuse to shelter ourselves under the fact that previous governments have done the same. We have denounced those governments because we claimed that they were ruining this country and were concentrating the wealth of this country in the hands of a few corporations. This is one of the few principles of the old Liberal party to which I still adhere, and I am not prepared to vote against a motion simply because it might imply blame on the government, when that motion condemns a policy that we have denounced time and time again in the past, and which as a Liberal I am prepared to denounce now.

House divided on the amendment (Mr. W. J. Roche).

YEAS :

Messieurs.

Alcorn,	Jackson (Elgin),
Ames,	Lake,

Armstrong,
Avery,
Barker,
Barr,
Bennett,
Blain,
Bland,
Borden (Carleton),
Bourassa,
Brabazon,
Bristol,
Broder,
Chisholm (Huron),
Clements,
Cochrane,
Cockshutt,
Crocket,
Daniel,
Elson,
Foster,
Fowler,
Ganong,
Gunn,
Haggart,
Henderson,
Herron,
Hughes (Victoria),
Ingram,
Lalor,
Lancaster,
Lefurgey,
Lennox
Leonard,
Lewis,
Macdonell,
McCarthy (Calgary),
McLean
(Queen's, P.E.I.),
Monk,
Morin,
Paquet,
Perley,
Pringle,
Reid (Grenville),
Roche (Marquette),
Schaffner,
Sproule,
Staples,
Stockton,
Tisdale,
Verville,
Walsh,
Wilmot,
Wilson
(Lennox & Adding.),
Wright (Muskoka)—58.

NAYS :

Messieurs

Adamson,
Archambault,
Aylesworth,
Beauparlant,
Belcourt,
Bickerdike,
Black,
Bole,
Borden (Sir Frederick),
Bourbonnais,
Brodeur,
Bruneau,
Bureau,
Caldwell,
Campbell,
Carney,
Carvell,
Cash,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Clarke,
Conmee,
Crawford,
Cyr,
Delisle,
Demers,
Derbyshire,
Desjardins,
Devlin,
Dubeau,
Dugas,
Dyment,
Emmerson,
Ethier,
Finlay,
Finlayson,
Fisher,
Fitzpatrick,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
Gervais,
Girard,
Gladu,
Gordon,
Grant,
Greenway,
Harty,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Laurier
(L'Assomption),
Lavergne
(Drum. & Arth.),
Law,
LeBlanc,
Lemieux,
Logan,
Lovell,
Macdonald,
Maclean (Lunenburg),
Macpherson,
McColl,
McCool,
McCraney,
McIntyre,
McKenzie,
McLennan,
Marcile (Bagot),
Marcil (Bonaventure),
Martin (Wellington),
Meigs,
Miller,
Oliver,
Pardee,
Paterson,
Parent,
Piché,
Pickup,
Power,
Proulx,
Ratz,
Reid (Restigouche),
Rivet,
Ross (Cape Breton),
Ross (Rimouski),
Ross (Yale-Cariboo),
Rousseau,
Savoie,
Schell (Glengarry),
Schell (Oxford),
Sinclair,
Sloan,
Smith (Nanaimo),
Smith (Oxford),
Hughes
(King's, P.E.I.),
Hunt,
Jackson (Selkirk),
Johnston,
Kennedy,
Knowles,
Lachance,
Lanctot,
Lapointe,
Laurence,
Stewart,
Talbot (Bellechasse),
Telford,
Templeman,
Tobin,
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Watson,
Wilson (Russell),
Wright (Renfrew),
Zimmerman.—111.

PAIRS :

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Hall,	Bergeron,
Costigan,	Maclean (York, S.),
Fielding,	White,
Calvert,	Taylor,
McCarthy (Simcoe, N.)	Northrup,
Sifton,	Seagram,
Carrier,	Kemp,
Copp,	Osler,
Hyman,	Ward,
Brown,	MacLaren (Perth),
Roche (Halifax).	Martin, (Queen's, P.E.I.),
Galliher,	Clare,
German,	Porter,
Guthrie,	Smith (Wentworth),
Beland,	Forget,
Burrows,	Christie,
Boyer,	Boyce,
Parmelee,	Worthington,
Loggie,	Thompson (Yukon),

Amendment negatived.

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

Indians, British Columbia—salaries, $18,060.

Mr. OLIVER. The only change is that the salary of Mr. Dalby, who has been in the service for six or seven years, has been increased from $720 to $840 on the recommendation of the superintendent, Mr. Vowell.

Mr. FOSTER. $120 seems an irregular increase.

Mr. OLIVER. It is $10 a month. A clerk at $600 is provided for the Indian agent at New Westminster. We have been charging this salary to 'miscellaneous,' and it is proposed to change that.

Mr. FOSTER. That disappears from the 'miscellaneous.'

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Indians, British Columbia—relief, $6,000.

Mr. OLIVER. That is for the relief of actual destitution among Indians throughout the province when absolutely necessary. The Indians are exposed to many dangers; the department is called upon to assist those whose homes have been entirely destroyed and to help the old and destitute in the different agencies. The expenditure in 1901-2 was $6,499 ; in 1902-3, $8,767 ; in 1903-4, was $7,182 ; in 1904-5, $8,002. The maintenance of the insane Indians while in the asylum is charged to this vote.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister should be careful that that item of relief does not creep into British Columbia where it was never intended to be at first. The British Columbia Indians have been self-supporting and it is better that they should go on in their old independent and self-supporting way. Of course if it is a matter of taking care of the insane it is a perfectly legitimate expense.

Mr. OLIVER. The expenditure is actually in the line the hon. gentleman suggests.

British Columbia Indians—seed, $750.

Mr. OLIVER. Implements and seed grain are given to Indians who show an honest desire to cultivate their lands, but who are too poor to purchase. It is seldom the Indians are able to save enough seed for the next spring sowing owing to drought and unavoidable causes. Tools are sometimes supplied to boys who have learned trades at the industrial school to assist them to make a living and that they may be of use in improving their houses. The department is informed that much benefit has been derived as a result of the expenditure made this way. The amount expended for the last two years has been:

1901-2	$510
1902-3	153
1903-4	416
1904-5	723

Mr. FOSTER. What supervision is there over them that they do not dispose of their tools ?

Mr. OLIVER. That of course is under the general supervision of the agent. I do not know that there is any very close tally kept but of course it is part of his duty to see that no improper disposition is made. The British Columbia Indians are very much more expert in the use of tools than the plain Indians, and have much more requirement for them.

Mr. FOSTER. I presume as a general rule they are supposed to buy their own.

Mr. OLIVER. They do as a rule, it is only, as this says, to encourage the young fellows.

Medical attendance and medicine, $15,000.

Mr. FOSTER. Here is a very large item.

Mr. OLIVER. This item does not seem to be excessive, it is the same as last year.

Mr. FOSTER. How has that been running for the last few years ?

Mr. OLIVER. The expenditure has been:

1901-2	$20,468 43
1902-3	18,341 45
1903-4	15,534 44
1904-5	17,407 59

Medical attendance and medicines are provided for Indians who cannot afford to buy them themselves. The physicians are either upon salaries, which represent a fair allowance for their services and the medicines supplied or when paid by accounts they are allowed the lowest possible charges made to poor white patients. Medicines are supplied by medical missionaries who distribute them to Indians under their charge.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What medical men are permanently employed ?

Mr. OLIVER. The following is a list of the doctors :

Victoria office—	
O. M. Jones	$ 500
Babine agency—	
H. C. Wrinch	300
Cowichan—	
H. P. Millard	240
H. B. Rogers	300
W. F. Drysdale (Nanaimo)	500
P. W. Rolston	400
Fraser agency—	
W. D. Brydone-Jack, M.D., Vancouver and vicinity	1,200
Drs. Hall and Drew, New Westminster	1,200
C. A. Elliott, M.D., Harrington Hot Springs	750
J. C. Henderson, Chilliwack	300
R. F. Greer, Steveston	300
A. A. King, Ladner	500
A. J. Stewart, Mission City	500

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. At Mission City or Harrison Hot Springs for instance how many Indians are there ?

Mr. OLIVER. At Mission City my officers say there are 300 and about 400 in the vicinity of Harrison Hot Springs.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would the minister explain why in Quebec medical attendance and medicines cost only a little over $4,000, in Ontario a little over $2,000 and in British Columbia $15,000 ?

Mr. OLIVER. In Quebec, I am informed, there are only about 10,000 Indians, and they are all on a small number of reserves, which are so situated as to be conveniently reached, whereas in British Columbia there are 25,000 Indians and their reserves are scattered all over the province; there are over 1,000 reserves. The Indians are scattered in very small bands, and in that way the medical attendance comes much higher, and of course medical fees are higher any way in British Columbia than in Quebec.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How many Indians are there in Ontario ?

Mr. OLIVER. About 20,000. In Ontario on a number of reserves where the bands are large and they are well advanced in civilization they pay for a good deal of their medical attendance out of their own funds.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Then I think it is high time the minister should make some investigation into this. In Ontario and in British Columbia there are practically the same number of Indians, 20,000, but in On-

tario we pay only a little over $2,000 for medical attendance and medicines, whereas in British Columbia the government in the nine months are paying $15,000 for the same service, for practically the same number of Indians.

Mr. OLIVER. The explanation, as I have said, is that in Ontario the Indians are massed in large numbers on a few reserves which makes it very much more easy to give them medical attendance whereas in British Columbia they are scattered over an area of over three or four times as large as the settled portions of Ontario.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. 1,000 reserves ?

Mr. OLIVER. 1,040 reserves. Reserves there are on an entirely different principle from the Ontario reserves or the Northwest reserves. A few families have a reserve and they are scattered all over the province. That makes the cost of medical attendance much higher than in Ontario. Besides I am informed that in Ontario where the Indian bands have become fairly well civilized, they pay a large part of their own medical attendance.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Do I understand that there are 1,000 reserves in British Columbia with an Indian population of only 20,000.

Mr. OLIVER. That is what I am informed.

Mr. SPROULE. If the Indians in the other provinces are able out of their earnings to pay such a large portion of the cost of their medical attendance it seems to me the British Columbia Indians are not up to the mark. For 1904, the British Columbia Indians earned $425,694, while the Ontario Indians earned $462,000, pretty much the same, and yet it is said that the earnings of the Indians in Ontario enable them to pay for their medical attendance whereas in British Columbia they do not.

Mr. OLIVER. Not the earnings. The Indians of Ontario, the large bands, have large revenues from property which has been sold and the proceeds funded so that they have a steady revenue, which, of course, the British Columbia Indians have not. The Ontario Indians are property owners, that is they have a valuable income which the British Columbia Indians do not.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Do not many of these British Columbia Indians earn large sums at fish panning ?

Mr. OLIVER. The hon. member has read that they earn $400,000 a year. Their earnings are as large as those of the Ontario Indians, but the Ontario Indians have in addition this fixed revenue, aside from their earnings, and it is out of this that they pay their share of medical attendance.

Mr. T. CHISHOLM. What is the difference between the charges the medical men make in Ontario and in British Columbia ? I have always understood that the Indians in British Columbia were fairly well civilized. Why should they not pay their own medical fees ?

Mr. MACPHERSON. In British Columbia the Indians contiguous to the water earn fairly good money but there are a great many removed from the possibility of making much money. For instance the Indians on the watershed of the Fraser river and in the interior.

Mr. SPROULE. The Indians make money from two sources—one, wages earned; and the other, other industries. Take wages earned and the proceeds from other industries, the British Columbia Indians last year earned $692,000 while the Ontario Indians only earned $601,000. If the British Columbia Indians are able to earn more, they should be able to pay a large share of their own expenses for medical attendance.

Mr. OLIVER. There are one-third more of them than in Ontario, which increases the cost of medical attendance without a corresponding increase in the earning power.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Has the hon. minister any report to show that one out of a thousand of these Indians ever sees a doctor or gets any medicine on these one thousand and forty reserves ?

Mr. OLIVER. I imagine that a good many are so far away that they do not get medical attendance except very rarely.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Are there any reports from these doctors ?

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly, they have to report from time to time.

Mr. FOWLER. Do you pay them a stated price per year as is done in New Brunswick ?

Mr. OLIVER. I was reading a list of the doctors and the salaries that are paid.

Mr. SPROULE. Does that include medicine ?

Mr. OLIVER. They have to provide medicine as well. We pay them a stated salary to attend certain bands, and they provide their own medicine.

Mr. FOWLER. If another doctor should be called in, does the regular doctor pay his fee ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. J. D. REID. This item of medical attendance and medicine is rather misleading. I see that in the Auditor General's Report of last year out of $5,615 paid under the heading of relief and medical attendance, are included payments for items such as lumber, oats, provisions, amounting to about two-thirds of the whole expenditure.

That looks to me as though the amount of $20,000 voted had been used for other purposes than medical attendance and medicine.

Mr. OLIVER. The heading in the Auditor General's Report is not medical attendance alone but relief and medical attendance.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is the item we are now passing intended to cover both ?

Mr. OLIVER. We are now dealing with medical attendance only. Relief is kept separate from medical attendance in British Columbia.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Is there much tuberculosis among the Indians of British Columbia ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, considerable.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Has the hon. minister had any of the British Columbia medical officers visit Ottawa at the time of the tuberculosis convention ?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. It would appear then that Dr. Lafferty is the only favoured one. Can the minister tell us if the visit this year of Dr. Lafferty to the tuberculosis convention was at the expense of the government ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, and the reason is that tuberculosis is very prevalent among the Indians in the Northwest, more so than in British Columbia. Tuberculosis is common to all Indians, especially where they have adopted civilized life to any extent.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Was there any other medical officer in the service of the government in any of these Indian reserves, invited down by the government to attend the tuberculosis convention at the government's expense, besides Dr. Lafferty ?

Mr. OLIVER. No, but we have had other medical men come here. Dr. MacKenzie of Manitoulin and Dr. Fraser of Brandon were brought here previously to discuss the question of tuberculosis.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. At the expense of the government ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes. Not to attend a convention but for the purpose of having discussion on this question.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The other night the minister told us that Dr. Bryce had invited Dr. Lafferty down to attend this convention. Did he invite Dr. Lafferty down this year as well ?

Mr. OLIVER. I could not say at the moment but will find out.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. This is either not complimentary to the doctor at Calgary or the Indians who reside there are specially favoured. I do not see any physician from any other province, except Dr. Lafferty, brought to attend a convention at the expense of the country. The trip is a very nice one, but I do not see why there should be this discrimination. It would lead one to imagine that Dr. Lafferty does not really possess those qualifications with which the Minister of the Interior so profusely credited him the other night, when Dr. Lafferty has to come to Ottawa to improve himself in his profession while the physicians of the other provinces do not require to take that course. But one can hardly call the deal a square one for the Indians of the other provinces, especially when the hon. minister states that the British Columbia Indians are suffering from tuberculosis.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Probably he made an elaborate report to the government upon the proceedings of the Tuberculosis convention. Has the minister that report with him ?

Mr. OLIVER. I certainly have not.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the minister know whether there was one ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not aware that there was.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. There is another reason, I think, why there is such a discrepancy between the Indians of Ontario and those of British Columbia in this respect. As I understand the state of affairs in the reserve in Brant county, the largest reserve in Canada, the doctor and medical attendants are paid by the Indians themselves. Why is it that some Indians should be charged with the whole of this expense while those in British Columbia and other places have medical attendance provided at the expense of the people of Canada. Because the Six Nations have saved money, they have to provide a fine house upon the reserve for their doctor and pay him a large salary out of the Indian fund. I think this is the explanation rather than that which the minister gives, that the Indians are scattered over many reserves.

Mr. TAYLOR. In the time of the late government I have often heard its leader Sir John Macdonald say that the Indians were the wards of the government. The Indians were looked upon then as human beings and Christians. But the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson) who, I presume, speaks for the government says that the Indians of British Columbia are a different breed of animals. So, I presume, they are treated as animals.

Mr. MACPHERSON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor) must not say that I said that. I said that they were different animals.

Mr. TAYLOR. Well, then, they are not human beings, according to the hon. member for Vancouver. Comparing the figures in the Auditor General's Report for 1895-6 and those of the Auditor General's Report

for 1904-5, which is now before us, I see that it costs the country a great deal more to take care of these Indians in the time when they are designated as animals than it did when they were regarded as human beings. I have often heard the late Sir John Macdonald say that the expenditure on the Indian should decrease year by year as the Indians were settled on reserves and taught to cultivate the ground and support themselves. But instead of that, the expenditure on Indians is going up by leaps and bounds, not only in the newer provinces but in the older ones as well. I find that in 1895-6 the Indians of Ontario and Quebec cost $74,369, while under this government they cost $117,383. And we know that in Ontario and Quebec the Indians are not increasing in numbers, but decreasing. Then take the management of the department here at Ottawa, the expense of which certainly should not have increased. Under the late government the cost was $49,000 while now it is $59,000 an increase of $10,000. And so it is with every department. I hope the hon. member for Vancouver will withdraw the statement he has made and will say that the Indians of British Columbia are wards of the government, that they are human beings and Christians.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. There seems to be great discrepancy in the expense for medical attendance in these Indian reserves. Take, for instance, the figures for the William's Lake agency, at page J—70 of the Auditor General's Report. I find there :

Salaries of physicians to June 30, 1905—S. Clarke, M.D., 12 months, $480 ; J. M. English, M.D., 3 months to May 31, $75 ; A. D. Morgan, M.D., 1 month to July 31, $35 ; Mactyn-Hoops, M.D., 12 months, $700 ; $1,280.

In another agency I find half a dozen doctors receiving only $263. These medical men do not seem to be up to their business. In the Kootenay agency the doctors are only paid $17.50. These gentlemen need to be given a pointer.

Mr. FOSTER. There is more there—It says, 'physician, Hugh Wall, M.D.', 3 months at $30, 9 months at $40.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Still there does not seem to be the same treatment all through. I do not know all these reserves but I know some of them, and I cannot understand why so much should be spent for medical attendance.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I believe that the discrepancy between the expenditure for this service in relation to the Ontario Indians and the British Columbia Indians requires further explanation. Then, I notice that in British Columbia boarding schools the expenditure is over $69,000, while in Ontario, Quebec and the maritime provinces, Indians numbering possibly 30,000 have only $40,000 spent for their education. I believe these two items should be left for further statement from the minister. I may say also that I am sorry that the hon. member for Vancouver has not made the apology suggested by the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor). If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macpherson) will look around this Dominion, he will find Indians filling some of the most prominent positions in the country. I feel sure that the hon. gentleman will take back the words he has uttered to-night.

Mr. J. D. REID. The minister stated a few minutes ago that several of these doctors were permanently employed. Are these physicians allowed to practice outside the agency ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. J. D. REID. I think that is unfair, I raised the same point last year. Such a physician practising in a town practically has a bonus, and so enjoys advantage over others. I think now would be a good time for the hon. minister to take a lesson from the Postmaster General and make the rule that these gentlemen confine themselves to this work. I hope the minister will take this into consideration.

Mr. OLIVER. I can give the hon. gentleman (Mr. J. D. Reid) the conclusion that I shall be bound to come to after considering the matter, without keeping him waiting. There is no object in providing medical attendance for the Indians unless the medical man engaged has some standing and experience in his calling. And of course, as the medical profession is one that is, very properly, fairly highly paid, we are giving these physicians only a retainer for their services to the Indians. Not in any case that I have noticed would the sum be considered an adequate compensation for a first-class physician giving up his right to practice outside. My hon. friend will appreciate that a medical man whom the department could hire for the amount paid at Comac, $240, would not be of great value to the Indians.

Mr. J. D. REID. This gentleman gets $1,500.

Mr. OLIVER. That comes nearer to being a fair compensation to a first-class man. But in these cases I do not think the amount is really a fair compensation for a first-class physician in that country. Besides, the duties pertaining to physicians where these salaries are paid are such, I am informed, as practically to preclude outside practice to any serious extent. The physician has got to give up outside practice in taking that position.

Mr. THOMAS CHISHOLM. Does the department supply medicine besides giving this salary?

Mr. OLIVER. No, the physicians provide their own medicine.

Mr. J. D. REID. I know a case where the physician employed by the government let a student practically do all the work at a very nominal salary.

Mr. OLIVER. I would consider that a very improper proceeding unless it was a case where the physician was temporarily disabled or absent and unable to attend to his duties, when it would be necessary to secure a supply for a short time. But if the hon. gentleman knows where such a a practice prevails I would be glad if he would communicate the facts to me.

Mr. J. D. REID. I do not feel like lodging a complaint of that kind, but I know it is done.

Mr. OLIVER. It is not done with my knowledge or consent, and I will make further inquiries.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I think there should be some further explanations with reference to this item, and also to the items for schools. I cannot understand how 30,000 Indians in one case should only cost $40,000 to educate, while in another case 20,000 Indians cost $62,000.

Mr. OLIVER. I think the hon. gentleman spoke first of the difference in the cost of medical attendance, which I have already explained. The explanation is partly due to the fact that in Ontario the Indians are in much larger bodies, where one medical attendant can give his services to a large band, and where the attendance is paid for out of the funds of the band and not out of the appropriation; whereas in British Columbia there are no such band funds from which medical attendance can be paid; the Indians are scattered far and wide, which makes medical attendance more costly. Besides, the physicians' services are more expensive than they are in Ontario. With regard to the difference in the cost of schools, the explanation is very much the same. The Indians of Ontario have been under the influences of civilization for nearly two hundred years, and there is not the same necessity or urgency to educate them that there is to educate the Indians of British Columbia. Besides, the Indians of British Columbia are much scattered and they need a larger number of schools in proportion to their number.

Day schools, $8,550.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Why have you not day schools in the province of Ontario? There is only one item for day schools, that in British Columbia district. Adding this to the $62,000 it would make $70,000 for education.

Mr. OLIVER. There are 72 day schools in Ontario and 37 in British Columbia.

Industrial and boarding schools, $62,500.

Mr. LAKE. I notice a number of boarding schools at or near the Indian reserve. Are these provided by the government or by private enterprise?

Mr. OLIVER. They are given a grant of so much per head on a certain number of pupils.

Mr. LAKE. I refer to the buildings themselves.

Mr. OLIVER. These are generally mission schools, but in some cases the government contribute towards the building of the schools. There are some cases where the government build the schools at public expense.

Mr. LAKE. On what principle is the discrimination made?

Mr. OLIVER. There is no principle governing the appropriation which is paid by the government to schools. It varies according to circumstances.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I suppose these are all under clerical control?

Mr. OLIVER. They are mission schools.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Can the minister give us a statement showing the various denominations that are concerned in this, and what grant is made to each school by denomination?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, I can give the list if the hon. gentleman wishes it.

Kamloops I. S., 50 pupils at $130, Roman Catholic	$ 4,875 00
Kamloops for erection of suitable class room	500 00
Kootenay I. S., 50 pupils at $130, Roman Catholic	4,875 00
Kuper Island I. S., 50 pupils at $130, Roman Catholic	4,875 00
Williams Lake I. S., 50 pupils at $130, Roman Catholic	4,875 00
St. Mary's B. S., 60 pupils at $60, Roman Catholic	2,700 00
Clayoquot I. S., 50 pupils at $130, Roman Catholic	4,875 00
Squamish B. S., 50 pupils at $60, Roman Catholic	2,250 00
Alert Bay I. S., 35 pupils at $130, Church of England	3,412 50
Alert Bay Girls' Home B. S., 10 pupils at $60, Church of England	450 00
All Hallows B. S., 35 pupils at $60, Church of England	1,575 00
Metlakahtla I. S., 30 boys at $140, 30 girls at $100	5,400 00
Metlakahtla I. S., to provide fire equipment for new building	150 00
Coqualeetza I. S., 80 pupils at $130, Methodist	7,800 00
Port Simpson B. S., girls school, 35 pupils at $60, Methodist	1,575 00
Port Simpson B. S., boys school, 20 pupils at $60, Methodist	900 00
Alberni B. S., 50 pupils at $60, Presbyterian	2,250 00
Alberni B. S., to provide water supply	500 00
Ahousat B. S., 25 pupils at $60, Presbyterian	1,125 00
Lytton I. S., 40 pupils at $130, Church of England	3,900 00

Schelt B. S., 50 pupils at $60, Roman Catholic	$ 2,250 00
Unforeseen expenses at industrial and boarding schools	1,387 50
Total required for 9 months	$62,500 00

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Has the hon. minister any classification as to the total amount paid to the various denominations? We have some placed at $130 per head and some at $60 per head.

Mr. OLIVER. The schools that are classed industrial schools receive $130 per head.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What is the difference between these and other schools?

Mr. OLIVER. Those which are classed as boarding schools receive $60 per head. The difference between the two is that the education is more limited at the boarding school than at the industrial school. At the industrial school trades of different kinds are taught while the boarding school is simply an educational institution.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Does the government make an inspection of these?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes. The Metlakathla school is a government school and in that case there is a payment of $140 for boys and $100 for girls. That is an industrial school.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I would like to ask the hon. minister if there is not another school in British Columbia that he has not mentioned, at Lytton?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, I mentioned it.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. I understood that was entirely supported by a theological institution called the New England Company.

Mr. OLIVER. For the Lytton industrial school there is a payment for 40 pupils at $130 each, it is under the auspices of the Church of England, and the total amount is $3,900.

Mr. COCKSHUTT. Was the building provided by the department as well?

Mr. OLIVER. The building was put up entirely by the Mission.

Mr. LAKE. The hon. minister has said that no particular principle has been adopted by the government in making grants for the building of these schools. Would the government give a grant for a school building on private property as readily as for a school building on an Indian reserve? I assume that a school on an Indian reserve would belong to the government as trustees for the Indians while a school on private property would belong to the particular church or society that built the school.

Mr. OLIVER. None of the industrial schools are built on the Indian reserves, but the property on which they stand is under the control of the government as long as they remain industrial schools.

Mr. LAKE. But does not the government contribute part of the cost of building these boarding schools?

Mr. OLIVER. The boarding schools are on the reserves and they are owned and controlled by the government.

Mr. LAKE. I would like to refer to one boarding school in particular; that is the Muscowequan's boarding school in the Touchwood Hills agency, Northwest Territories.

Mr. OLIVER. My answer was in regard to British Columbia schools.

Mr. LAKE. Could the hon. minister give some information in regard to Muscowequan's school in the Touchwood Hill agency?

Mr. OLIVER. That school, I am informed, is on the reserves.

Mr. LAKE. I think that is a mistake. The minister's own report contains the statement that it is not on the reserve. I think that several schools up there are not on the reserves.

Mr. OLIVER. Our report is that it is on the reserve. We may be in error but that is our report.

Mr. LAKE. I would like to read to the minister the statement of the principal of the school contained in the report of the Department of Indian Affairs, page 328:

> The land connected with the school is a homestead of 160 acres and belongs to the society of the Reverend Oblate Fathers, to whom nothing is paid for the use and benefits from it.

What I wish to know is whether there has been any contribution from the government to the building of this school and if so, how much.

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot answer that at the moment but I will probably be able to in a few minutes.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The hon. minister says that these industrial schools in British Columbia are not on the reserves. Are the children taken from the reserves and do they board at these industrial schools?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Well then, what is the difference between industrial boarding schools and those that are called ordinary boarding schools? I presume it is six of one and half a dozen of the other.

Mr. OLIVER. The difference is in the instruction given in the two classes of schools.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Oh, I know that is the theory, but what is really done?

Mr. OLIVER. We say that is what is really done.

Mr. LAKE. Has the hon. minister that reply yet?

Mr. OLIVER. We are just looking it up. That, of course has no bearing upon this particular item, but I will have the reply in a few minutes.

Mr. HENDERSON. I notice that the land on which the Alberni industrial school is erected is owned by the Presbyterian church. Did the government erect the building or was it erected by the church society?

Mr. OLIVER. The church erected the building.

Mr. HENDERSON. How much does the government contribute to the support of the school?

Mr. OLIVER. The vote is $2,250.

Mr. HENDERSON. Does that vote pay for the full staff of seven teachers or is there anything else contributed?

Mr. OLIVER. That is the only contribution towards maintenance, but we have a vote of $500 to provide a water supply for the building.

Mr. HENDERSON. Does the government contribute anything for the clothing of the Indian children, or is that done entirely by the church?

Mr. OLIVER. This is our total contribution and is under control of the church. I cannot say whether they use any part of it for clothing.

Mr. HENDERSON. Has the government no supervision over the money voted? Do they hand over the money to those in charge of the school and allow them to dispose of it as they see fit? In the case of this particular school I know that a considerable quantity of clothing has been sent to it by the Woman's Auxiliary in the section of the country in which I live. I wondered whether the church has to supply all the clothing for the children of this school. That is the information which those who are sending this clothing would be glad to have. I am surprised that in case of a school like this the government does not supply clothing to the children. I understood the plan is to contribute a sum which goes in part to pay the teachers and to leave the church to look after the children in other respects.

Mr. OLIVER. I understand the church desires to carry on a boarding school at this place; they erected a building and undertook to conduct it. The government contributes this amount to the school; which complies, I presume, with the requirements of the department. We do not interfere with the application of the money, but we see that the school is properly conducted, leaving the responsibility of the management, with the church whose missionary enterprise established the school.

Mr. HENDERSON. Does the government send an inspector to the school?

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is the inspection with regard to religious subjects or ordinary educational questions?

Mr. OLIVER. We inspect the school both as to education and conduct.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Last year the government paid $62.72 freight on this clothing to which no doubt the hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) has referred; they also put in a few desks in the schools. I see they have furnished the industrial school at Kootenay with lumber and nails and spikes and so on. Is any manufacturing done at that industrial school and if so what becomes of the stuff manufactured? Is it sold: who gets the rake off on that?

Mr. OLIVER. The product of the school is the property of the institution conducting the school.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Has the minister no report on what the product of that school is?

Mr. OLIVER. I have none here; I do not know that we require the school authorities to make a return.

Mr. HENDERSON. Does the government pay the freight on the clothing sent out by different religious bodies to the Indian children in these schools. They did so in the past, but this year for some reason they are asking the contributors to pay the freight.

Mr. OLIVER. That is the intention of the department.

Mr. HENDERSON. Why the change in policy?

Mr. OLIVER. The idea is that the department does not wish to mix up in the charitable enterprises of those who are interested in the schools. We desire to make a certain contribution to the schools and we wish that to be the limit of our responsibility. If there are charitable people who wish to contribute clothing or other supplies to the schools we do not see that we are under any obligation to interfere in that.

Mr. HENDERSON. Possibly there is no obligation, but why the change in policy? The payment of the freight by the government was regarded as of material advantage and no doubt larger contributions were sent because the freight for such long distances was borne by the government which is responsible for the care of the Indians. This change of policy on the part of the government is a mistake, for it discourages

the contribution of clothing by the various churches. If the government had continued the system of paying the freight it would have met with general approval. I understand from the minister that that sysfen. is to be withdrawn.

Mr. OLIVER. It is the intention to withdraw it.

Mr. BLAIN. I endorse what my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) has said. If the government have not already decided to discontinue paying the freight upon such goods as are contributed, it would be well for them to continue the laudable practice. I rather think that if they refuse to pay the freight, the contribution of clothing and other articles will not be as large as in the past, and the government will be doing an injury to the Indian wards. I think the practice should be continued, and I hope the minister will consider it very carefully before he decides that the payment of freight on such goods as are contributed freely to the Indians shall be discontinued.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. I notice that the Kootenay Industrial School gets a large sum, and one of the others in the way of 'fixing dam.' Does the government pay for all this sort of thing for one school and not for all, or is it building the school ? What is its policy ?

Mr. OLIVER. In this vote there is a sum of $500 to furnish a water supply for the Alberni school and we are also asking $500 for the erection of a suitable class room in connection with the Kamloops school and in the case of other schools there are similar items. We from time to time give some assistance in the way of improving the conditions of the school buildings as well as paying the per capita grant for the support of the schools.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. I notice that Dr. P. H. Bryce has made a medical inspection. Has he furnished the department with a report of his trip ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, it is in the Indian Report.

Mr. LAKE. Is that information ready yet ?

Mr. OLIVER. The department contributed to the building $2,250.

Mr. LAKE. The point I wish to make is that this building is on private property. It seems to me it is quite a legitimate expenditure for the government to contribute to the building of these schools, in fact to build them entirely if they are on the reserve, but when they are being built on private property it seems to me it is contributing to the assistance of the owner.

Mr. OLIVER. The understanding of the department is that the building was on government property. We will have it looked into and decide whether we are in the wrong or not, and will try to arrange the matter so that we will have security in the control of the property.

Mr. LAKE. The information is contained in the hon. gentleman's own report and I have private information to the same effect as to the location of the school. Of course I fully concur that these institutions are doing a great work in the matter of education and that they should be assisted in the actual work they do, but I do not think the government should spend money on private property. I would like to ask if there is any intention to make any further grant to this school during the coming year ? Is that provided in the estimates ?

Mr. OLIVER. No, there is provision for a grant of $72 per head for forty pupils, but there is nothing further asked towards the building.

Mr. LAKE. I notice also that the proprietor of the land appeared to make something of a complaint that nothing is paid for the use and benefits of the school. It looks as if they wanted not merely to have the school supplied, but to have the rent paid for it as well. I understand that the principal in this school did very good political work during the recent local election.

Mr. OLIVER. What is his name ?

Mr. LAKE. Rev. Father Menyon.

Travelling expenses, $4,950.

Mr. OLIVER. This item is to provide for the travelling expenses of Superintendent Vowell, School Inspector Green, and the nine Indian agents in British Columbia. The appropriation for 1905-6 is $4,000 in excess of the appropriation for 1904-5 owing to the appointment of School Inspector Green. The estimate for 1906-7 is proportionately the same as for 1905-6.

Office and miscellaneous, $7,927.50.

Mr. OLIVER. This is divided into different items, contingencies and unforeseen expenses, $2,600, and assistance to hospitals, $4,450. These hospitals are at Lytton, Metlakahtla, Port Simpson, Bella-Bella and Hazelton.

To provide for the prevention of the sale of intoxicants to Indians and for the punishment of offenders, $1,520.

To provide for dyking, irrigation and reclaiming of land, $1,520

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Does the minister know the population of Hazelton ? And how many nurses and attendants there are in the hospital ?

Mr. OLIVER. We have a report in the department.

Steamboat for northwest coast agency and running expenses, $12,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This is entirely new ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes. The note I have on that is

The advisability of providing a steamboat for the northwest coast agency, and for its running expenses has been urged upon the department by Superintendent Vowell and by the Indian agent for the district, Mr. G. W. Morrow. The former agent, Mr. Chas. Todd, had a boat at his disposal, but several years ago it was sold as it had become unseaworthy. It was thought wise to allow a few years to elapse in order that experience might be gained as to whether the work of the agency could be performed by the ordinary facilities for coast travel. It has become clear that these are not sufficient to meet the needs of the case. The Indian agent has to cross a long and dangerous stretch of open water to the Queen Charlotte Islands, and has also to visit many reserves on the sea coast which are not served by the ordinary steamboat navigation. It is thought advisable, therefore, in the interest of good administration and also to save Mr. Morow undue exposure and risk, to provide him with a thoroughly seaworthy boat which can be at his demand at all times to visit the reserves in his large agency.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to ask how the boat will be constructed and where ?

Mr. OLIVER. No decision has been reached as to the building of the boat yet. I am informed it is the custom in British Columbia to have boats built by tender and I imagine this will be done in that way.

Mr. HENDERSON. Does the minister know any one out there who has a boat to sell worth $12,000 ?

Mr. OLIVER. If the hon. gentlemen will pass the item we will give them a guarantee that we will have a boat built.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. By tender ?

Mr. OLIVER. Public tender.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Fitzpatrick, House adjourned at 12.20 a. m., Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, April 4, 1906.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

JUDGES OF PROVINCIAL COURTS.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce a Bill (No. 83) to amend the Act respecting the judges of provincial courts. He said :

Mr. OLIVER.

The object of this Bill is to rectify, or rather supplement, an omission found in the Act of last session with respect to travelling allowances of county court judges.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

ACCIDENTS IN THE ST. LAWRENCE.

Mr. BERGERON asked :

1. How many accidents have happened on the St. Lawrence route below Montreal since 1890 ?
2. How many between Montreal and Quebec and how many below Quebec ?
3. What is the number of sea-going vessels wrecked, what are their names and the date of accident ?

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

1. 122.

2. Forty-three accidents have occurred in the pilotage district of Montreal. 36 occurred in the pilotage district of Quebec. 43 occurred in the St. Lawrence route below the pilotage district of Quebec.

3. Eighty-two as follows :

19th September, '92, 'Magnificent' ; 13th May '92, 'Norwood' ; 31st May, '92, 'Peace' ; 11th May, '92, 'Quebec' ; 20th November, '94, 'State of Georgia' ; 7th July, '95, 'Mexico' ; 25th May, '96 'Turret Cape' ; 21st August, '96, 'Brookside' ; 10th August, '96, 'Bengore Head' ; 21st May, '97, 'Glenivet' ; 26th July, '96, 'Iona' ; 12th August, '96, 'Neptune' ; 9th August, '96, 'Vancouver' ; —'97, 'Salernian' ; —'97, 'Eleanor' ; 4th May, '97, 'Louisburg' ; May, '97, 'Loughrigg Holme' ; —'97, 'Turret Cape' ; 26th June, '97, 'Turret Cape' ; 26th September, '97, 'Arabia' ; 16th May, '98, 'Cacouna' ; May, '98, 'Castlemoor' ; 1st June, '98, 'Campana' ;—'99, 'Lobelia' ; 5th September, '99, 'Almerian' ; 10th August, '99, 'Ella Sayer' ; 31st August, '99, 'Parisian' ; 10th August, '99, 'Philadelphian' ; —'99, 'Ramillies' ; 12th September, '00, 'Turret Chief' ; 10th May, '01, 'Jacona' ; 10th October, '01, 'Urania' ; 12th May, '01, 'Aggi' ; 16th May, '01, 'Kildona' ; 13th May, '01, Zanzibar' ; 26th June, '02, 'Indiana' ; 21st June, '02, 'Pretorian' ; 1st August, '02, 'Rustington' ; 16th August, '02, 'Virginian' ; 25th August, '02, 'Manchester Importer' ; 23rd August, '02, 'Melville' ; 12th July, '02, 'Monteagle' ; 14th September, '02, 'Numidian' ; 16th August, 02, 'Symra' ; 4th September, '02, 'Westphalia' ; 30th October, '02, 'Iberian' ; 4th August, '02, 'Kildona' ; 6th November, '02, 'Loango' ; 15th October, '02, 'Manchester Engineer' ; 24th November, '02, 'Sicilian' ; 11th November, '02, 'St. Andrews' ; 20th September, '02, 'Tiger' ; 24th April, '03, 'Carrigan Head' ; 10th June, '03, 'Loughrigg Holme' ; —'03, 'Cam-

pana' ; —'03, 'Dominion' ; 30th July, '03, 'Lake Manitoba' ; 10th August, '03, 'Manchester Trader' ; 14th July, '03, 'Monterey'; 13th June, '03, 'Norwegian' ; 29th July, '03, 'Pomeranian' ; 4th June, '03, 'Protector' ; 19th July, '03, 'Sardhana' ; 3rd November, '03, 'Drottning Sophia' ; 12th June, '04, 'Cape Breton'; 21st August, '04, 'Catalone'; 22nd May, '04, 'Vancouver' ; 2nd July, '04, 'Vancouver' ; 7th September, '04, 'Virginia' ; 12th June, '05, 'Tampican' ; 12th September, '05, 'Chr. Knudsen' ; 27th July, '05, 'Corinthian' ; 12th August, '05, 'Unique' ; 1st September, '05, 'Virginian' ; 23rd October, '05, 'Euphemia' ; 23rd October, '05, 'Tordenskjold' ; 3rd November, '05, 'Bavarian' ; 21st November, '05, 'Angola' ; 1st September, '05, 'Victorian' ; 29th September, '05, 'Universe' ; 13th September, '05, 'Wastwater' ; 12th September, '05, 'Thrift'.

DEPARTMENT OF INDIAN AFFAIRS—NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES.

Mr. ARMSTRONG asked:

1. How many government officials were in the employ of the Department of Indian Affairs each year or part of year from 1896 to 1906, inclusive, and what was the total amount of salaries paid each year out of the funds of said department ?

2. What was the Indian population for each year from 1896 to 1906, inclusive ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The number of officials and salaries paid is as follows:

INSIDE SERVICE.

Officials.

Year.	No.	Salaries.
1895-96	67	$ 56,216 38
1896-97	65	55,781 40
1897-98	56	52,096 64
1898-99	61	54,450 38
1899-1900	65	56,796 23
1900-1	63	59,270 44
1901-2	64	60,174 57
1902-3	65	64,503 28
1903-4	65	69,961 34
1904-5	67	71,256 82

OUTSIDE SERVICE.

Commissioners, superintendents, agents and other employees.

Year.	No.	Salaries.
1895-96	317	$151,971 76
1896-97	385	155,650 75
1897-98	342	107,735 45
1898-99	391	127,228 84
1899-1900	431	133,589 69
1900-1	378	141,403 79
1901-2	381	145,449 62
1902-3	404	144,843 00
1903-4	405	147,698 94
1904-5	443	131,867 65

Physicians.

Year.	No.	Salaries.
1895-96	217	$ 33,522 68
1896-97	275	31,340 31
1897-98	277	39,348 22
1898-99	261	38,189 61
1899-1900	271	47,167 55
1900-1	290	50,662 19
1901-2	304	56,782 25
1902-3	313	65,034 40
1903-4	268	54.529 27
1904-5	323	69,332 79

School teachers.

Year.	No.	Salaries.
1895-96	276	$ 55,892 57
1896-97	267	52,026 98
1897-98	242	57,295 15
1898-99	238	56,800 25
1899-1900	268	54,872 79
1900-1	263	51,962 68
1901-2	280	57,579 19
1902-3	263	57,608 77
1903-4	292	57,382 79
1904-5	277	59,579 20

Statement showing number of officials, &c., employed by the Department of Indian Affairs and the total amount paid to them each year from 1895-96 to 1905-6 :

Year.	No. of officials.	Total amount paid.
1895-96	877	$297,608 39
1896-97	992	294,799 44
1897-98	917	256,475 46
1898-99	951	276,669 08
1899-1900	1,035	292,426 26
1900-1	994	303,299 10
1901-2	1,029	319,985 63
1902-3	1,045	331,989 45
1903-4	1,030	329,572 34
1904-5	1,110	332,036 46

Population of Indians in the Dominion from 1896 to 1905 inclusive :

Year.	Population.
1896	100,027
1897	99,364
1898	100,093
1899	98,981
1900	99,010
1901	99,527
1902	108,112
1903	108,233
1904	107,978
1905	107,637

The census returns for 1906 will not be received until after the 30th June next.

CANADIANS IN SOUTH AFRICAN WAR.

Mr. KEMP—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. How many Canadians who served in the war in South Africa were killed or died as a result of the effects of the campaign ?

2. How many suffered either partial or total disability during the campaign ?

3. How many are receiving pensions from Great Britain, and what is the amount of same in each case ?

4. Has the attention of the government been called to the fact that certain seriously dis-

abled soldiers have received no recognition from the Imperial government ?

5. Has the government taken any steps to draw the attention of the Imperial government to such cases ?

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

1. The number who belonged to Canadian contingents, including the South African Constabulary, was 224. In addition, Major Howard and some twenty others who at the time of their death had ceased to belong to Canadian corps, but were still serving in South Africa, also lost their lives.

2 and 3. Information not available, but will if possible be obtained.

4 and 5. No.

JOHN O'GORMAN.

Mr. ELSON asked :

1. Is John O'Gorman in the employ of the government in any capacity ?

2. If so, in what capacity, and at what salary ?

3. What was the date of his appointment ?

4. What are his duties ?

Right Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I do not know of any one named John O'Gorman in the service of the government.

OTTAWA CARBIDE COMPANY.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. What amount of money has been paid up to 31st December, 1905, to the Ottawa Carbide Company, at what rate per ton for carbide, and how much on contract based on public tender ?

2. What amount of money has been spent up to 31st December, 1905, at Prescott, in connection with the depot at that point, and as aids to navigation ?

3. What part of this expenditure has been made under contract based upon public tender?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I answered that question the other day, and I am told by the other departments that no money has been paid to the Ottawa Carbide Company.

HARWOOD ESTATE, VAUDREUIL.

Mr. BOYER asked :

1. Is the government obliged to furnish the Harwood estate with means of communication for the taking out of the stone in the quarry belonging to that estate at Pointe des Cascades, County of Vaudreuil ?

2. Is it obliged by any agreement to build a wharf for that purpose on the land belonging to the Harwood estate, or on the adjacent land ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. No.

2. No.

ST. MAURICE RIVER—BOOMS.

Mr. PERLEY—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

1. What has been the total outlay since confederation for improvements, collection of revenue and working expenses, in connection with the booms, slides and other works on the St. Maurice river ?

2. What has been the total revenue from such works during the same period ?

3. What is the estimate of the total cost from this date of the new booms, piers and other improvements and works which are now being built on the St. Maurice river ?

Hon. CHARLES S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works) :

1. $1,214,526.05.

2. $515,168.12.

3. With the exception of the usual yearly maintenance, it may be said that the works of construction on the St. Maurice will be practically completed this year, unless the construction of a dam at Les Piles—which is under consideration—be proceeded with.

GOVERNMENT VESSEL SERVICE.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. What is the complement of officers and crew, and employees, for each vessel, in the service of the government ?

2. What is the average months employment each year ?

3. What is the service on which each is employed ?

4. What is the number of vessels which carry passengers ?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) :

'CHALLENGER'

	Average months' employment.
Grosse Isle, Que.—	
1 Captain	7½
2 Mates	7
4 Seamen	7
1 Cabin Steward	7
1 Chief Engineer	8
2 Engineers	8
5 Stokers	8

The above crew also man the second boat at Grosse Isle which has been hired for some seasons.

'EARL'

Victoria, B. C.—	Months.
1 Captain	12
1 Engineer	12
1 Fireman	12
1 Deckhand	12

'ARGUS'

Halifax, N. S.—	Months.
1 Captain	12
1 Mate	12
1 Engineer	12
1 Deckhand and asst. engineer	12

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). As far as my department is concerned I gave the answer the other day.

NIAGARA FALLS.

Mr. COCKSHUTT asked :

1. Have any petitions or memorials been received by His Excellency the Governor General, or by any member of the government, in favour of the preservation of the beauty of Niagara Falls ? If so, how many ?

2. Did any of these petitions emanate from citizens or organizations in Canada ? If so, how many ?

3. Did any of these petitions emanate from citizens or organizations in the United States? If so, how many ?

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

1. Yes.

2. 14 petitions from Canadian organizations or citizens.

3. 467 petitions from organizations or citizens of the United States.

MARINE AND FISHERIES DEPARTMENT—MONTREAL AGENCY.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN asked :

1. How many officials are employed in the Montreal agency of the Marine and Fisheries Department ?

2. Who is the landlord of the offices, and what is the annual rental ?

3. How many rooms are used by the staff and by the caretaker, respectively ?

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

1. Montreal Agency.. 6
   Steamboat Inspectors.. 2
   Cattle Inspectors.. 2
   Pilotage and Investigation into wrecks.. 3
   Caretaker.. 1

2. Estate Boyer, $2,800.

3. 23 rooms used by staff—department has nothing to do with caretaker's rooms. Estate Boyer furnished same to him.

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK—NEW BRUNSWICK AND NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. SINCLAIR asked :

1. How many Dominion government savings banks in the province of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick have been converted into post office savings banks since 1896 ?

2. At what places were the said savings banks carried on ?

3. What was the date of transferring in each case ?

4. What was the balance on deposit at each of said branch banks at the date of transfer ?

5. What was the balance on deposits at each of said post office banks so transferred on June 30th, 1905 ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). A certain number of savings banks in the province of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia have been turned into Post Office saving banks since 1896 as follows.

Office.	Date of Transfer.	Balance at Time of Transfer.	Balance June 30, 1905, P. O. Savings.
		$ cts.	$ cts.
Yarmouth, N.S.	Dec. 1, 1896	658,116 30	422,802 81
Annapolis, N.S..	April 1, 1897	255,193 60	146,831 99
NewGlasgow,N.S	" 1, 1897	402,402 74	333,606 44
St. Andrews,N.B.	June 1, 1897	296,971 30	288,823 92
Woodstock, N.B.	Aug. 1, 1897	512,719 47	677,581 59
Parrsboro, N.S..	Sept. 1, 1897	113,385 77	63,563 73
Liverpool, N.S..	Feb. 1, 1898	232,427 78	116,029 47
Bridgewater, N.S	Jan. 1, 1900	145,643 76	122,720 89
Dalhousie, N.S..	June 1, 1902	501,774 36	336,851 83
Chatham, N.B...	Mar. 1, 1905	308,972 77	254,026 34

MAILS—KING'S COUNTY, N.B.

Mr. FOWLER—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. Have tenders been received for the carrying of the mails landed from the steamers at Oak Point, King's County, N.B., to be driven to Round Hill in same county, and returned to the steamers ?

2. If so, how many tenders received, who were the respective tenderers, and what was the amount of each tender ?

3. Has a contract been entered into ? If so, with whom and for what amount ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Postmaster General). Tenders have been received for this service, but no contract has yet been executed, and, until a contract is formally entered into, it is considered not advisable to make public the amount of the respective tenders, and the names of the individuals tendering.

PAYMENTS TO JOSEPH NIXON ; LAND AGENT.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. Has a claim been made by or on behalf of Mrs. Hodge, of Fort Macleod, that she paid $30, more or less for lot 7, south side of 24th street, west of 5th avenue, to Joseph Nixon, formerly land agent for the government, that she holds receipt for the same, but that she has not obtained a title to the lot ?

2. If so, what action has been taken thereon by the government ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Yes.

2. Lot No. 7 south side of 24th Street, west of 5th Avenue, Town of Macleod, has been retransferred to the Crown in order that the sale of the same to the original purchaser, Mrs. Hodge, may be carried out.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

Is the Department of the Interior in receipt of information that subagent Nixon collected $30 from one James Daley, as rent for land cultivated on section 29, township 10, range 27, west of 4th meridian, and that said Daley has received no acknowledgment of credit for that amount from the department ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The sum of $30 was collected from Mr. James Daley by subagent Nixon, as rental for land described, and was by him forwarded to the department. Departmental receipt therefor, No. 3462, was issued in Mr. Daley's favour. The receipt was inclosed with departmental letter of 5th June, 1903, to C. E. D. Wood, barrister, Macleod, who was acting for Mr. Daley.

F. L. BROOKS & CO., MONTREAL.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

What amount of money has been paid to F. L. Brooks & Co., of Montreal, from July 1, 1904, to December 31, 1905 ?

2. How much of this has been paid on contract based on public tender ?

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

1. $52,406.48.

2. $9,410.

SUPREME COURT JUDGES.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. Have any members of the Supreme Court of Canada obtained leave of absence ? If so, what is the duration of said leave ?

2. Is it the intention of the government to introduce legislation at the present session in order to provide for the nomination of ad hoc judges in the Supreme Court of Canada ?

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice) :

1. Leave of absence has been given the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court for six months.

2. The government is considering the propriety of introducing legislation to provide for the appointment of ad hoc judges.

RIFLE RANGES, KEMPTVILLE, N.S.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES asked .

1. What is the cost for land of the rifle ranges at Kentville, N.S. ?

2. How many acres are there ?

3. From whom were the lands purchased ?

4. What is the cost of the land for the Sussex, N.B., ranges ?

5. What number of acres are there ?

6. What is the cost of the land for the Woodstock, N.B., ranges ?

7. What number of acres are there ?

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

1. The cost is not yet determined.

2. 625 acres including Aldershot Camp ground and rifle range.

3. The lands were expropriated, not purchased. Litigation is not yet concluded.

4. $4,850.

5. 170 acres.

6. $6,234.

7. 223·81 acres.

THE RIOTS AT SYDNEY, CAPE BRETON.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES asked :

1. What was the cost to the people of Canada of the riots at Sydney, Cape Breton, a year or two ago ?

2. What troops were called out ?

3. Has the municipality repaid all the said sums of money ?

4. If not, why not ?

5. Is it the intention of the government to collect the balance, if any, due ?

6. What other municipalities are in arrears to the government for the services of troops to suppress riots ?

7. Why are there any such arrears, if there are any ?

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

1. $7,809.02.

2. 17th Field Battery ; No. 5 Company, 94th Regiment ; 200 all ranks of 63rd and 66th Regiments. The troops named above were replaced by a detachment from the Permanent Force of 123, all ranks.

3. $2,500 only paid to date.

4 and 5. The Department of Justice was instructed to take legal proceedings against the municipality, February 27, 1905.

6. Lowe Township, Quebec, (1895-96), $1,683.32 ; Richmond, B.C., (1900-01), $2,-021.32 ; Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, (1903-04), $6,851.05.

7. Arrears are due to the fact that the amounts have not been paid in.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. I wish to draw the minister's attention to the fact that the last part of the question, No. 7, has not been answered.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I have answered it as well as I can. There is no other information.

MILITARY SCHOOLS.

Mr. SAM HUGHES asked :

1. Has a commission or board of inquiry to examine into and report upon the condition of the various schools of military instruction in connection with the permanent corps been appointed ?

2. Who are the members thereof?

3. What is to be the mode of procedure in the inquiry ?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). No committee or board has yet been appointed.

EMPLOYMENT OF W. A. GALLANT.

Mr. GANONG asked :

1. When was W. A. Gallant first employed at the Point Lepreau, New Brunswick, and at what salary ?

2. Did he receive any advance in salary while employed ? If so, what was the date of the advance, and the amount ?

3. Did he contribute to the superannuation fund ? If so, for how many years ?

4. What were his duties, and what his hours of service ?

5. When was he dismissed, and on whose complaint ?

6. Was there an official investigation either before or after his dismissal ? If so, by whom ? If not, why not ?

7. Did he not write the department asking for an investigation ?

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

1. 1st April, 1871. $400 per annum.

2. Yes. On 14th June, 1875, his salary was increased to $450.

3. Yes. 27 years.

4. Engineer of fog alarm at Point Lepreau, N. B. In case of fog he was required to keep watch sixteen hours and the lightkeeper took charge of the fog alarm eight hours in the day.

5. He was dismissed by Order in Council of May 20th, 1898, for neglect of duty.

6. Yes, before his dismissal by the agent of the department at St. John, N. B., who was instructed to hold an investigation.

7. No.

GRAND MANAN BREAKWATER.

Mr. GANONG asked :

1. In what newspapers were tenders advertised for the construction of a breakwater at North Head, Grand Manan, New Brunswick ?

2. From whom were tenders received, and what were the respective amounts ?

3. Has a contract been entered into for the erection of this breakwater ? If so, with whom? If not, why not ?

Hon. CHARLES S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works) :

1. In the following newspapers :—St. Andrews 'Beacon,' Bathurst 'Le Courrier des Provinces Maritimes,' Chatham 'Commercial,' Chatham 'Miramichi Advance,' Campbellton 'Events,' Fredericton 'Herald,' Hillsborough 'Albert County Journal,' Moncton 'Transcript,' Richibucto 'Review,' Sackville 'Tribune,' St. John 'Globe,' St. John 'Gazette,' St. John 'Monitor,' Sussex 'Record,' Woodstock 'Despatch,' Woodstock 'Carleton Sentinel,' Halifax 'Chronicle,' Halifax 'Echo,' Halifax 'Acadian Recorder,' Pictou 'Advocate,' Truro 'Midland Times.'

2. No tenders were received.

3. No.

TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION.

On the notice of motion :

That in the opinion of this House the government should at the earliest possible day, present the report of the Transportation Commission, together with all the evidence taken before the said commission, and that the same should be thereupon dealt with by the House.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, this motion has stood on the paper now for about three weeks, and if the Minister of Public Works does not bring down the papers, I shall have to rely on what was printed in the newspapers at the time. If the minister can give the House some assurance that the report will be brought down soon, I will ask that the motion be allowed to stand.

Hon. CHARLES S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works). I regret that there has been any delay, but it is not the fault of the department. The moment the report reached the department, it was put into the hands of the printers. I have endeavoured on several occasions to hurry the printers along. I had hoped to get the report on Saturday. I am now in telegraphic communication with the printers, and I will give the hon. gentleman the information as soon as I get an answer.

Mr. BENNETT. Then, I would ask that the motion be allowed to stand.

Motion allowed to stand.

THE REPRESENTATION OF PROVINCES.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (King's, P.E.I.) moved

That an humble address be presented to His Majesty, King Edward VII., praying that he may be graciously pleased to cause a measure to be submitted to the imperial parliament, for the purpose of amending the British North America Act, so that no province of the Dominion shall at any time have fewer representatives in parliament than it was given when it entered confederation.

He said : Mr. Speaker, in moving this resolution, my purpose is to have, if possible, the British North America Act amended, so that what I believe was the intention of the fathers of confederation and the framers of the Act itself, shall be carried out, namely, that no province of the Dominion, particularly none of the smaller provinces, should at any time have fewer representatives in this House than the number originally assigned to it. But if there be any doubt on that point, there can be no doubt whatever that that was the intention of the delegates from Prince Edward Island and of those who negotiated with them the terms of union for the admission of that province into the confederation. In order to prove this statement, I will turn to the documentary evidence on the subject. I find that resolution No. 21 of the Quebec conference reads as follows :

No reduction shall be made in the number of the members returned by any section unless its population shall have decreased relatively to the population of the whole union to the extent of five per centum.

The principle of that resolution was subsequently embodied in the British North America Act, and constitutes subsection

4 of section 51, which was plainly intended to limit the application of the principle of representation by population, and thus save the representation of the smaller provinces. If it was not intended to have that effect, and if it was not placed there for that purpose, I at least can see no reason why it should be in the constitution. At that time it was felt that the increase in the population of all the provinces would be about the same, and it was considered highly improbable that any one province should fall behind in the increase to a greater extent than five per cent, as compared with the increase of the whole union. This five per cent was to be the saving clause, so that if any province should come within five per cent of the increase of the whole union, a new basis of calculation might be established every ten years, which in time might give to any province a larger representation in this House than its actual population entitled it to.

Conditions have arisen since confederation which the fathers of confederation did not and could not foresee. It is reasonable to conclude that since they were then making provision to meet all probable contingencies, had they known that the conditions and circumstances would become such as they now are, they would have made sufficient provision to meet them. We know by actual experience that this provision in the constitution has proved entirely inadequate. And if it has proved insufficient in the past, it is bound to be doubly and trebly so in the future. The fathers of confederation could not foresee the very large emigration which took place from the maritime provinces to the United States. Nor could they foresee that the cultivable portion of the province of Quebec would extend so far north and be capable of sustaining so large a population as we know it will have in a few years. Neither could they foresee the immense possibilities and resources of the great west, then called the Great Lone Land, and consequently could not provide for the conditions which have since arisen. To show that they thought they were making adequate provision for future conditions, let me turn to the discussion which was had on these resolutions. But first of all let me say that the delegates from Prince Edward Island were strongly contending for at least six representatives. No smaller number, they emphatically declared, would at all satisfy their local conditions and requirements, and unless they were given that number it would be impossible, so far as Prince Edward Island was concerned, to carry out the scheme of confederation. Some of the delegates from the other provinces were anxious to meet the views of the delegates from Prince Edward Island. Mr. Galt moved this resolution :

> That Upper Canada shall have 99 members, Lower Canada 74, Nova Scotia 21, New Brunswick 17, Newfoundland 8 and Prince Edward Island 6.

That resolution however, did not carry, but here is what Mr. Galt said in proposing it :

> We have supposed that the population of Lower Canada, being tolerably equable in its character, would afford the best basis. But having respect to the rapid increase of Upper Canada, we think the lower provinces should not be reduced if they do not increase in the same ratio. Therefore, the lower provinces would have the same as they have now unless in the very improbable case of any one falling off by five per cent or more—that is a decrease relatively to the whole federation.

Evidently it was then considered that whatever number the province of Prince Edward Island would start with, that number would continue and be permanent. That resolution, however, did not carry, and Mr. Brown, the great apostle of the principle of representation by population moved a reduction in the total number. He moved that Upper Canada should have 82 members, Lower Canada 65, Nova Scotia 19, New Brunswick 15, Newfoundland 7, and Prince Edward Island 5. That resolution carried, the delegates from Prince Edward Island alone voting nay. But the number for Newfoundland was subsequently increased to 8. Here is what Mr. Brown said, in speaking to his motion :

> The practical result will be that while Lower Canada certainly will not be less and the lower provinces may increase in population, they cannot decrease in the number of representatives. It keeps the House within a reasonable limit.

That was 194 members. The idea, however, underlying the scheme was that Prince Edward Island would never have its representation reduced below 5. Were the delegates from that province satisfied ? No, Sir. On the contrary, they contended that they could not advise their people to come in with a smaller representation than 6. Mr. Brown's motion, however, carried, Prince Edward Island alone voting nay. Here is what the representatives from the Island said :

> Mr. HAVILAND. Prince Edward Island would rather be out of the confederation than consent to this motion. We should have no status. Only five members out of 194 would give the Island no position.
>
> Mr. PALMER. Our trade and revenue are rapidly increasing. Why give up so great certainties for an uncertain benefit where we have only a feeble voice. Looking first at the larger provinces, Canada has secured to herself a greater number of representatives than she had before. It may be said that we may join with the other maritime provinces in any matter affecting our common interests, but even then our united strength would still be far below Canada's number of representatives.

On the same day, Mr. Galt, on the motion, said :

It would be a matter for the greatest regret that any difficulty should arise over this matter. We request the Prince Edward Island delegates to reconsider their decision. It would be a matter of reproach to us that the smallest colony should leave us.

And Mr. Whelan, another of the delegates, spoke as follows :

We are in an isolated position. Our resources are large and our people would not be content to give up their present benefits for the representation of five members. It may be said that the confederation will go on without Prince Edward Island and that we shall eventually be forced in. Better, however, that, than that we should willingly go into confederation with that representation.

The conference adjourned for that day, and two of the delegates from the island, who were somewhat disposed to favour Mr. Brown's motion, took time to consult with their co-delegates. After the Prince Edward Island delegates had consulted together, they made the next morning this statement :

Col. GREY (Prince Edward Island). I am instructed by my co-delegates to say that the provision of five members is unsatisfactory. Prince Edward Island is divided longitudinally into three counties, each returning ten members. But they are always opposed to change of representation. You cannot divide the three counties into the five members.

Mr. POPE. I agree in all that has been said by Col. Grey and Mr. Cole, but the circumstances of Prince Edward Island are such that I hope the conference will agree to give us such a number as we can divide amongst our three constituencies. Nature, as well as the original settlement of the Island, has made three counties, and it would give rise to much difficulty if we had to adjust five members to the three counties. I cannot ask it as a matter of right, but one of expediency, as one without which it is impossible for us to carry the measure in Prince Edward Island. I therefore ask for six members.

Mr. HAVILAND. I fully agree with Mr. Pope. It would be an insuperable difficulty to us if we had not six members.

Mr. A. A. Macdonald, then one of the delegates, and now a senator, spoke as follows :

We are not bound by the principle of representation by population laid down in Charlottetown. Our constituents will say and will speak of the increased representation of Canada and the decreased representation of the lower provinces.

Sir, the delegates from Prince Edward Island took this position at the Quebec conference and when they returned to Prince Edward Island their attitude was unanimously endorsed by the press and the legislature and the people of that province, and when confederation took place, three years afterwards, Prince Edward Island remained out of it because of this consideration. Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island remained out of confederation. The home authorities and the Dominion authorities were very anxious that Prince Edward Island should come in, no matter what Newfoundland might do, and accordingly we find negotiations resumed from time to time. In 1869, I think, Earl Grenville, then Colonial Secretary, wrote to the then Governor General suggesting the advisability of the island joining confederation, saying that, inasmuch as Manitoba and British Columbia had come in and the total representation in this House was about 200 or upwards, more than 194, the Dominion government would be justified in giving liberal terms to Prince Edward Island, and what is known as the Better Terms of 1869 were offered, but still the Dominion government would not consent to give six representatives and the negotiations again fell through. In 1873 they were again taken up and Earl Kimberley wrote to the then Governor General in terms somewhat similar to those used by Earl Grenville and the Governor General of Canada in a communication to Lieutenant Governor Robinson of the province suggested to him that if his government would send a delegation to Ottawa a committee of the Privy Council would meet the delegation to negotiate terms of union. Accordingly the Prince Edward Island government sent delegates here, Messrs. Laird and Haythorne, and a committee of the Privy Council met them consisting of Sir John Macdonald, Sir Charles Tupper. Sir Leonard Tilley, Sir Hector Langevin and Mr. Howe I think. To show the importance that was attached to this question of the representation of the province I will quote some telegrams that passed between the Lieutenant Governor of the island, Governor Robinson and the delegates at Ottawa. Mr. Haythorne on the 26th of February sent this message to the Lieutenant Governor :

Probably yield six representatives.

On the 6th of March, we find this telegram :

Highly probable get six representatives.

And in a telegram from the Lieutenant Governor to Mr. Haythorne on the same day the Governor says :

We hope six representatives will be conceded.

And later in the same day Mr. Haythorne wires to his colleague in the government, Mr. Edward Palmer :

Six representatives conceded.

Thus after nine years the principle for which Prince Edward Island was contending was yielded, six years after confederation had taken place. Now, Mr. Speaker, was that to be for a few years only? If it was in the minds of any of these delegates that that privilege or concession

was to remain for a few years only, would it have been worth while to have made it so important and to have remained out of confederation for six years because of it? It certainly would not. It was certainly in the minds of the delegates from Prince Edward Island that we were obtaining a concession which would be permanent and that being the idea that they had, we must conclude that the committee of the Privy Council which was negotiating with them must also have had the same idea because they knew what the delegates of Prince Edward Island were thinking of what they were contending for, and if they deceived them or even allowed them to deceive themselves on a matter which to them was so important, they would not in my judgment be men worthy to occupy the positions which they held. I think, Sir, it would be doing an injustice and more than an injustice, it would be a crime against the character and memory of these men to say that they knowingly deceived the delegates from Prince Edward Island or allowed them to deceive themselves. Therefore we are driven to the conclusion that both parties, when conferring, thought they were giving to that province for all time to come, six representatives. According to the decision of the courts it appears they had not the power to do it, but whether or not they thought that the principle which was embodied in the constitution, by subsection 4 of secton 51, would be sufficient to meet all the difficulties and probable contingencies of the case, for some reason or other no person reading all the negotiations that took place in connection with this matter can come to any other conclusion than that both parties to the contract thought they were negotiating for at least six representatives for the province of Prince Edward Island for all time. Under the terms of confederation we are granted for all time to come four representatives in the Senate, and it never was at any time in the mind of any person who laid the foundations of the confederation that any province in this Dominion should have fewer representatives in this House than in the Senate. According to the interpretation given by the courts and according to conditions as we now know them to exist the time is rapidly approaching when Prince Edward Island will not have more than one or two representatives in this House while she has four in the other chamber. That was a condition of things, that was never contemplated at the time of confederation, and the conditions of things, I am satisfied, for which provision would have been made if it could have been foreseen. I do not think, so far as I have been able to look into the constitution of other countries, that there is a country in the world having a confederation such as we have, with representative institutions, having two Houses that has in the lower House fewer representatives from any section than it has in the upper House, and we are fast coming to that in this country so far as Prince Edward Island is concerned. Whether the same thing will apply to New Brunswick and Nova Scotia or not I do not know. I have looked into the constitution of the German empire which is a confederation of kingdoms and states and I find there that no great attention appears to be given to the principle of representation by population. I find that the unit of representation, leaving out the odd numbers, is as follows:

State.	Unit.
Kingdom of Prussia..	146,000
" Bavaria..	128,000
" Saxony..	200,000
" Wurtemburg	127,000
Grand Duchy of Baden..	130,000
" Hesse..	124,000
" Mechlenburg-Schwerin	101,000
" Saxe-Weimar	121,000
" Mecklenburg-Strelitz..	102,000
" Oldenburg. ..	133,000
" Brunswick ...	155,000

That is in the lower house or Reichstag.

In the United States, upon which our constitution was to some extent founded, they have, I think, in the House of Representatives, the principle of representation by population carried out. But in the Senate no attention whatever was paid to population, and we know that the Senate is the all powerful body in that country, the popular body, the law making body. But I come to a country which, though further away from us in point of distance, is nearer in other respects. I refer to the Commonwealth of Australia, which was established a few years ago, and doubtless to some extent based its constitution upon ours and perhaps avoided some of the mistakes we made. I find provision is there made that no state of the Commonwealth shall at any time have fewer representatives in the popular chamber than five, and provision is also made for a minimum representation, which is practically what I am asking for to-day. Let me read that provision in the constitution of the Australian Commonwealth:

> The House of representatives consists, as nearly as may be, of twice as many members as there are senators, the numbers chosen in the several states being in proportion to the respective numbers of their people as shown by the latest statistics of the Commonwealth, but not less than five shall be chosen in any original state.

I may be told that this is a matter of sentiment, and so it is to some extent, but it is more than sentiment to the province of Prince Edward Island. Already one-third of our representation has been cut off. Within a few years, in another decade, we

will have at least another member taken from us, and in a very short period our representation may be reduced to one member, or perhaps we may have no representation at all. And if at the time of confederation five representatives would give us but a feeble voice in a House of 194, what voice will we have at the Council Board of the nation when we shall be represented by only one member in a House probably consisting of 300? This may be a matter of sentiment to some extent, but the world is largely governed by sentiment, and it is surely not an ignoble sentiment for any province to desire a reasonable voice in the public affairs of the nation. We of the maritime provinces, including Prince Edward Island, sat by the cradle of confederation; we were among the first to conceive the grand idea of a united British North America extending from ocean to ocean; and it was at Charlottetown that the first conference on the subject was held. We have borne our per capita share of the burden, and we would like to share in the triumphs, whatever they may be. We are glad to know that the cultivable and habitable areas of the province of Quebec have been greatly extended since confederation, and that that province is capable of supporting a very large population. We rejoice in the fact that numbers of our countrymen are coming back from the United States and going into the northern counties of that province, where they are building it up and making prosperous and comfortable homes for themselves. It is with great pleasure that we look forward to seeing that province the home of a large, thrifty, vigorous and virile population. We are glad to hear of the wonderful mineral development in the northern part of Ontario and of the thousands who are going in there to develop its great natural resources. It is with equal satisfaction that we realize that the northern part of Ontario not only has an abundance of minerals, but unknown quantities of rich agricultural land, destined to be the homes of millions of people. We equally rejoice when we hear of the immense resources and development of our great Northwest, of the tens of millions of acres of golden grain under cultivation, and the hundreds of millions of bushels exported. We are pleased also to learn that the territorial areas of these western provinces are likely to be extended. The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway), speaking yesterday, referred to the almost certain extending of the territorial limits of the province of Manitoba. The province of Ontario is also to be extended to Hudson bay. But the limits of the maritime provinces cannot be extended. We are narrowly circumscribed by nature. If we were in a similar position to that of the other provinces, we could look forward to the future with brighter hope. I may add that we in the maritime provinces note with a glow of pleasure and satisfaction the various resources of the province of British Columbia, her great mineral wealth, her vast timber areas, her rich agricultural land, her valuable fisheries, her open and spacious harbours destined to be the gateways of the trade to the Orient and to contain a very large population. But when we look to the other side of the picture, when we realize what all this means to us, the picture is not so pleasant. When we realize that all this progress in the other parts of the Dominion means our practical exclusion from a voice in the public affairs of our country and the council board of the nation, the prospect is not so agreeable. We have given and are still giving to the other provinces that which is dearer to us than any earthly consideration. We are giving them our flesh and blood, and it is hard for us to think that this contribution is the very cause of our exclusion from any control in the public affairs of this Dominion. Is there any man in this House who will say that the privilege I am asking for, the principle which is contained in this resolution, can mean any injury to any other province or any interest in any other province or even an individual. If it did, I would be prepared to reconsider it. But if on the other hand it cannot be shown that to give Prince Edward Island and the other maritime provinces for all time to come that which they thought they were getting, in the matter of representation, when they entered confederation, will not affect prejudicially in any possible way any other province or any interests or individual in any other province, will it be too much to expect that the representatives from these other provinces will favourably consider our request. In 1892, when a possible reduction in the representation of British Columbia was suggested, the late Sir John Thompson spoke strongly against it and likewise did the right hon. gentleman who is now leading the House. He said he would be sorry that the representation from any province should ever be below the number it always had considered it was entitled to. Of course we know that a strict application of the letter of the law will not give us six representatives, but we know that the letter killeth where the spirit quickeneth and giveth life, and the spirit of the constitution would give us the representation we had when we entered confederation. It is with confidence, therefore, that I submit this resolution—confidence in the large-minded generosity of the men from the other provinces. This may be an unimportant matter to the large provinces, but it is a very important matter to us. Why withhold this privilege from us? I say again, it is with confidence that I submit this resolution for the consideration of the House.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queen's, P.E.I.). I am much pleased that the hon. gentleman (Mr.

J. J. Hughes) has brought forward this resolution. It is a very important one, not only to Prince Edward Island, but to all the maritime provinces, and also to the province of Ontario. As the hon. gentleman as shown, the representation in this House changes according to the increase or decrease in the population of all the provinces except Quebec. We find that in the last distribution the province of Ontario lost six members, the province of Nova Scotia lost two members, the province of New Brunswick lost one member, and the province of Prince Edward Island also lost one member.

Mr. STOCKTON. New Brunswick lost two.

Mr. A. MARTIN. I see one here, this is according to the last change.

Mr. STOCKTON. We have thirteen now, we had fifteen years ago.

Mr. A. MARTIN. These figures are made under the last redistribution. So far as Ontario is concerned, she lost six out of eighty-six, that is, they lost about one-fourteenth of their representation ; Nova Scotia lost about one-ninth of her representation ; New Brunswick about one-thirteenth ; and when you come to my own province, we lost one-fourth of our representation. Therefore, while this rule bears heavily on Ontario, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, it bears still heavier on the province from which I have the honour to come. I think the proposal in the resolution merits the serious consideration of this House. It would result in no serious disadvantage to this great country ; on the contrary, if we maintained the representation as it is, there would be no need for a redistribution of the ridings every ten years. In 1864, as the hon. gentleman has said, when they were discussing the terms of confederation, this question was thoroughly gone into. The first proposal was not for a representation by population, though that rule was afterwards adopted. The unit of representation at the time of confederation was one representative for 17,000 population ; to-day it is one representative for 25,100 of a population. Quebec was made the pivotal province and was given a representation of sixty-five members, giving her an increased representation of forty-three members, while there was a decrease in Ontario according to the ratio then adopted.

Now we know that in Quebec the increase of population is very rapid, the birth rate is greater than in any other province of Canada. We have a very keen race in the other provinces to keep up with Quebec on account of her large birth rate. The birth rate of Quebec, I see, is about thirty-eight per thousand, the birth rate in the rest of Canada is only about twenty-eight per thousand. I suppose Quebec's birth rate is owing to the physical vigour of her people, and the healthy religious sentiment that prevails, for which I honour them, and give them praise. We would have to make a very keen race to overcome that disadvantage of ten per cent under which we labour on account of the different birth rate. But there are other circumstances which make my argument still more effective. When Quebec was made the pivotal province, it had only an area of 233,000 square miles. In 1896 the boundaries of Quebec were increased and 118,420 square miles were added to her territory. So that besides having a greater birth rate than the other provinces, Quebec has largely increased her territory, increased it over fifty per cent. Taking that increased area into consideration, I think it would be unfair to the other provinces that they should be compelled to maintain the same ratio in their representation according to population as Quebec. Why, Sir, an area of territory was added to Quebec in 1896 equal to all England, Scotland, Ireland and a few other islands thrown in. When you consider that at confederation Quebec, the pivotal province, had only a small area and that that area has been so largely increased, the chances for the maritime provinces especially are very small. But this argument does not apply to the same extent to Ontario, because Ontario has also increased her territory. In 1884, 159,000 square miles were added to the area of Ontario. The only provinces whose area cannot be increased on account of the situation in which they find themselves are Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. So these three are, I think, under a peculiar disadvantage in that respect. I think in coming to some conclusion this House should bear these facts in mind, particularly the fact that the area of Quebec, the pivotal province, has been increased fifty per cent since confederation. Why, that area is equal in extent to Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Ireland, Scotland and a few other places. The population of Quebec is very rapidly increasing, and will soon raise the unit above what it is to-day. The day is not far distant when the unit, instead of being 25,100, will be at least 50,000. When the unit goes up to 50,000 Prince Edward Island possibly may have two, when it goes up to 75,000 we will have one, and when it goes up to 120,000 we will have none at all. That is a state of affairs which I am sure there is not a member of this House would welcome, especially in view of the fact that when that prosperous province entered confederation it assumed that the understanding, as it has been quoted by my hon. friend who has just sat down, would be carried out. I have here the excellent work by Mr. Joseph Pope entitled 'Confederation Documents' which proves exactly what I say. As they have often been quoted I forbear doing so. I am going to speak more particularly in regard

to Prince Edward Island because there are other gentlemen from other provinces who are well able to take care of their own.

When confederation was first mooted there were two questions of paramount importance as far as Prince Edward Island was concerned. One was the question of representation in this House. The other question was that of maintaining communication with the rest of Canada. In regard to both of these paramount questions Prince Edward Island has not been treated as she had a right to expect. Prince Edward Island, when she entered confederation, being an island, was cut off from the rest of the Dominion and it was realized that her position in the confederation would not be equal to that in which the other provinces were situated. So, they made it a part of the bond of union that steam communication should be maintained daily between the province and the mainland. I need not go fully into this phase of it, because it will come up for discussion, perhaps, before very long, that that part of the terms of confederation have not been carried out. Then there was the other point. The people of Prince Edward Island understood that their representation should consist of six members in perpetuity. They were given to understand that this was the least representation they should have. Therefore, in regard to the maintenance of communication with the mainland we have not been treated as we should have been treated. In regard to the question of representation we have likewise not been treated properly. The resolution proposed by my hon. friend would not only give Prince Edward Island justice but it would do so for New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and perhaps Ontario, what I think would be to their advantage and to the advantage of the Dominion. I was very well pleased that my hon. friend quoted from the Australian constitution to show that the representation of the various states of the Commonwealth was not, under the constitution, decreased, but was maintained at the minimum which had previously existed in the various provinces and was not to be decreased. I know that there are a good many to speak on this subject here; it is a subject of general interest to this House and I think I may safely leave it to the consideration of the hon. gentlemen whom I see around me and who will take part in this discussion. I think it would be very improper for me to occupy too much time in this discussion. These are my views hurriedly expressed, in regard to the question, and I hope the government will take it up and remove the grievances which exist in that province. If they remove this grievance and that in regard to winter communication they will be held up in Prince Edward Island as the benefactors of their country.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD (Pictou). Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a word in support of the motion of my hon. friend from King's, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Hughes) which proposal, as it has been presented by my hon. friends from that province, has been along the line of remedying the injustice which has come to Prince Edward Island by reason of the interpretation which has been placed upon the British North America Act in regard to the particular section which relates to representation. That injustice is one which does not affect merely Prince Edward Island but which also affects the other two maritime provinces more particularly. It does so by reason of the fact that what may be called the other smaller provinces in the Dominion have come into the union under conditions, which, to a certain extent, protect their status as regards representation. It may be urged that as we have had an interpretation of the British North America Act upon the rights of the various provinces in regard to representation given by the Supreme Court of Canada and confirmed by the Privy Council we have a condition of affairs with which we ought to be satisfied because it may be said that these decisions interpreted correctly what the views were of the fathers of confederation at the time of the passage of the British North America Act, but I desire to point out the fact, which I am sure every member of the legal profession in the House will agree with me upon, that, as my hon. friend from King's has said, the interpretation placed by the courts on this Act has been due to a consideration rather of the letter rather than of the spirit of the law. The confederation documents, speeches and agreements which were made, spoken and entered into and which formed the basis of the confederation subsequently arrived at were not of themselves in evidence before the courts, and they could not be regarded when they came to interpret and go into all these statutes, and therefore they present to us a side of this agreement which we in this House to-day, asking the Imperial parliament as we do by this motion to reconsider this question, have at least a right to consider. In 1867 and previous to that time we had a condition in the four provinces similar in degree to four individuals coming together and saying: We desire to enter into a partnership whereby we lose our individual identity which for certain purposes becomes lost in this partnership. This partnership is to have certain rights and powers and there are reserved to the individual partners certain other rights and powers. Among these rights which were allocated to the different individual members of the partnership the one which formed the principal bone of contention was this question of the representation in the confederation of each of these partners and it will be at once agreed as a matter of fair play and as a matter of consideration of what must have been the

understanding of each one of these entities at that time that no one of them would have entered into the partnership if it had thought as a result of the entrance that it would have been placed in a worse position in so far as representation in the common bond thus established was concerned. As a result and consequence each one of these provinces had allotted to it in the federal parliament a certain specified number of members. As a matter of fair play this House and this country must admit that each one of these partners must have thought that the figure as fixed at that time would be the minimum figure as far as representation was concerned. That is shown by reason of the fact that the language used in the British North America Act dealing with the question of representation, as it is to be found in section 51 of the Act, speaks of the representation being the representation of the four provinces not each one of the provinces then in existence or in the Canada that was to be and that now is, but each one of the four provinces which then made this partnership, which then combined themselves together for the inauguration and inception of this Canada that is to-day. The fact is to be remarked that in that agreement which took place and which led up to the final passage of the British North America Act you find in the first draft the provision which adjusted the representation as affecting 'each' of the provinces.' Then, you will find in the second draft the word 'each' eliminated and the words 'four provinces' substituted, while the third draft reproduces the word 'each' and finally it is settled once and for all by the final draft and subsequently by the Act that was passed that, in so far as the representation of the different partners that formed the confederation was concerned they were dealing with the representation of the four provinces. Let us see what was done afterwards. By section 146 of the British North America Act certain provisions were made by which various other portions of the then British North America Act should come into the confederation, and they were to come into confederation 'subject to the provisions of this Act.' It was argued before the courts which gave the present authoritative interpretation to the wording of this section of the Act, that these words 'subject to the provisions of this Act' were limiting words, and words which bound every member of the confederation as it came in subsequently by the clause in regard to representation. But that was not the course that was adopted. That is not what was understood by Sir John Macdonald in 1871. In the memorandum which he sent to Downing street with regard to the effect of the Manitoba Act, and when, in dealing with the necessity which was realized at home of having a special Act conferring upon the federal parliament the right to deal with representation, it was shown that Sir John Macdonald's view was as I have stated.

When we come to look at the way in which the other provinces came in, we find that as regards representation there was a special provision. While you see a general observation of all the other provisions of the Act there was a special clause relating to representation in each one of the agreements which were made. You find that British Columbia came in with six members and a provision which provided for an increase of these six members at each decennial census. The British Columbia Act did not contain any clause which provided for 'readjustment', and therefore British Columbia ever since she came into confederation has stood in the anomalous position that while its representation may be increased it cannot be decreased. But, Prince Edward Island which came in with six members, the same as British Columbia, came in with the words in its Act that its representation should not merely be increased, but readjusted. As a consequence of the word 'readjusted' Prince Edward Island has had its representation decreased in this parliament. Then as regard all the other provinces have come in since confederation, their representation has been fixed not under the terms of the original confederation Act but by virtue of the power conferred on this parliament by the Imperial Acts of 1871 and 1886. Therefore the status of the other provinces cannot be regarded in looking to find what was the spirit of the men who formed the confederation in 1867 in regard to this matter. A moments consideration will confirm the contention which has been made with respect to Prince Edward Island. In 1873 when Prince Edward Island came into confederation it was not entitled to six members, if you take the unit of population as it then existed in the province of Quebec ; it was entitled to less than five members. And yet in the agreement which was made it was given six members. Whether you are dealing with the ordinary affairs of life or whether you are dealing with constitutional problems and constitutional rights which perhaps should be given a higher regard than the other ; it is only common sense and fair-play to say that the people of Prince Edward Island who were given six members in 1873 although they had no right to that number according to the unit of population, are entitled to preserve that number of six members right through so long as the confederation of Canada lasts.

Let me deal for a moment with the different conditions existing to-day which render it necessary to ask for the relief which is sought for in this motion. The trouble today does not arise on account of any difficulty with reference to the unit of Quebec; the trouble of our friends from Prince Edward Island is not in regard to that, although the unit of representation no doubt

will increase so long as Quebec will increase in her population, and so long as her immense resources will be developed and so long as Canada will advance. But the trouble in this: That under subsection 4 of section 51 of the British North America Act, the men who formed confederation when they drafted this section as relating to the four provinces merely, they understood that the comparison which was to be made under subsection 4 between the population of each province and the population of Canada was to be a comparison which was to be made with 'Canada' as it was constituted in 1867 and not 'Canada' as it may be constituted from time to time in the future. It was on that question that the discussion was raised in the Supreme Court of Canada. The word 'Canada' might have three interpretations. 1st, Canada composed of the original four provinces; 2nd, Canada composed of the seven provinces; and 3rd, Canada as it was known territorially taking in all the territories. The Supreme Court of Canada decided that the word 'Canada' was to be interpreted as meaning the seven provinces of the Dominion as they existed in 1903, and not the four provinces which existed at confederation. Had they decided that the word 'Canada' was to mean the four provinces in the very terms in which this section apprehends that it should mean, then our friends from Prince Edward Island, our friends in Nova Scotia, our friends in New Brunswick would not be hampered by the difficulty which we have to face to day; because, with all the enthusiasm for the great Northwest, with its tremendous possibilities, the enormous population which is going in there, and the abnormal unheard of increase that has come to Canada as a result of the influx of settlers into that portion of our territory; if you consider the seven provinces as being the unit with which this comparison was to be made you can readily see that those of us who live in the maritime provinces cannot begin to increase and cannot be expected to increase in any measure either to-day or as the years roll by (so far as we can see) so that we can have the advantage of any comparison with the seven provinces of the Dominion. Whereas, if what we say is the intention of the fathers of confederation were carried out, and a comparison was to be made only with Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, then we claim that that comparison would be a fair one and that we would be perfectly willing to go along on and stand by the electoral unit fixed by the province of Quebec, and take chances on our comparison with the original four provinces.

The result of the decision which has been given upon this question fixing the comparison with Canada as it may be from time to time; was this. That whereas the words 'four provinces' are used specially in section 51, the Supreme Court of Canada decided that the word 'four' should be read out of it, and that the word 'seven' which was the number of provinces which existed at that time, should be substituted for the word 'four'. That was a case in which you had the letter of the law interpreted on account of the meanings which were given to the word 'Canada' in other portions of the Act. But when I read section 51 you will see the situation perhaps more clearly than I have been able to present it. Section 51 of the British North America Act says:

> On the completion of the census in the year 1871 and of each subsequent decennial census the representation of the four provinces shall be adjusted by such authority, in such a manner and from such time as the parliament of Canada from time to time provides, subject and according to the following rules.

Subsection 4 contains these words:

> On any such readjustment the number of members for a province shall not be reduced unless the proportion which the number of the population of the province bore to the number of the aggregate population of Canada at the then last preceding readjustment of the number of members for the province is ascertained at the then latest census to be diminished by one-eleventh part or upwards.

It was contended on behalf of the provinces that the word 'Canada' in that subsection 4 should be interpreted to mean Canada as originally constitued by the original four provinces. It has been decided not to mean the four provinces which were the parties dealt with by this section; but the word 'four' is stricken out, and the word 'seven' used. Hence the smaller provinces are in this position, that in comparison with Quebec, by whose developments we are to be judged, we are face to face with an anomalous condition of affairs which the fathers of confederation never thought of, in the tremendous development of the Northwest. We do not ask anything unfair; we do not ask that the view which the fathers of confederation held was the correct view in 1867 should be subverted; but we do ask you to say that, whereas in the latter portion of the nineteenth century there has been a development in our national life which those men never thought of forty years ago, that unusual development should not bring about a condition of affairs as a result of which these smaller provinces by the sea would be prevented from having those full rights which they had at the time of confederation, and their full share in the doings of the nation which they were intended to have when the partnership was originally formed. I do not wish to detain the House further than to make clear what our position is; but this motion is the natural consequence of the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada and the Judicial Committee of the Privy

Council. I may be permitted to re-state the fact, which every man who appreciates fair-play and common sense will admit, that no province came into this Dominion with the idea that it was going to have less representation at any time afterwards than it had at the beginning. I think that every one will concede as a matter of common sense and fair-play that the people of the province of Prince Edward Island would not have come into confederation if they had known that as a result of a legal decision their representation in this parliament would be reduced to one member; for the statement of my hon. friend from King's (Mr. J. J. Hughes) is not the statement of a possibility merely, but of an extreme probability if the developments go on in the west which we expect. I submit further that it is in the best interests of confederation that a minimum number should be fixed. We are not asking for any extension of rights. We are not asking that there should be given to us any greater representation than it was always intended we should have. In the United States the little state of Rhode Island, which is less than a postage stamp on the map, retains its senatorial representation to the same extent as the great state of New York; it has the same status in the union as one of the entities that go to make up the United States, as Pennsylvania, Ohio, or any of the other great states; and so far as the provinces by the sea are concerned, looking to the future of Canada, anxious to share in the great events that will come to us, we are here asking the parliament of Canada to accept this resolution asking the imperial parliament to declare that the law is what the fathers of confederation thought was the law—that our status in this country shall remain unimpaired, and that the condition of affairs which has been created as a result of a judicial decision on the letter of the British North America Act should be done away with, and a minimum of representation fixed for the people of the maritime provinces.

Mr. A. A. STOCKTON (St. John City and County). Mr. Speaker, coming from one of the provinces especially affected by the interpretation which has been placed upon the British North America Act by the highest judicial authorities, I feel that I should say something upon the question before the House. The hon. member for Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) has presented an argument as to the meaning of the term 'Canada' in section 51 of the British North America Act. I remember that the argument of those representing the provinces before the courts was as my hon. friend has pointed out, that is, that 'Canada' meant the four original provinces of the Dominion. Unfortunately for us, however, the judicial committee of the Privy Council held that 'Canada' was not a variable term—that we could not apply to it in 1867 a meaning different from its meaning in 1902 or 1903. I quite agree, however, with my hon. friend that it was fairly understood by all the framers of the Confederation Act that there never should be any diminution of the representation of the provinces named in that Act; and why do I come to that conclusion? We must bow to the decision of the Judical Committee of the Privy Council, which is the highest appeal authority for us within the empire. Under the British North America Act we were to have fifteen members from the province of New Brunswick, nineteen from the province of Nova Scotia, and six from the province of Prince Edward Island was provided by the terms of Union with the latter province. Now, it was supposed that as we took Quebec as the pivot, there would never be any diminution of the representation of the other provinces; and if the confederation had been permitted to stand as it began, I do not believe there ever would have been any diminution in the representation. The fault that I have found is that there has been a change in the pivot, that the territorial boundaries of the province of Quebec have been increased to such an extent as to be unfair to the other provinces of the Dominion, by disturbing the respective representations of the different provinces. I do not know how far—I have not looked into that question—there would have been a change in the representation of the different provinces in the last re-adjustment if there had been no change in the territorial boundaries of the province of Quebec. If we look into that question, I think we shall find that there would not have been the change there has been. At the same time, Sir, looking at this matter from a constitutional standpoint, I express the opinion which I have expressed before on the floor of this House, that the smaller provinces, the weaker parties to the confederation, should be careful how they endeavour to get away from the fundamental principles of the constitution—that we should stand as firmly as we possibly can by the terms of the British North America Act. But there is force in what my hon. friend from the county of Pictou says, that it was never understood that there should be any diminution of the representation of the different provinces; but the pivot has been changed, and as a result the principle of representation as between the different provinces has been disorganized.

I am not going to prolong the discussion. I merely mentioned that it is unfair to the other provinces that that change should have taken place, and in consequence of that change the time may come, as my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. J. J. Hughes) has said, when they will have but one or two members from the little province of Prince Edward Island and only

four or five members from the small province of New Brunswick or from the province of Nova Scotia. That was never intended by the framers of confederation, and I am quite satisfied that the right hon. gentleman who leads the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), who leads the government to-day, never for a moment in his political history supposed that that was going to be the case. Some person has handed a note to me to say that it would be especially unfair to Prince Edward Island, because Prince Edwad Island can never be increased in area. The same argument applies, as pointed out by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) with reference to New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. Nova Scotia cannot extend its boundaries unless it runs out into the sea. The province of New Brunswick cannot extend its boundaries unless it takes in some part of Nova Scotia or a portion of Quebec, or probably, as my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) suggests, some of the state of Maine. There is not much probability of that, but if we did we would only get back probably what we are entitled to. I do not intend to prolong the discussion except to say that the fault I have to find is that there was a change in the method of computation in the pivotal province of Quebec, in extending the boundaries of that province to the detriment of the maritime provinces.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN (Queen's, P.E.I.). I quite agree with the remarks made by the hon. member for St. John county (Mr. Stockton), and I am of his opinion that the pivotal province of Quebec has been changed by the reason of the great increase of territory which that province has acquired since 1867. The case of Prince Edward Island especially has been very ably put by the hon. members for King's (Mr. J. J. Hughes) and Queen's (Mr. Martin) and the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) has backed them up well and presented the case in a clear light. The legal aspect of this case was threshed out, so far as Prince Edward Island was concerned, before the Supreme Court of Canada and also before the Privy Council in London. Prince Edward Island was ably represented by Mr. Aylesworth, now the Postmaster General. Mr. Aylesworth in presenting the case for Prince Edward Island stated that an agreement had been reached between the province of Prince Edward Island and the Dominion of Canada that Prince Edward Island should have a representation in the Dominion parliament of six members. He stated, and the same statement was made here to-day by the hon. member for King's (Mr. J. J. Hughes), that Prince Edward Island had refused in 1864 to join the confederation because they could not come to an agreement with the other provinces as to the number of representatives which the province should have in the parliament of Canada. Canada, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia were willing to concede to Prince Edward Island five representatives in the Dominion parliament. Prince Edward Island asked for six, to which number, as the member for Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) stated, the province was not entitled at that time. But it asked for six and the other provinces would not concede the point. Subsequently, owing to representations made from London and also to an agreement which was entered into between Prince Edward Island and the Dominion government, they came to an arrangement that Prince Edward Island should be represented in the parliament of Canada by six representatives. This was purely and simply a matter of agreement. Prince Edward Island at that time was not entitled to six representatives, but as Mr. Aylesworth said in his argument before the Supreme Court of Canada, and I take it that this is a matter which should have the greatest weight with the government of Canada in asking the British parliament to pass a law to give Prince Edward Island the representation which it had when it entered into confederation in 1873:

> It came to be a matter of agreement between the Dominion on the one part and the Island on the other, and it was settled that there should be six representatives, and upon that footing and basis these addresses were passed by the provincial Houses at Charlottetown, and by the Dominion legislature here and incorporated in the Queens Order in Council admitting the province.

By some oversight it was incorporated in the resolution that Prince Edward Island should be subject to all the provisions of the British North America Act and this privilege which the province was fighting for from 1864 and which was conceded to them in 1873, was overlooked and the province entered into confederation by resolution of the Privy Council under the provisions of the British North America Act, with reference to representation.

There is no doubt in my mind, there was no doubt in Mr. Aylesworth's mind when he argued this case, and I do not think there was any doubt in the minds of the members of the Supreme Court of Canada, that this agreement had been made between Prince Edward Island and the Dominion of Canada that they should be entitled to six members in this House, but the fact remained that when this matter came up in 1903, there was a law and the parliament of Canada had to take the law as they found it. Mr. Aylesworth ably argued his case. He went on in his argument, as will appear at page 601 of the report:

> Now according to representation by population there was no such right. If one had divided the population of Prince Edward Island as it stood in 1873 by the unit fixed in section 51 of the statute in reference to the population of Quebec, the Island would not have been entitled

to six members at all, it would have been entitled to barely five, and that circumstance coupled with the fact that the province had been, from the time of the original proposal of confederation, standing for better terms, so to say, standing out for larger representation; now that the terms of union were being arranged it was stipulated on their part and agreed to by the Dominion that they should have a representation larger than their population entitled them to.

This was a matter which the Dominion government was justified in conceding to any province, particularly to Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland these colonies need not come in under the British North America Act on the same terms as the four original provinces. The Dominion parliament had power to concede them greater representation than, according to population, they were entitled to under the British North America Act. Prince Edward Island thought they were getting this, but, by an oversight they came under the provisions of the Act and they are today entitled to a representation in this House of only four members. Now suppose the population of Canada and Quebec increases as it has during the last ten years, what will be the condition of Prince Edward Island and of the provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, perhaps 25 years from this time? We will not, I consider in 25 years be entitled to more than one representative in this House. I do not think the framers of the resolution which admitted Prince Edward Island into this Dominion thought for one moment that Prince Edward Island was to come into the union other than under the terms of the agreement referred to. That is a matter which the leader of this House and his government should represent to the Imperial parliament in asking that a law should be passed by the Imperial parliament conceding to Prince Edward Island and the maritime provinces the representation to which they are entitled, and which it was the intention of the framers of the constitution they should have in this House.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton, N.B.). I consider this matter, Mr. Speaker, of so much importance to the province of New Brunswick, that I do not feel justified in allowing it to go by without giving my views on the question. It was considered so important in the province of New Brunswick that our provincial government undertook to pay the expenses of laying this matter before the Supreme Court of Canada as a special case and of appealing from the adverse decision of that court to the Privy Council of England. Unfortunately—and I use the word advisedly because I think it was a great misfortune—the Privy Council upheld the decision of the Supreme Court, and as the result of the consequences of that decision have been ably set forth by my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), I need not refer to the legal side of the question, but there is another side which I think of much greater importance. It is within the knowledge of many hon. members of this House, it is in fact a matter of history, that many serious objections were raised by the maritime provinces against entering confederation. It is of course a matter of history that insuperable difficulties had arisen between the old united provinces of Canada, consisting then of the two provinces now known as Quebec and Ontario, which rendered it impossible to carry on government in these united provinces, and the best means that could be devised to get rid of the deadlock was to confederate all the British American provinces. For that reason mainly was confederation brought about. It is also known that the province of Prince Edward Island at first absolutely refused to take any part in confederation. It is equally of record that the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia at first refused and in fact it was only after considerable discussion and perhaps enlightenment that these two provinces were induced to join with the others ; but I would like to ask the right hon. the leader of the government and every hon. gentleman in this House if at that time any one supposed that these provinces could have been induced to join confederation had they ever imagined that the representation which they were given by the last draft of the Quebec resolutions would eventually become reduced below that number. I admit that the basis of representation from the different provinces was to be governed by population. There is no escaping from that proposition. I also admit that that is the stumbling block against which we are face to face. But I submit that the principle of representation by population was not held inviolable or unchangeable like the laws of the Medes and Persians. Because when Prince Edward Island afterwards came into the union that province was actually given six members, when, according to population, it was only entitled to five. And again when British Columbia joined the union, it was given six members, and it was further provided that its representation should never be less. Therefore the principle of representation by population is not something which cannot be changed and which we need have any scruples about asking the imperial parliament to change.

Unfortunately the courts havt decided that the legal construction of the sections in the British North America Act compels us to submit to a decrease in our representation, but as has been ably pointed out by the hon. member for St. John's (Mr. Stockton) and also by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), the great difficulty arose from the fact that the unit has been changed, that the boundaries of the province of Que-

bec have been increased very largely, and the question is not now so much what took place in the past when confederation was framed. It is not such a serious matter that New Brunswick should have lost two members, Nova Scotia one, and Prince Edward Island two. That could pass. While serious enough, is not so very serious. It is not so serious that we could not get along if no further changes took place. But the thing I am afraid of, the thing which looks unavoidable, is that on account of the increase of territory of the province of Quebec, it is probable that within a few years the representation of the maritime provinces will be so materially reduced that we shall no longer occupy anything like the position we expected we would, and the provinces of Quebec and Ontario and the British government expected we would, when confederation was consummated. We have only to remember that not only are the boundaries of the maritime provinces circumscribed, but the chances for increase in population, the prospects of maintaining our own, are not nearly as satisfactory as are those in the province of Quebec. We have not in the interior of New Brunswick any large quantity of land fit for settlement such as there is in the province of Quebec. We have very large quantities of land immensely valuable as timber property, but unfortunately, while worth almost untold dollars, that does not increase our population. Nova Scotia fortunately is in a better position. That province has vaulable mines and fisheries, but as an agricultural country can never hope to compare with the province of Quebec. On the other hand, while the province of Prince Edward Island possesses every advantage from an agricultural standpoint, its boundaries are so circumscribed that in these days, when by means of machinery one man can cultivate as much land as four or five could thirty or forty years ago, we can expect no possible increase in the population of that province to compare with the growth in the province of Quebec. Therefore the natural possibilities of increase in population in the three maritime provinces are very much circumscribed compared with those in the province of Quebec. We all know that an immense territory has been opened up in the northern portion of Quebec. This territory which has been added to that province since confederation is going to be traversed by the Transcontinental Railway. Lands have been opened up upon the headwaters of the rivers entering the St. Lawrence, which were heretofore considered unfit for settlement. Lands are being opened up today in that province which in 1866 were supposed to be barren and unfit for cultivation or the support of any reasonable amount of population. For these reasons it seems to me a great injustice to the maritime provinces that they should be compelled to submit to any decrease in their representation. Unfortunately the Act of Confederation has been construed against us by the courts but it seems to me that we can, with every right and claim to justice, ask this parliament to go to the imperial parliament and there have this wrong righted which has resulted from the British North America Act of 1867.

Mr. A. A. LEFURGEY (Prince, P.E.I.). I do not intend, Mr. Speaker, to take up much of the time of the House as this matter has been very well discussed by the hon. members who have preceded me and I had occasion, when the Representation Bill was before the House, a year or two ago, to go into it particularly as regards the claims of Prince Edward Island. However, I may say that I am in entire sympathy with this motion. At the time this question was being discussed before, I suggested that if this parliament would not take the responsibility of giving Prince Edward Island the representation we had at entrance into confederation and to which we are fairly entitled, namely, six members, and if the decisions of the Supreme Court and the Privy Council should go against us, an address should be sent from this House to the Throne asking that the constitution be amended so as to apply a remedy, and I believe that upon that occasion the right hon. leader of the government suggested to me that means of meeting the difficulty. It was also supported by, and I believe had the sympathy of a great many members of this House. The hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) on that occasion suggested this, and the hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan). I think it would be better now, if the government is not prepared to accept this motion, that a sub-committee of this House should be appointed to look into the situation; and if it found, as I believe it can be clearly shown beyond peradventure, that Prince Edward Island was entitled by the intention of the framers of the bond of confederation to have six members in perpetuity representing her in this House, then I think this House is in honour bound, on the report of such committee, to petition the Imperial authorities to have that intention expressed in the bond. Now that we have had a decision of the Privy Council on the legal construction of the bond of confederation, saying that we were not entitled to the six members, I believe it is proper for this House to take some action with a view to providing that the intention of the parties to the union, the intention on both sides, is carried into effect. The intention of the parties to confederation as regards Prince Edward Island has been ably shown by the hon. member for King's (Mr. J. J. Hughes) who quoted from the leading men of the conference of 1864 who represented on that occasion Prince Edward Island, showing that this point was always in the

foreground, and was the obstacle on that occasion which prevented the island coming into conferedation. Her representatives claimed that on account of our isolated position, and the possibility and probability that the population of Quebec would increase very rapidly, ultimately we would be left without any representation. You will find from the quotations made by my hon. friend from King's, and from others that I could give, and have quoted previously, that our province would not have entered confederation had she not been assured that six members would be given her in perpetuity. For some reason that condition was not placed in the terms of the bond, although the intention of giving her that representation was clearly manifest; and I think under these circumstances we are in honour bound to have it placed there. The right hon. leader of this House said, in 1903, that we had acquiesced in the reduction on two occasions. In 1882 when the Redistribution Bill was before the House, Prince Edward Island was only entitled to five members according to the unit of population, but she retained her six members. That was when the Rt. Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald was leader of this House, and it is to be remembered that in 1873 he was at the head of the conference held with a view to bringing Prince Edward Island into confederation; and it is reasonable to suppose that if it had not been the intention of the conference to give Prince Edward Island six members in perpetuity, this parliament in 1882 would have reduced her representation to five. But as I have said before, discussion at the conference showed on the part of leading men on both sides that it was intended that the island should have six members in perpetuity. I trust therefore that the government will take this matter up seriously, because it means, as has been pointed out by my hon. friend from Queen's (Mr. A. Martin), that if the present movement goes on for another decade or two, the representation of Prince Edward Island will be pulled down to one, and indeed we may suppose that as time goes on we shall have absolutely no representation at all under the present rule regarding representatives. The point that has been brought out regarding the increased area of Quebec is also deserving of a good deal of consideration. Already that area has increased her population, and will do so to a much larger extent in the future, and consequently will raise the unit of representation. The increased area given Quebec is 59 times as large as the province of Prince Edward Island. You will see therefore, Mr. Speaker, that our fears are justifiable that if the present rule is continued, and the present increase of unit of representation maintained, the time will come when we shall have no representation at all.

Mr. LEFURGEY.

Mr. TURGEON moved the adjournment of the debate.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I understand that several members desire to speak on this question who are not present. It is one of great importance, and the government have no objection to the adjournment.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The right hon. gentleman might say further that he himself suggested the adjournment, if he were inclined to be frank about it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The subject is one of great importance, and it is desirable that it should be discussed and brought to a conclusion, and not buried. Therefore I trust the adjournment of the debate does not mean that we shall hear no more of it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It will be placed on the order paper for next Monday.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

THE MONTREAL HARBOUR BOARD.

Mr. L. A. A. RIVET (Hochelaga) moved :

For copies of all documents, correspondence, reports and resolutions received by the government, or by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, from the Chamber of Commerce and the Board of Trade of Montreal, or from any corporation or private individual, respecting the reorganization or abolition of the Montreal Harbour Board.

He said : My object in introducing this motion is mainly to call the attention of the House to a question which has engrossed public opinion in Montreal, and it is one with which the country as a whole is at the present moment deeply concerned. For some years past the trend of public opinion in Montreal has been in favour of making some change in the constitution of the Montreal Harbour Board. That public feeling, though at first it was not very marked, has grown until now it is asserting itself in no unmistakable way through the leading organs of the press, and by resolutions passed by the Montreal Board of Trade.

These expressions of opinion are of such import,—the state of things which they have in view is pregnant with such far-reaching results as regards the general interests of the metropolis, and of the Dominion at large, —that this House should not be left in ignorance of them. And while there is not likely a single hon. gentleman in this House who is not aware of their existence and of their purport, I deem it advisable to introduce them as a subject worthy of the attention of this House. I do not propose to indulge in any lengthy remarks. I simply want to direct the attention of the House to the state of affairs and to the reasons which

have led public opinion in Montreal to ask for a change. The port of Montreal, I suppose, like most of the Canadian ports is under the management of a commission, which is composed of representatives of the government, the boards of trade, the city of Montreal, the shipping federation and the Montreal Corn Exchange. This state of affairs has been in existence now for fifty years. In 1852 the powers which were possessed by Trinity House, which then had jurisdiction over the harbour and also, if I am not mistaken, over the ship channel and the navigation of the St. Lawrence between Montreal and Quebec, were transferred to a body which was constituted by statute and which body was incorporated under the name of the Commissioners of the Montreal Harbour. In 1855, by another statute, this body was composed of five members, three to be appointed by the government, one by the board of trade, and one by the shipping federation. The constitution of the Harbour Commission was altered twice. At the present time it is composed of 11 members, six representing the government and five representing the city of Montreal, the board of trade, chambre de commerce, the Montreal Corn Exchange, and the shipping federation. In 1889, by a statute passed by this parliament, the government took over the ship channel or, took over the control of and jurisdiction over the navigation of the St. Lawrence between Montreal and Quebec, and at the same time assumed the debt which had been incurred by the commissioners of $3,000,000 in the deepening and improvement of the channel. In 1903 another statute was passed by this parliament by which the jurisdiction which had been exercised over the harbour improvements by the Department of Public Works was transferred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. That is now the present state of affairs in regard to the administration of the port of Montreal. Now, Mr. Speaker, has the system of management of the harbour been satisfactory, to Montreal and the country at large ? I have not the least hesitation in answering, 'yes.' In the half century during which the commissioners of the harbour had control very extensive improvements were accomplished not only in the port, but also along the ship channel. It is not necessary for me to refer in detail to these improvements. Suffice it to say that the harbour commissioners have been, as a rule, conscious of their responsibility and have certainly effected a number of improvements which have facilitated ocean navigation in the St. Lawrence river and attracted to the port of Montreal a great deal of traffic which otherwise would have been diverted to American roads and American ports. Amongst those who have accomplished these great results I felt it my duty to recall the name of one man whose memory is still honoured by the citizens of this country ; I mean the Hon. John Young. Every one in this House knows that the Hon. John Young accomplished more than any one else towards the improvement of the St. Lawrence and the improvement of the port of Montreal, and the Act which was passed last year authorized the harbour commissioners of Montreal to erect a monument on one of the public squares as a just and due recognition of the great services which he rendered not only to the province, but to the country at large.

If the system of management of the port of Montreal has been satisfactory up to the present time how is it that there is a movement on foot which has for its object the reorganization of that board ? It seems to me, Sir, that for the last few years, taking into consideration the many expressions of opinion which I have heard in Montreal from the leading financiers, business men and especially those in the shipping interest—and these are opinions which cannot be ignored—that the commissioners have not met with the general approval of the citizens of Montreal or of the public at large in the management of the port. In order to meet the growing needs of the trade and in order to cope successfully with competition offered by foreign routes, especially by the New-York route, the commissioners had, a few years ago, to undertake some very extensive improvements in the harbour of Montreal. These included high level wharfs, elevators and sheds. Some of these works have been accomplished. Others are actually in course of achievement. But the fact is undeniable that they have not been accomplished with the speed that is necessary to meet the crying needs of the trade and to offset foreign competition. This state of affairs is calculated to cause not only disappointment but also a great deal of harm. Owing to lack of proper accommodation in the harbour a great deal of the traffic, especially of the western traffic, which used to pass through our channels is now diverted to American ports. That is the reason why, at the present time, public opinion is almost unanimously in favour of a radical change in the management of the port of Montreal. About this point, I do not think there is a doubt. As to the nature of the change opinions differ. I have heard many expressions of opinion. There is an opinion prevailing in some quarters to the effect that the harbour of Montreal should be placed under a system of municipal management. If I am not mistaken a French paper of Montreal has spoken of that system, but rather in a condemnatory way. That is also my position. I do not believe in the municipalization of the port of Montreal. I have the greatest confidence in the wisdom of the city fathers of Montreal, and I have no doubt that they would endeavour to carry out successfully the improvement of the port. I assert, Sir, that it is a national necessity that the port

of Montreal shall be brought under the immediate control and jurisdiction of the government of the Dominion. There have been two important expressions of opinion from the commercial interests of Montreal on this question ; I refer to the resolution adopted by the chambre de commerce de Montreal, and the memorial presented by the Montreal Board of Trade. The resolution adopted by the chambre de commerce reads as follows

Considering that the chambre de commerce has reason to deplore the slowness with which the improvements to the harbour of Montreal are being prosecuted ;

Considering that this chamber, as well as the country at large, recognize the desirability of declaring the port of Montreal a national port:

Resolved, that this chamber request the Dominion government to have the necessary legislation enacted, during this session, which will vest in said government full control over the management of the harbour of Montreal.

That resolution means the abolition of the board of harbour commissioners and the establishment of state control. The expression of opinion by the Montreal Board of Trade is set forth in a memorial addressed to the Hon. L. P. Brodeur, Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and it reads:

The Montreal Board of Trade,
Montreal, March 15, 1906.

To the Honourable L. P. Brodeur,
Minister of Marine and Fisheries, Ottawa.

The memorial of the council of the Montreal Board of Trade humbly showeth :

That your memorialists have repeatedly urged upon the Dominion government the importance of its assuming the existing obligations of the Montreal Harbour Commissioners and the cost of maintaining the port of Montreal, in order that the trade of the country may for ever be freed from the harbour charges now imposed :

That the Dominion government has expended large sums of money upon its canal system, the channel of the St. Lawrence and aids to navigation, in order to develop the carrying trade of Canada and that your memorialists submit that the object of such expenditure will be defeated if the Montreal harbour dues are not abolished at an early date and Montreal created a free national port.

That the growth of trade and the increase in transportation facilities render urgently necessary the early completion of the projected improvements in the harbour ;

That most unfortunately there has been for several years undue delay in the progress of the improvement works in the harbour and that even at the present time, owing to the lack of harmony between the members of the commission and its officers, a deadlock exists which has retarded the carrying on of the works during the past year.

That although navigation will be open in a few weeks yet owing to the aforesaid deadlock there will be no more berth accommodation in the harbour than at the close of last season, a fact which will seriously restrict the trade of the port ;

That your memorialists deem it urgently necessary in the interests of the port of Montreal and also of that vast section of the Dominion which it serves, that the projected harbour improvements should immediately be pushed to completion ;

That your memorialists have arrived at the conclusion that such speedy completion of the works can only be accomplished by a reorganization of the board of harbour commissioners;

That your memorialists therefore urge the Dominion government to take immediate steps towards such re-organization by introducing at the earliest possible date during this session of parliament an amendment to the Act whereunder the number of commissioners shall be reduced from eleven to three, and your memorialists consider that these three commissioners should be men closely in touch with the commercial, shipping and transportation interests of the city, who, in return for a liberal remuneration, shall engage to devote a large part of their time to the duties devolving upon them ;

That your memorialists consider that if the harbour commission should be thus re-organized it would be in the best interests of the port that the Montreal Board of Trade, whose members supply the greater part of the revenue obtained from inward and outward cargoes. should have the right through its council to nominate one of the said three commissioners until such time as the Dominion government is prepared to assume the obligations of the harbour commission.

(Sgd.) P. H. MATHESON.
President.

GEO. HADRILL,
Secretary.

Signed on behalf of the council of the Montreal Board of Trade, March 15, 1906.

Mr. BERGERON. By whom is that signed?

Mr. RIVET. It is signed by Mr. P. H. Matheson, president, and Mr. Geo. Hadrill, secretary of the Montreal Board of Trade. The memorial of the Montreal Board of Trade seems to be of a more conservative character than the resolution of la chambre de commerce, but the object of both is substantially the same; they both seem to have in view that the government should take over the port of Montreal and declare it a free national port. That question is one which now presents itself to the serious consideration of this government and of this parliament. From 1852 to 1889 the Montreal ship channel was under the control and jurisdiction of the Montreal harbour commissioners, who, I give them the credit of saying, have accomplished very essential improvements and greatly developed the facilities for navigation in the channel. In 1889 the Dominion government saw fit to accede to the repeated representations of the commission and they decided to take over the control of the ship channel. And why? It was because it was considered that the deepening of the ship channel was not a work of a local character, but was just as much a work for the advantage of the whole Dominion of Canada as the enlargement of the canals. It was decided then that the ship channel work should be

carried out at the public expense. Now, cannot the same argument be used with reference to the port of Montreal? Bearing in mind that port terminal facilities at Montreal are to-day more required than ever before, and remembering also that at no distant date this parliament will be called up to complete the task begun in 1889, let us consider if the time has not arrived when the government of this Dominion should declare the port of Montreal a free national port. It is not for me to suggest what is the best solution of this question. I am perfectly prepared to stand by any policy which may be adopted by this government to improve the present state of affairs in the harbour of Montreal. I have stated that there have been delays in the work of improving the harbour. Those who have looked closely into the management of the harbour have been pointing out that there are three factors lacking in the management of the port which are essential to its efficiency. It is said in the first place, that there is lacking a thorough understanding between the government and the commission. As every one knows, most of the improvements accomplished in the harbour have been effected with the aid of money advanced by this government, and I understand that at the present time the total indebtedness of the Montreal Harbour Commission is $7,200,000, and out of that amount $5,020,000 is due to the Dominion government. This money was voted by parliament upon the condition that all improvements shall be carried out with the consent and approval of the government, represented first by the Minister of Public Works, but under the amended legislation, by the Minister of Marine. It will strike every one that in order that such a division of power should bring satisfactory results, it is indispensable that there should be a cordial understanding between the harbour board and the government. I regret to say that this cordial understanding has not always been present. We all know of the difficulties and delays which have been a feature of the relations between the harbour board and the Hon. Mr. Tarte, when Minister of Public Works, with regard to the erection of high level wharfs in Montreal.

However, every one knows that the Hon. Mr. Tarte exhibited clear sightedness, energy and intelligence in that connection, and that in the end public opinion sided with him. I may remind the House also that his worthy and lamented successor, the Hon. Mr. Préfontaine, met with obstacles in the carrying out of his plans for the improvement of the harbour. I do not mean to say, and no one believes, that in every case the commissioners should have conincided in their views, but it does appear that they have not always exhibited the necessary degree of conciliation or given sufficient attention to the representations of the government. In speaking of these misunderstandings, I mean no disrespect towards or disparagement of any member of the harbour commission, but I say that the interests of this country require that a change should be made. There is a condition which is lacking in the management of the board which is due to misunderstanding between the commissioners themselves. I regret to say that for the last few years, and especially for the last few months, the harbour commission has been the scene of general strife, and that in consequence there has been a deadlock in the management. Is it not natural to infer that on account of that deadlock the improvements of the harbour have been neglected? The management of a great port like Montreal should be the main, if not the sole, occupation of those who compose the commission. I know all the members of the board; they are all honourable citizens, men of high ability, who have attained the highest positions in their respective callings and who enjoy the confidence of all their fellow-citizens. For my part I admire and esteem and respect every one of them, not excepting my honourable colleague, Mr. Bickerdike, who since 1896 has devoted his time and energy to the improvement of our national port. But, Sir, these gentlemen cannot devote all their time to the interests of the harbour; they can give to the work only a few hours per week, in the midst of other cares at times very numerous and exacting, and I believe that, as a result, the improvements of the harbour have been neglected.

With regard to the nature of the change to be effected, I say that at the present time I have no policy to offer. It is for the government of this Dominion to do what is fair and right by our national port. I believe, however, that I am only voicing public opinion in Montreal and propounding what is in the best interests of my constituents, when I say that the government should not defer adjusting the management of the port of Montreal so as to make it better meet present requirements.

Again I say, this is no merely local question. It is a much higher and broader question; it is even a question of national importance. This is not merely my own opinion. In a report made in 1852 to the Board of Harbour Commissioners of Montreal by United States engineers, Messrs. John Childe, W. J. McAlpine and James P. Kirkwood, regarding proposed improvements to the port of Montreal and to the channel of the St. Lawrence, I read the following conclusion:

> The improvements in the channel of the St. Lawrence at or near Montreal, and the construction of the proposed harbour, are not local questions, but of national importance, by which the final success of the scheme of the Canadian public works will be materially influenced.

That report, which is very elaborate, sets forth a fact which is to-day generally admitted, viz.: that the waterways supply the best and cheapest means of communication and that, among the waterways of North America, the St. Lawrence route stands pre-eminent. That report also evidences the fact that the port of Montreal, at the head of ocean navigation and at the foot of the great rapids, is of all the most advantageously situated along that great sea route, and can compete successfully against all United States ports, provided it be suitably equipped. The only waterway capable of competing with the St. Lawrence route is that between New York and Buffalo. But even this route cannot compete to advantage if the port of Montreal be provided with improvements and the accommodation necessary to handle the traffic which naturally would come to it. I might show, by means of more incontrovertible testimony, that the improvement of the port of Montreal is inseparable from the development of our national trade, and for that reason is a great Canadian seaport. It has never been contended that it is the only port, as was stated some time ago in some correspondence which I read. But we do say, in accord with engineers, financiers and business men, that, owing to its geographical situation, that port is the only one which will insure the success of the St. Lawrence route.

There is only one standpoint from which we ought to approach the consideration of this question and that is the national standpoint. Whether we hear from Quebec, from Halifax, from St. John, or from Toronto, we should put aside all sectional considerations and endeavour to serve only the great interests of the country at large; and I say that the longer we delay the improvements in the harbour of Montreal which are at the present time so urgently needed, the severer is the blow which we deal at the prosperity of the Dominion. Now, Sir, I have every confidence that the Dominion government will take the necessary steps to improve the present condition of affairs. In 1896, when the Liberal government came to power, they undertook to make very extensive improvements in the St. Lawrence route. They considered then, as they consider now, that this is the only way to attract to our channels not only the traffic originating within our own country, but also a great portion of the traffic originating in the western states. For the last few years we have been attracting that traffic; but at the present time, as I said before, owing to the lack of proper accommodation in our harbour some of that traffic has been diverted to American routes. Sir, we must approach this question with due consideration and care, and I have every confidence that the Dominion government will act fairly and generously by our national route, and more particularly by the port of Montreal. I have every confidence that the new Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the Hon. Mr. Brodeur, whose patriotism, energy and talents enable him to cope successfully with the task, will act generously and fairly with the St. Lawrence route, and will continue the improvements which have been carried out so ably by his predecessors, and will also act generously by the port of Montreal. The state of affairs in that port at the present time is not satisfactory, not alone to the citizens of the metropolis, but also to the country at large. Therefore I have every confidence that the improvements which are urgently needed at the present time, which are called for by public opinion in Montreal and the whole country, will be effected without any further delay, and I believe, Sir, I am sure, that should those improvements be effected, the Hon. Mr. Brodeur, who is especially entrusted with the management of the port, who has jurisdiction over the port of Montreal, will acquire new titles not only for himself, but also for the government of which he is an honoured member, new titles to the gratitude and confidence of the citizens of this country.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 22) respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 19) respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Guthrie.

Bill (No. 24) respecting the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Railway Company.—Mr. McColl.

Bill (No 28) respecting the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company.—Mr. Sloan.

WEST ONTARIO PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 26) respecting the West Ontario Pacific Railway Company—Mr. Pardee.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). I would like to draw attention to the words 'that period' in the fourth line of section 4. There are two periods previously referred to, and I would like to know to which period these words apply.

Mr. SPROULE. That Bill provides that the Governor in Council may grant permission to build branches to the extent of thirty miles.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I draw attention to the uncertainty that results from the use of the words 'or period'. You cannot say whether it refers to two years or to five. I propose that we add the words 'a period of five years.'

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

VANCOUVER AND LULU ISLAND RAILWAY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 29) respecting the Vancouver and Lulu Island Railway Company

On section 1,

The Vancouver and Lulu Island Railway Company may, within five years after the passing of this Act, construct and complete the railways and branches which it has been authorized to construct: Provided that as to so much there of as is not constructed within that period the powers of the said company shall cease and determine.

Mr. DEMERS. The words 'and branches' in the third line were struck out in committee, which I think was a mistake. Section 2 provides that the delay for constructing a branch should commence only after permission is granted by the Governor in Council, and the Governor in Council may not grant that permission for many years.

Mr. SPROULE. Provision was made in the Bill that the two years time limit for commencing was to begin from the date of the passing of the order in council.

Mr. DEMERS. Yes, but as we passed the Bill we gave two years delay in which to commence a branch railway on each of those sections. In that case parliament knows when the delay begins and when it ends. But when you give permission to build branches within two years after the Governor in Council should give permission you do not know where you are, they may not give permission for fifty years. That is why I say we should pass the Bill as it was presented, giving permission to construct the main line and branches within two years. The words 'and branches' should be left in.

Mr. LENNOX. I think there is some misunderstanding about this matter. The Act which this Bill amends provided that there should be a main line and certain branches. As it was explained to us in committee, there was also a power given to the Governor in Council to authorize the construction of other branches not to exceed 30 miles in length in any case. The understanding in committee was, I think, that this section was satisfactory as regards the main line and as regards the defined branches, those branches that were defined in the main Act; but that as regards the branches that might be constructed under an order of the Governor in Council, as the order might not be made for several years to come, it would be unfair to limit the time for commencement within two years. So the committee have not reported the Bill in the manner in which it was understood in committee. I think it would be safer to all parties to refer the Bill back, and I move that it be referred back to the committee.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I might explain that this Bill provides, as the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) has stated, for a main line and some branches. The words 'and branches' here were struck out by the committee, and another clause inserted providing that these branches should be commenced within two years from the time of the passing of the order by the Governor in Council and completed within five years. I think this is as the committee ordered. The second clause will explain that.

Mr. LENNOX. I did not understand you had a second clause there.

Mr. DEMERS. The objection was made that we should not give such a power. This power should be kept by parliament. In a Bill passed a few moments ago we mentioned that the obligation to construct the main line and branches should commence within two years. Why should we give power to build those branches within perhaps fifty years? Why should we leave that power in the hands of a company? I think it is not a wise policy. The other day the Minister of Railways objected to such a policy, he said it was not proper for parliament to grant such a power, and for my part I think we should pass the Bill as it was presented. I move therefore that section 1 be reinserted as the Bill was presented.

Mr. BARKER. It seems to me that when we have adopted the second section, clause 1, without the words 'and branches' is all right.

Mr. DEMERS. I object to striking out the words 'and branches.' If we do not carry section 2 we should reinstate the words 'and branches.'

Mr. BARKER. Had we not better consider that when we take up section 2 and then go back to section 1?

Mr. SPROULE. The reason for leaving this unusual provision in the Bill was the fact that this work had been financed under the original Bill which contained this provision. It was contended by the secretary of the Canadian Pacific Railway, who was there and spoke for the Bill, that they had already financed it with that provision in, and that it would be an injustice to those who had put their money into it to take that provision out now. In view of that, I think it was finally passed by the committee, although it was regarded as a very exceptional

thing and the principle as a very unsound one.

Mr. DEMERS. We have their own petition and Bill, we know what they want and they do not ask for clause 2, but they ask for clause 1. I do not see why we should complain.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. A new section has been added to the Bill as section 2. It is as follows :

2. Section 3 of chapter 86 of the statutes of 1901 is amended by adding the following subsection thereto :

2. Such branch lines shall be commenced within two years and completed within five years after the construction thereof has been authorized by the Governor in Council, and if such branch lines are not so commenced or are not finished and put in operation within the said periods respectively, the powers of construction conferred upon the company shall cease and be null and void as respects so much of the said branch lines as then remain uncompleted.

Mr. LENNOX. I have sent for the Act. We cannot get along very well without seeing what we are asked for. But, as I understood it to be explained the day before yesterday the position is this : The former Act provided for the main line, provided for branches that were defined in the ordinary way and in addition provided for branches that might be constructed under the order of the Governor in Council at any time hereafter, these undefined branches not exceeding 30 miles in length. This clause, when it was framed was intended to apply to the main line and the defined branches—those branches which have been laid down and prescribed in the original Act, and if so, the words 'and branches' should remain in the section as it is. I did not understand that the words 'and branches' were to be struck out. Then, I point out that we were not to read that section as applying to the branches which were to be authorized by the Governor in Council ; that is that there might be no such authorization for 10 or 15 years and we could not say that they should be commenced in two years after the passing of this Act. So that, we would require both clauses. It was certainly so understood by the committee at the time. In regard to what the hon. gentleman says about it not being right to have this provision authorizing the issue of the order of the Governor in Council, it seems to be perfectly fair in this case where the enterprise was entered upon, where money was expended and the project financed upon the strength of this legislation. Otherwise, I would be very much opposed to the system of legislating by order of the Governor in Council, but in this case the committee were unanimous in the view that it was fair having regard to the circumstances as they exist.

Mr. DEMERS. I think that this is a very important matter. This is a question that concerns an island, a small territory, and you are granting an unlimited permission to build branches.

Mr. LENNOX. The parties who are promoting this legislation are not here, and I think the only satisfactory way for us to deal with this Bill is to refer it back. I move that it be referred back for consideration.

Mr. CAMPBELL. This matter was very fully considered by the Railway Committee and the committee were almost unanimous in opposition to the power that was granted some five years ago to build branches not exceeding 30 miles by getting the consent of the Governor in Council. The Minister of Railways and Canals thought that that was not the right thing to do and he opposed that principle in any further Bill. But this power, in so far as this Bill is concerned, was granted five years ago, and it is very difficult to take it away now. If we leave the Bill as it is now, without that second amendment, they will have unlimited power to build branches, in the second clause as it has been read by the chairman we limit them and we oblige them after having obtained the power from the Governor in Council to build these branches to commence operations within two years. If they do not do this their powers cease under this Bill. The committee were practically unanimous as to the terms of the second clause which was read and which was formally drafted afterwards by the Clerk of the House. I may say that this is according to the decision of the committee and it seems to me that under these conditions the Bill cannot be very objectionable as it is. If you let it to go without that second amendment then they would have an indefinite power to build branches.

Mr. DEMERS. I beg my hon. confrère's pardon. It is quite the reverse. If we leave clause 1 as it was left in the committee then the time for building the main line is perfectly certain—it is limited to two years and five years—but if we adopt this amendment the result is quite the reverse. We agree on the principle, but we disagree only on the effect of that clause, and I think that everybody who will read the clause will come to the conclusion that for the purpose of limiting the time the clause should be adopted as it was proposed by the company.

Mr. SPROULE. The reason, as I understand it, why the words 'and branches' were struck out was that the original Act provided for completing the railways. The contention of the Canadian Pacific Railway was that the enterprise was financed under this privilege in the Bill, and that it would be an injustice to restrict it in any sense now. Then, for the purpose of compelling them to commence the branches which were authorized by the Governor in Council to be

built within two years, and to finish them within five years after the passing of the Bill, this additional clause was put in.

Mr. DEMERS. I move that the words 'and branches' be inserted again in clause 1.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. You cannot do that under rule 72. All you can do is to move that the committee rise and report progress and let the House deal with it.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think there is a very grave doubt as to whether it was the intention of the committee or not to strike out the words 'and branches.' We cannot determine that until we ascertain what is defined in the Act. We have sent for the Act of 1901 and we find that it confirms an Act of the British Columbia legislature passed in 1891 and until we get the statutes of British Columbia passed in 1891 we are unable to ascertain just what branch lines are authorized. If there were branch lines authorized in the original Act then I think the intention of the committee was to extend the power then conferred in reference to these branch lines as well as to the main lines. The new clause was intended to apply wholly to lines authorized by this parliament in 1901 when it gave power to construct lines not exceeding 30 miles in length. We had better not hastily adopt that clause without ascertaining whether there are branch lines authorized by the original of charter.

Mr. SPROULE. I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

KOOTENAY AND ARROWHEAD RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 30) respecting the Kootenay and Arrowhead Railway Company—Mr. Galliher.

Mr. DEMERS. I have the same objection to this Bill as I have to Bill (No. 29). I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. HENDERSON This Bill is quite different from Bill (No. 29). In this Bill there are no branches in the original charter beyond the branches that may be constructed under authority of the Governor in Council. In this respect this Bill differs quite materially from the other Bill. I understand there is a clause added which provides for the extension of time with reference to the branches to be authorized by the Governor in Council. I am strongly of the impression that this Bill is exactly in the form that the Railway Committee wished it to be.

Mr. DEMERS. I object altogether to giving this power by order in council.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I may inform the committee that the following clause has been added.

Such branch lines shall be commenced within two years and completed within five years after the construction thereof has been authorized by the Governor in Council. If such branch lines are not so commenced or are not finished and put in operation within the said periods respectively, the power of construction conferred upon the company shall cease and be null and void as respects so much of the said branch lines as then remain uncompleted.

Mr. LENNOX. That is what the committee agreed to. We fought out the question of policy in the committee and unless it is intended now to reverse the decision of the committee the Bill should pass.

Mr. HENDERSON. There are no branch lines specifically defined in this Act with regard to which they ask extension of time. The extension of time asked for with regard to branches would relate to the branches to be constructed on the authority of an order in council. This Bill is complete as the Railway Committee intended it to be. The question of policy with regard to the authorization by order in council of a branch 30 miles in length was fully discussed in the Railway Committee and it was considered unfair to change the Act because the Railway Company had negotiated the bonds on the strength of this charter, and to interfere with that would be to interfere with securities which are pledged in the old country.

Mr. DEMERS. The amendment was accepted in the committee because it was more favourable to the company, but my hon. friend knows that with reference to one of these Bills there was read a letter of protest from the people of that country against too long a delay.

Mr. McINTYRE I wish to draw the attention of the Minister of Railways to a point in relation to all railway Bills, though not especially to this one.

Rule 53 calls for the production of a map before the committee, and this map is produced and it shows the proposed line. As soon as the committee rises that map disappears and I am told it is sent to the Senate committee. After that I understand that it no longer belongs to the House or to the Railway Department. I believe that map should be kept in possession of the department, because eventually the company will file its plan for the railway and the Minister has not the benefit of that plan to show him the route of the railway which had been adopted by the committee of parliament. It would be well for the Minister of Railways to see that the map that is filed with the committee should remain the property either of the committee or of the Railway Department, so that when the plan is filed later the minister may be

able to know the route of the railway which the committee has endorsed.

Mr. EMMERSON. When the Bill to amend the Railway Act is before the House there will probably be a clause requiring those who make applications under section 122 of the Railway Act to submit their application either the original map used when obtaining the charter or a certified copy thereof which may be used as evidence on the hearing as to the route.

Motion that the committee rise negatived.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

On the order:

Second reading of Bill (No. 58), an Act respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. L. G. McCarthy (Simcoe).

Mr. LEIGHTON G. McCARTHY (North Simcoe). Mr. Speaker I desire to say that in my absence the other day the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) introduced a Bill which was on my desk as if it were to be introduced, but which was not the proper Bill. I beg leave, therefore, in place of this Bill to introduce the Bill as it should be. While it is an important Bill, it is a very simple one. It merely asks power, in accordance with section 111 of the Railway Act of 1903, to issue $25,000,000 of debenture stock as required by that section.

Mr. SPROULE. This Bill cannot be introduced unless it has gone before the Committee on Standing Orders and has been reported upon by that committee.

Mr. LEIGHTON G. McCARTHY. The Bill does not go before the Standing Orders Committee. It is only the petition that goes before that committee. The petition prayed for a Bill to enable the railway company to issue debenture stock to that amount, and the petition was duly approved and reported upon.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think it would be a dangerous precedent to substitute one Bill for another. I can understand that the Bill does not require a petition, as a petition has been reported upon by the Committee on Standing Orders, but by some mistake a Bill was presented which should not have been presented. I think the best course for my hon. friend is to withdraw this Bill and introduce another and have its second reading on Monday.

Bill withdrawn.

Mr. McINTYRE.

STEAMBOAT INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. LEIGHTON G. McCARTHY moved second reading of Bill (No. 16) to amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, 1898.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR. I have no objection to the Bill being read the second time, on condition that it be referred to the same committee as the Bill respecting certificates to masters and mates of ships. The same principle is involved in this Bill as in the other.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and referred to the said special committee.

SAFETY OF SHIPS.

Bill (No. 48) to amend the Act respecting the Safety of Ships.—Mr. Sinclair—read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Mr. STOCKTON. Will the promoter of the Bill explain its object ?

Mr. SINCLAIR. The purpose of the Bill is to correct a curious anomaly that exists in the law. The law as it stands now was intended to apply to ships of the old style which had not a shelter deck. There is a new type of ship known as the shelter-deck ship, and the construction put upon the law by the board of trade is that wood or lumber is not permitted to be carried between the main deck and shelter deck, excepting to the height of three feet, whereas there are some eight or nine feet of space between the main deck and the shelter deck. This space is inclosed and is as strongly protected as any other part of the ship. Under the existing law you can carry pig iron, coal or any other heavy material there, but you are not allowed to carry wood or lumber. If this Bill becomes law, deals and wood goods may be carried in this space. That is the curious anomaly that exists in the law. I am endeavouring to remove that by striking out the section, and if this amendment is made it will enable a ship owner not only to carry coal or heavy goods of any description in this space, but also to carry deals and boards. It is curious that such a thing should exist in the law but it does. An amendment, I understand, is passing through the Imperial House at the present time for the purpose of correcting the same mistake, and I propose that this Bill shall not come into force until the Imperial Act comes into force. I intend, therefore, if this clause passes to move that a clause be added to the Bill by which it will not come into force until proclaimed by the Governor in Council.

Mr. DANIEL. This, I presume, is intended to allow vessels to carry a deckload of deals after a certain date ?

Mr. SINCLAIR. It is intended to allow vessels to carry deck loads between the main and the shelter deck which is not allowed at present, that is a deckload of lumber. The present law allows them to carry a deckload of any other material except lumber. I am endeavouring to correct that.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is no objection to the Bill as far as the department is concerned. Of course we would like that the clause which is about to be moved by my hon. friend (Mr. Sinclair) should carry, so that the amendment would come into force on proclamation of the Governor in Council ; that is when the Imperial parliament has passed legislation which it is expected they will pass this session. If that Imperial amendment is passed this session the Governor in Council will probably issue the proclamation, but so long as the legislation is not passed by the Imperial parliament it is not intended to have this legislation proclaimed.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I beg to move that the following section be added :

This Act shall come into force on a day to be named by proclamation of the Governor in Council.

Motion agreed to.

Bill as amended reported.

On motion of Mr. Paterson, House adjourned at 9.05 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, April 5, 1906.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 84) respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.—Mr. L. G. McCarthy.

Bill (No. 85) for the enfranchisement of Jamieson Webster Lewis, of the Moravian band of Indians, of the Thames, province of Ontario.—Mr. Oliver.

QUESTIONS.

RETIREMENT OF CAPT. H. W. LUMB.

Mr. SAM HUGHES asked:

1. Why has Captain H. W. Lumb, of the 59th Glengarry regiment, been gazetted out of that corps?

2. Were there any charges or accusations made against him ?

3. Was Captain Lumb given an opportunity to explain or meet any charges, if any, against him ?

4. Upon whose recommendation was he retired ?

5. What are the incidents in detail leading up to Captain Lumb's retirement ?

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

1. For scandalous conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman.

2. Yes.

3. Yes.

4. Upon the recommendation of the officer commanding Eastern Ontario.

5. On or about January 10, 1906, Capt. Lumb was convicted before a civil court of having on December 27, 1905, wilfully obstructed a conductor on the Grand Trunk Railway in the prosecution of his duty; of having refused to pay his railway fare and of using most abusive language. He was sentenced to a fine of $40 and costs, or in default to two months in jail with hard labour, and bound over in the sum of $100 to keep the peace for one year.

WHARF AT GRANDE VALLEE DES MONTS.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. R. L. Borden—asked:

1. On what date was the wharf built at Grande Vallée des Monts received by the government ?

2. What revenue has the government derived from said wharf up to 1st April instant ?

3. Is the government aware of the state in which the said wharf is to-day ?

4. Is it the intention of the government to make the necessary repairs to the said wharf ?

5. Will the said repairs be made this year ?

Hon. CHARLES S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works):

1. Work completed since December, 1904.

2. None.

3. Yes.

4 and 5. Matter under consideration.

COST OF LIGHTING ON THE ST. LAWRENCE.

Mr. TAYLOR asked:

1. How many lighthouses are there between Lachine and Bay of Quinté ?

2. How many buoys are there fitted out with lights between Lachine and Bay of Quinté ?

3. How much was paid for carbide used for lighting system between Montreal and Bay of Quinté during the season of 1905 ?

4. What was the total cost for maintaining lighting system between Montreal and Bay of Quinté for the season of 1905, including cost of maintaining and operating the steamers 'Scout,' 'Reserve' and 'Maisonneuve,' used on this lighting system ?

5. What was the total cost for maintaining the lighting system between Montreal and Bay of Quinté, season of 1896 ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I shall have to get the information from Prescott. We have written to Prescott about it and have not yet received an answer.

BREAKWATER AT POINTE A LA FRIGATE.

Mr. MONK asked:

1. Has the government received any reports regarding the construction of a breakwater at Pointe à la Frigate, in the county of Gaspé ?
2. Is it the intention of the government to construct a breakwater at said point ?

Hon. CHARLES S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works). There is no report in the department in relation to this work.

WORKS AT ANSE AUX GRIFFONS.

Mr. MONK asked:

1. What amount has been spent by the government to date on works at the entrance to the river at Anse aux Griffons, province of Quebec ?
2. What are the names of the contractors for said works ?
3. What sums have said contractors received to date ?

Hon. CHARLES S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works):

1. $7,116.24.

2 and 3. No contract. Work done by day labour under direct supervision of departmental officers.

FOX RIVER BREAKWATER.

Mr. MONK asked :

1. What was the total amount expended on the breakwater at Fox River, P.Q. ?
2. For what purpose is the said breakwater used at present ?

Hon. CHARLES S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works) :

1. $42,554.24.
2. Work not yet completed but is intended for protection and wharf purposes combined.

MILITARY BANDS IN STREET PARADES.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES asked :

1. What are government regulations regarding the engagement of military bands in uniform in street parades other than those under military authority and command ?
2. Is a military band permitted to play in any procession which has not the Union Jack at its head ?
3. Are military bands forbiddden to take part in Orange and other loyal processions where the Union Jack is invariably carried ?

Hon. Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). Bandsmen, when dressed in militia uniform, are forbidden to take part in demonstrations or processions for party or political purposes.

Mr. TAYLOR.

VICTORIA MEMORIAL MUSEUM—CHANGE OF PLANS.

Mr. PERLEY asked :

1. Was the plan for the Victoria Memorial Museum, on which tenders were called and the contract awarded, the original plan drawn by the Department of Public Works ?
2. If not, upon whose suggestion was the present plan substituted ?
3. Have any protests been received by the department against the present and in favour of the original plan, on the ground that the latter would furnish more light to the different rooms ?
4. Is it the intention of the government to revert to the original plan ?

Hon. CHARLES S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works) :

1. No.
2. Upon the suggestion of the Department of the Interior.
3. No.
4. No.

VICTORIA MEMORIAL MUSEUM—CONTRACT.

Mr. PERLEY asked :

1. To whom was the contract awarded for the Victoria Memorial Museum at Ottawa ?
2. Has any work been done beyond putting in the foundations or a portion thereof ?
3. What was the stipulation in the contract as to the locality from which the cut stone was to be obtained ?
4. How many quarries in the locality named could furnish the stone stipulated for, and under whose control are they ?
5. Has the contractor objected to providing the stone from the locality named, on account of the excessive price asked by the owners of the quarries ?
6. Has the government taken any steps to ascertain whether equally serviceable stone can be obtained nearer Ottawa ?

Hon. CHARLES S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works) :

1. Mr. George Goodwin.
2. Yes, material is being prepared.
3. To be obtained from the quarries at Wallace, N.S., or others of same quality.
4. The quarries of Read, Battey and River Phillip.
5. Some verbal communications were made by contractor to Chief Architect, but satisfactory arrangements have now been completed by the contractor.
6. A large proportion of the stone used (i.e. Nepean stone for random coursed work) is obtained in the vicinity of Ottawa, but no suitable sand stone for face work could be obtained.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY ——PURCHASE OF SUPPLIES.

Mr. R. C. MACDONELL asked:

1. In what manner has the government purchased the food supplies for the use of the

survey and exploration parties in the employ of the government on the Ontario section of the National Transcontinental Railway ?

2. If such supplies were purchased by tender, what are the names and addresses of such successful tenderers, the amounts of such tenders, and the goods supplied ?

3. Has the government received any complaints regarding such supplies, or any of them ?

4. Were such supplies examined or tested ? If so, by what government officials ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1 and 2. The government has not purchased any food supplies for the use of the survey and exploration parties in the Ontario section or any section of the National Transcontinental Railway—but the Transcontinental Railway Commission has and they advise that quotations are obtained, and food supplies purchased by the purchasing agent of the Commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway at the most favourable wholesale prices.

3. No.

4. Yes, by the purchasing agent of the Commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway before shipment, and by the Commissioners' agents at point of destination after shipment.

COUNTY COURTS AND JUDGES.

Mr. LENNOX asked :

1. Into how many, and what, county court districts, including counties and unions of counties, is Ontario divided ?

2. In how many, and which, of these districts, are there three county court judges, in how many only two, and in how many only one ?

3. In such of these districts, counties or union of counties as there are two or more judges, what are the names of such of these judges as were appointed on or subsequent to the 13th day of April, 1897, the population of such district, county or union at the date of each appointment, respectively, according to the then last census, and the residence of the judge at the date of his appointment in each case ?

4. In and by any, and if so which, of the commissions to the said several judges is it recited that the population of the district, county or union of counties, over the court of which the judge is appointed to preside, exceeds 80,000 ?

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice) :

1. Into 37 county courts and 7 district courts, viz.:

COUNTY COURTS.

Brant, Bruce, Carleton, Dufferin, Elgin, Essex, Frontenac, Grey, Haldimand, Halton, Hastings, Huron, Kent, Lambton, Lanark, Leeds and Grenville, Lennox and Addington, Lincoln, Middlesex, Norfolk, Northumberland and Durham, Ontario, Oxford, Peel, Perth, Peterborough, Prescott and Russell, Prince Edward, Renfrew, Simcoe, Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry, Victoria, Waterloo, Welland, Wellington, Wentworth, York.—37.

DISTRICT COURTS.

Algoma, Manitoulin, Muskoka, Nipissing, Parry Sound, Rainy River, Thunder Bay.—7.

2. There are three judges in York. There are two judges in Bruce, Carleton, Elgin, Essex, Grey, Hastings, Huron, Kent, Lambton, Leeds and Grenville, Middlesex, Northumberland and Durham, Ontario, Prescott and Russell, Renfrew, Simcoe, Stormont, Dundas and Glengarry, Wellington, Wentworth, Victoria, Algoma, Nipissing.—22.

There is only one judge in Brant, Dufferin, Frontenac, Haldimand, Halton, Lanark, Lennox and Addington, Lincoln, Norfolk, Oxford, Peel, Perth, Peterborough, Prince Edward, Waterloo, Welland, Manitoulin, Muskoka, Parry Sound, Rainy River, and Thunder Bay.—21.

3.

County.	Judge.	Population, Census 1901.
Carleton	MacTavish, O'Meara	77,017
Elgin	Colter	50,443
Grey	Hatton, Widdifield	74,609
Hastings	Deroche	59,291
Huron	Doyle, Holt	53,489
Kent	Dowlin	31,866
Lambton	MacWatt, Taylor	45,431
Leeds & Grenville	Reynolds	63,564
Middlesex	Macbeth	103,125
Ontario	McCrimmon, McIntyre	54,177
Prescott & Russell	Constantineau, Johnston	62,201
Renfrew	Donahue	62,201
Stormont, Dundas & Glengarry	O'Reilly, Riddell	68,930
Victoria	Harding, McMillan	36,21
Wentworth	Snider, Monk	95,783
York	Winchester, Morgan, Morson	284,280
Nipissing	Leask	36,551

The residences of the judges at the time of their appointment are not on record.

4. The population is not mentioned in any of the commissions.

WEST BLOCK—COLLAPSE OF NEW TOWER.

On the Orders of the Day being called :

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the government

whether or not they have any information as to the somewhat extraordinary accident that happened within a few feet of us this forenoon. I would like to know to what the accident is supposed to be due and who is charged with the supervision of the work. It seems very remarkable that such an accident should have happened under such conditions; that is what the immediate supervision of the Department of Public Works, at the very centre of affairs, and with the entire force of the department ready at hand to see that the work was properly done. I do not know anything of the details of the accident, except that I understand it was only by a miracle that three or four men did not lose their lives. The accident therefore might have been attended with very much more serious consequences than those which fortunately have been present. I fully realize, of course, that it is not possible at this early hour to give the result of any detailed investigation or examination, but I would suggest that some information might be vouchsafed to the House on the question.

Hon. CHAS. S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works). Mr. Speaker, I desire, in the first place, to say that I am very glad indeed that this unfortunate accident should not have been accompanied by any loss of life. Immediately after the accident happened, I instructed the chief architect to make as early a report as possible. He has looked over the work. Of course, it is impossible for him to come to any conclusion in regard to the reason for the unfortunate accident so soon after the occurrence. This is a contract work. The contractor is Mr. Geo. Goodwin. The plans and specifications are exactly in accordance with those used in the construction of the other towers in the buildings and in general work all over. The materials specified are exactly the same as those specified for the other portions of the buildings. Mr. Taylor, one of the most experienced architects in the department, had full and complete charge of the work. It was under his immediate personal supervision. I have not had an opportunity yet of making that full investigation which I purpose making into the whole question of the accident and the reasons which led up to it. I intend to make the most searching investigation possible not only by officers of the department but possibly by those outside of the department, so that the government and the House may be in a position to have a full report in regard to the matter.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I ask the hon. gentleman whether or not, in addition to the architect, there was a permanent inspector appointed, whose duty it was to examine the work from hour to hour as it went on?

Mr. HYMAN. Mr. Taylor, who is, as the hon. gentleman knows, employed in the department, had full charge. In addition to that an inspector, who is also employed in the department, had part of the inspection work to do. I have not had a full report in regard to that matter yet, but it is one of the matters which I intend to fully investigate.

Mr. HAGGART. Who was the inspector of masonry?

Mr. HYMAN. Mr. Taylor, one of the chief architects in the department, was actually in charge of the building operations.

Mr. HAGGART. Who was the actual superintendent or inspector or clerk of the works?

Mr. HYMAN. I have not that information yet.

Mr. HAGGART. Was there any?

Mr. HYMAN. I have not inquired as to who was the inspector. However, the moment I get an opportunity, I will bring down full details of the matter. This is practically the first accident of any kind which has occurred in the Department of Public Works, in connection with any building which the department has erected. There has been a large number of works erected and this is the first serious accident that has happened. This is a contract work and there will be no loss by the government. The contractor will be called up to complete the work according to the plans and specifications. I think it will be shown that there is no fault in the plans and specifications under which the building was erected. I have no further information to give the House at the present time, but I will see that the fullest investigation is made.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important that this inspection should be made by some one outside of a government engineer before any of the materials are removed. Without desiring to throw any reflection upon any of the officers of the department, I think it would be only natural on the part of any officer of the government who would go on the work, to try and protect other officers of the department, who might be responsible. I think the minister should immediately have an outside inspection made.

Mr. HYMAN. I quite agree, and I will see that an outside inspection is made.

Mr. FOSTER. Let not the corpse be removed until the coroner has done his work.

Mr. HYMAN. Well, we will have the coroner on as rapidly as possible.

AGRICULTURAL COMMITTEE—ORDER TO A WITNESS.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Before the Orders of the Day are called I deem it my duty to bring to the attention of the House a matter of great urgency and importance, as to which its attention cannot be called too soon. A witness under examination before the Committee on Agriculture and Immigration, yesterday—Mr. Scott, superintendent of immigration—received an order from the committee to communicate by cable with Lord Strathcona, High Commissioner in London, as to the standing and other circumstances connected with the North Atlantic Trading Company. That order was to have been executed at once, and the answer of the High Commissioner was to be placed in the hands of the chairman of the committee in the afternoon. I am creditably informed that the Minister of the Interior forbade the witness to carry out the order of the committee, to cable Lord Strathcona the High Commissioner. This interference of a minister of the Crown with a witness acting under the orders of one of the standing committees of this House is a very grave infraction of the privileges of parliament. The day is past when ministers can defy the wish of the House of Commons or any of its committees, and having been informed on reliable authority of this interference it is my duty to call the attention of the Minister of the Interior and of the government to this matter. I hope the minister will give the House an assurance that the order of the committee given to its witness who is an official under the control of the minister, will be executed at once. We have not gone back 150 years; we are living in a century when parliamentary authority even over ministers must predominate. We cannot revindicate too soon our privileges in that regard.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I think my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) must be under some misapprehension. I can assure him and the House that certainly I never interfered or never wished to interfere with any order issued by a committee of the House. I can give the hon. gentleman the most positive assurance on that point. As I understand the workings of parliamentary government here, I have no authority to interfere, and my instructions to an officer of mine would have to take second place to the order of a committee of the House. I cannot imagine that such an absurd position could be taken as that an order issued by a committee of this House could be countermanded by myself even if I had the wish to do it, which I most certainly say I have not.

Mr. MONK. Mr. Speaker, my informant is the witness himself. It was understood when we left the committee that I would communicate with Mr. Scott in the afternoon to find out what answer he had received from the High Commissioner. I communicated with Mr. Scott after 3 o'clock and that gentleman informed me that he had not even sent the cable ordered by the committee; that the minister had told him not to do so; that if the committee wished to communicate with Lord Strathcona it had money at its disposal and it could do so itself.

Mr. OLIVER. That rather puts a different face on the affair. If I understand it right now from the hon. gentleman who has spoken, the committee issued an order to me to communicate with Lord Strathcona.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. OLIVER. Because, if the committee wish to order me to communicate with Lord Strathcona, not being a witness before the committee I was not I think required to accept that order.

Mr. MONK. Did the hon. gentleman say that to this witness?

Mr. OLIVER. Well, I did not see the witness nor did I have any communication with him since the witness appeared before the committee. However, I hope the position is clear. That a committee of this House has full authority to send for persons and papers and to require any communication that it wishes to send, to be sent. There can be no question about that. I cannot understand how the idea can have been arrived at, that even if I had wished to interfere with the orders of the committee I have any authority to do so.

Mr. SPROULE. That seems to be the preposterous part of it.

Mr. OLIVER. It is preposterous. I submit to the House that I am not responsible for a preposterous supposition that may be entertained by hon. gentlemen on the other side.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me the matter is not quite so clear as the minister would have us suppose. We have the definite assurance of the minister that he has not communicated in any way with the witness; we have the definite and distinct assurance of the witness, (according to my hon. friend from (Jacques Cartier) that the minster did communicate with him and order him not to send the cablegram. It is a matter which the minister should take in hand at once, and inform the House how it is that this extraordinary misunderstanding has occurred. One thing at least seems to be clear: That the witness was directed by the committee to send a certain cablegram for information that is not available here; that that cablegram has not been sent; that therefore no answer has been received;

that therefore the information is not forthcoming and that the action of the witness must be due to some cause. It is not due to the minister as the minister assures us. It is the duty of the minister to ascertain at once why an officer of his department should have made so extraordinary a misstatement and why it is that the direction of the committee has not been complied with.

Mr. MONK. I may say that the witness stated in the committee that he was ready to send the cable—it was he who suggested it as a means of getting the information—and that he would send it at once provided he did not have the disapproval of his minister.

Mr. OLIVER. Oh, then the matter is not quite so clear. I understand now, Mr. Speaker, that the witness did not undertake to send a cable and was not ordered by the committee to send it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes he was.

Mr. OLIVER. There seems to be a very radical misunderstanding as to what the witness was instructed to do. Now I say that if the committee did instruct Mr. Scott to send that message and Mr. Scott did not send the message, then Mr. Scott is subject to discipline on the part of the committee. That is as I understand the matter. But, that if the committee saw fit to hold a discussion with Mr. Scott in regard to a certain cablegram which was to be sent or was not to be sent on the responsibility of myself as minister, then, I do not see that the witness is to be subject to the discipline of the committee or that any fault has been committed either by him or by myself. If the committee has any orders to give let the committee give its orders and let it be responsible for the carrying out of these orders, but I submit that a discussion or an understanding in which I am involved and in regard to which I did not appear before the committee, is not to the point at all.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. According to the minister's own statement, the witness is apparently, at least trifling with the committee. Let us assume that he was to obtain the minister's approval; the minister has given his assurance to this House that he has held no communication whatever with that witness nor the witness with him. Therefore, this witness is trifling with the committee or the minister is trifling with the House; one or the other.

Mr. OLIVER. If I may explain the matter to the House it is this: That my hon. friends being anxious to find fault have jumped in and found it where it did not exist, and as a matter of fact on this occasion as on many others all they have found is a mare's nest.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the minister held no communication with the witness?

Mr. OLIVER. I have never seen nor spoken to the witness from that time to this.

Mr. SPEAKER. I desire to call the attention of the House to the fact that this discussion is all irregular. There is no report of the committee before the House nor any motion before the House.

Mr. BARR. Then, Mr. Speaker, we will move the adjournment.

Mr. E. N. LEWIS (West Huron). Mr. Speaker—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is no occasion at all for moving the adjournment of the House. There is no report of the committee before the House. It may be that there is something extraordinary that may have to be explained, and the committee may perhaps see fit to bring in a report to the House for its consideration and action. But the question brought up by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier is whether the Minister of the Interior gave orders to his subordinate not to issue that telegram. The Minister of the Interior says emphatically that he has given no such order and that he has had no communication with the witness.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. So far as moving the adjournment of the House is concerned, that is not necessary at the moment, though it may be necessary on some future occasion in connection with some matters that the minister has not made quite clear. I understand that the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Lewis) desires to bring a matter to the attention of the House to-day, and that it is in that connection that he proposes to move the adjournment. I understand he has given notice to the Prime Minister.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If that is the subject on which the hon. member for West Huron wishes to speak, I would suggest that it will be far better for him to speak on the motion for the House to go into Committee of Supply. It is not a matter of urgency, and my hon. friend will have an opportunity to make his speech either to-day or to-morrow.

CANADA'S MERCHANT MARINE.

Mr. LEWIS. I wish to inform the Prime Minister that I have consulted with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, but not with the Prime Minister, with reference to the matter which I wish to bring before the House. It is a matter which I consider of sufficient importance to justify me in bringing it to the immediate attention of the House. If it is the wish of the Prime Minister that I should not go on—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, some of my hon. friends around me seem to think that I am very anxious to go on with this matter. It is a matter which has been standing for some time, to which I have given considerable thought, and a matter of great importance and interest to the members of this House and to the people of Canada. During the last few days certain articles in the press have come to my knowledge which make it still more important that this matter should be brought to the immediate attention of the House. I ask the attention of you, Sir, and the hon. members of this House on two grounds. The first ground is that I have not trespassed on the time of this House before to any considerable length. The second ground is that the matter which I require to bring to the notice of the members of this House is one of the utmost importance to the people of Canada. It is in reference to the merchant marine of Canada. On March 28, 1906, the North Sydney 'Herald' had the following :

It is both commendable and practical on the part of the Halifax Board of Trade in calling attention to the surprising declension in the tonnage of vessels registered in Canada in the past thirty years of almost fifty per cent, while our water-borne commerce has increased during that time considerably over fifty per cent : which only goes to show that Canada is losing control of one of her greatest assets, consistent with her growth of commerce should be a proportionate increase of registered tonnage, instead of the regrettable decrease. Doubtless the passing of the old-time barques and sailing ships and their supplanting by the swifter and surer foreign steam freighter will account largely for this.

The organization within the past two years of several steamship companies in Cape Breton and the purchase of foreign steamers is a step in the right direction, giving employment to our own Canadian seamen, and proving that it is one of the best paying investments. The profits made by foreign steamship companies on this coast and the opportunity for employment lost to thousands of Canadian seamen is so apparent, it is surprising that this opportunity for investment has so long been overlooked.

It is generally conceded, Mr. Speaker, that maritime nations have an advantage over inland countries, and it is also conceded that no maritime nation which does not handle its own produce in its own ships can make true progress as a nation. Now, it is contended that the merchant marine of Canada, instead of increasing as it should increase, in view of our opportunities, is decreasing. There are reasons for this. I have facts which show conclusively that Canada is in a better position than almost any other nation of the globe to increase its merchant marine. I have a good case, Mr. Speaker, to lay before this House: and if you do not see it as you should, it will be solely my fault. There is no other question which affects the farmers of Canada as does the shipping question; there is no other question which so affects the labour of Canada. Canadian shipping is not linked with the transportation systems which take the produce of our farmers to foreign markets and I contend that the missing link should be supplied by ourselves. The United States in 1810 had 100,000 tons more of foreign-going shipping than it has to-day. In 1838—and this is a statement which I am prepared to verify—the United States had more foreign-going steam shipping than Great Britain. This is a statement which may surprise a great many. In 1860 the United States was a close competitor with Great Britain; it carried sixty-two per cent of its own produce. To-day it carries only eight per cent. Ninety-two per cent of the exported produce of the United States is carried in foreign ships. What is the case with Canada ? Our ships carry comparatively nothing.

It takes 15,000,000 tons of shipping to carry our produce for a year. And we do not carry any of it. I have the facts and figures to lay before you to show why the state of affairs is what it is and how it can be remedied. Some say that we cannot build ships here because of the high price of labour. Now, here is a statement that I wish to emphasize—that in building a ship, from the digging of the coal, and ore, the making of the plates and other material, to the putting of the finished products together in the form of a ship, ninety per cent of the cost goes to labour. I wish also to say that we here in Canada, are in a better position than are any other people on earth to increase our shipping. We have an object lesson in the experience, in these matters of the two great English-speaking nations. Great Britain, with very little over one thousand miles of coast line and 40,000,000 people has 100 large shipyards. The United States with 10,000 miles of coast line, and 80,000,000 people, has only 20 large ship yards. And what is the reason ? Great Britain, the great free trade country of the world makes an exception to her free trade policy and protects her shipping, while the United States, a protective country does not extend to her ocean shipping the protection it gives to other industries. We also are a protective country, and protect every other industry, but to shipping we afford no protection whatever. In the United States shipping on the lakes is protected. And the United States has on the lakes 55,000,000 tons of the best shipping, for the object in view, that is to be found in the world. The sailors are paid better wages than any others, and the mechanics who build the ships also receive better pay than any others of their class in the world. And, Mr. Speaker, I am a believer in high wages ; I do not believe in the cry of cheap labour. And what is the result of this policy in the United States ? The re-

sult is that the United States shipping on the great lakes carries freight at lower rates than prevail anywhere else in the world. Iron ore is carried a thousand miles from the end of Lake Superior to the end of Lake Erie, at from 85 cents to $1.20 a ton. Ships trading to Sweden and sailing under the British flag carry iron ore for a thousand miles at $2.50, that being the best rate they can give. And what is the reason? The United States shipping on the great lakes is protected as completely as is the ocean-going shipping of Great Britain. These ships are not so much built as manufactured with a view to the special trade in which they are to engage; and by the machines which the ingenuity of our southern neighbours has enabled them to build, these ships are loaded and unloaded so quickly that they are kept constantly on the move during the season of navigation, and so they carry in nine months what it takes ocean-going ships of equal capacity twelve months to carry.

Mr. Speaker, I have many facts that I desire to bring before the attention of the House to establish my position in this matter. Speaking for the first time before this highest and greatest legislative body in the Dominion, I may not make my remarks so consecutive as they should be, but I shall be well content if I can convince this House that this matter is one of serious importance to the people of Canada. We have 2,384 miles of waterway from tide-water to the head of Lake Superior at the centre of the continent, and we own the best half of it. But we are not utilizing it. If the United States had such advantages they would certainly use them. Every dollar spent by us or by the United States in improving this great waterway means an increase in the price of the grain of the farmers of Canada. Before these improvements were started on the St. Lawrence and Welland canals it cost from 15 cents to 20 cents to carry a bushel of grain from the head of Lake Superior to Buffalo. And what does it cost to-day? Sometimes as low as 1½ cents. It used to cost $13 to carry a ton of ore from Lake Superior to Lake Erie; it costs 87 cents to-day. But Canada has not done her share in this great development and improvement. In 1878 we had 1,333,000 tons of shipping in Canada. And, according to the last report available, that of 1904, our shipping has fallen off to 667,000 tons—not half of what it was in 1878. And of this shipping that we have, part is made up of worn out ships which we import from Europe—Sweden and other places. I protest against that. We object to diseased and worn out immigrants coming to this country. Why, then, should old ships be brought in to take the place of ships that should be built by our men? We have the ore, we have the coal, we have the skill, we have the brains, to build ships. And if this industry is protected, I contend we can build ships with any nation on the globe.

Where would Japan be if it were not for her ships. In 1894 Japan had 213,000 tons of shipping. Two years ago she had increased that to 913,000 tons. And how about our shipping? In 1874 we built 191,000 tons of shipping; in 1896 when this government came into power we built only 16,000 tons. I am not making a political argument out of this, you will see. And what is it to-day? Comparatively nothing. There were 58 ships added to the registry of Canada last year, and our tonnage increased by about 4,000 or 5,000 tons. But this was in the shape of worn out ships from abroad, tugs, dredges and other craft on the lakes. Our theory in this matter is commendable in its way; the trouble is that we begin at the wrong end. Where are the sailors to man new ships? You can make a soldier in a few hours, if he knows how to shoot. You can build a ship in eight months. But you cannot make a sailor in less than five years. And I contend that every sailor belonging to this country is worth double a man of any other class. He does perilous work from which other men would shrink; he must be a skilled mechanic far above the ordinary workman. But these men do not exist in sufficient numbers in Canada. And why? Because this government, like past governments, has not protected our shipping. We are in the same position with regard to shipping generally as the United States is with regard to ocean-going shipping. Why has not the United States taken this matter up before? Simply for this reason that although all the presidents from Washington down, have advocated what President Roosevelt is advocating to-day, the voters in the interior of the country took a selfish view and did not know that they were voting against the best interests of their country. We are but 6,000,000 people here, but we may yet run a close competition with Great Britain the great maritime nation of the world. I am an optimist, gentlemen. There are two kinds of politicians.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Several kinds.

Mr. LEWIS. There are only two to which I am going to refer. There is one who says 'I view with alarm,' and one 'I point with pride.' I am one of the latter class. I can point with pride to this country and I hope to point with pride to the fact that this parliament has taken hold of the question which I now bring before it. Sir, we are in a favourable position to attain a maritime supremacy—we have the men—we inherit that from away back in the ages to make the best seamen in the world. Why? Because we inherit the blood of the men who manned the cutters of England in the British channel and the luggers of France. If you take the men who sail the bankers in the maritime pro-

vinces or the Mackinaws of the great lakes, or the sealers of British Columbia, I say you cannot beat them on the face of the globe, if they have fair play. They are high-priced men, but they are worth the money. I intend to produce to you certain extracts which I have culled from certain documents and papers in reference to this matter. I have taken considerable time over this, as it is a serious matter, and I wish to place these facts on the Hansard of this House. I have here the Canadian Hand-book issued by the government of this country in which it says that Canada now stands seventh on the list of maritime nations of the world. In 1874 there were ships built in Canada of a tonnage of 191,000; but in 1896 of 16,146; in 1904 total tonnage of 672,838; but in 1878 we had a total of 1,333,045.

Our average total external trade for the 3 years, 1901-1903, was $425,959,428, or an increase of $1,000,000 over the average for the preceding three years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I put these facts before you and I wish to state to you that in the preparation of this statement I have culled over 7,000 pages of documents of the British House of Commons, of the great nation to the south of us and of this country. I am not going to talk verbiage. I think there is too much talking in this House. I have not said very much before to-day because there is nothing that the farmers of this country deprecates as a lot of talk without very much being done.

With reference to the iron trade, we have nine plants making iron in which we have $50,000,000 invested. In British Columbia we have the coal and iron within 20 miles of each other.

The export trade of the port of Montreal in 1895 was $40,000,000 and in 1903 it was $105,750,000. Halifax has the finest of the many great harbours of the empire, capacious enough to afford anchorage for all the navies of Europe. Bedford basin, which has an area of nine square miles, is completely land-locked. In 1871 the total lake traffic on this side of the line was 14,283,000 tons. In 1905 there passed through the St. Mary's canal over 40,000,000 tons. Why, Sir, more traffic passes the city of Detroit and the city of Windsor in one hour than passes any other place in the world in the same space of time. This statement may seem to some of you not acquainted with the circumstances very startling, but it is a fact.

I am a great believer in object lessons, in comparisons, and I shall point for a moment to what has been done in another place. Here is the little republic of Argentine, away down in South America, with the city of Buenos Ayres, and what do you think they have done? They have spent $25,000,000 on their docks and wharfs alone in that one city. The value of the produce exported is $360,000,000 odd, and they have in that small city the finest newspaper building in the world, erected at a cost of $2,000,000, in which 2,000 words are printed every morning, cabled from New York. But there are special difficulties there, for if an American in New York or Baltimore wants to send his goods or a letter to Buenos Ayres what does he have to do ? He has to send it via Liverpool or down by the Panama canal to the straits of Magellan around the Horn and then up to Buenos Ayres. That is why I contend that our Canadian produce should be carried in Canadian ships. Besides the advantage which would accrue to Canada from the return cargoes and the wealth which the Canadian shipowner would bring to this country, every ship going to a foreign land will advertise our country. There is no greater factor in the promotion of foreign trade than the Canadian ship. A Montreal man going to Winnipeg is not going to advertise Toronto goods there. If we send our freight by a foreign vessel do you mean to say that foreign vessel is going to advertise Canada and tell where and how you can get the produce of this country—and our produce is increasing so rapidly that it is essential that we should adopt every possible means to promote our export trade. I venture to say that in five years there will not be enough grain produced in the United States to feed the people of that country. As an object lesson on that, I cite the two great states of Ohio and Illinois. In the last year, 1904-5, these great states did not produce enough grain to feed themselves. I have documents here to prove that assertion.

Since confederation the federal government has spent on railways $152,000,000, besides grants of land, a total expenditure of $1,100,000,000. We have in all 20,814 miles of railway. I contend that these railways should have their own ships so that a man in the Northwest or elsewhere can make a through rate by one company right through to any of the great trading posts in the world. By doing that he gets the skill and the brains and the continuity of the railway company. We should have the railway men with us in this matter, because when you have the railway men you have thousands of the cleverest and brightest men there are in Canada, whether they are constructing a line of railway in the Rockies or building a great station in the city of Ottawa.

At page 147 of the Canadian Hand-book it says:

> The commerce of Canada is largely waterborne. On the Great Lakes, on the Atlantic, and on the Pacific many vessels are carrying the products of the Canadian farm, forest, factory and mine to the markets of the world. Canada employs in her over-sea trade a tonnage of 15,826,705 tons of shipping.

Canada has an immense length of sea coast. The eastern coast from the Bay of

Fundy to Belle Isle is 5,600 miles, while the western sea coast of British Columbia is reckoned at double that of Great Britain and Ireland. The salt water inshores of Canada cover 15,000 square miles, not including indentations. There is a nursery for seamen for this country, and we have had the evidence of the reports of this Marine Department that these men are the best sailors on the globe.

Some two years ago I had occasion to compare the men on a Canadian steamer in the harbour of Halifax with the men on British merchantmen of the North Atlantic and the West India fleet. We had there the little steamer 'Acadia' with 36 men, and in all the sports those 36 men carried off the palm. In fact the gig crew there ran away from the navies of the greatest nation in the world although they had 2,000 to choose from. I say the sailors on the great lakes, the sailors of British Columbia and of the maritime provinces cannot be beaten by any other sailors in the world. Take the steamship 'Canada', our only armoured cruiser; she went to the West Indies and there, in competition with a number of fleets of other nations, our men were quicker in gun practice, quicker in rowing, quicker in everything that makes a sailor. These are facts, Mr. Speaker. The fresh water of the great lakes that belong to Canada covers 72,700 square miles, not including the waters of Manitoba and the Territories. The production of the fisheries in 1903 amounted in value to $36,000,000. We have the waters of the Hudson's bay, 1,000 miles long and 6,000 miles broad.

Now I sometimes talk with our cousins the Americans to the south of us who visit us yearly. We are great friends, and I hope we always will be. I say to them, you can talk about your 80,000,000, but I have read the history of the past and I have read about a great nation that came down from the north and swept everything away to the south of them. I contend we are just on the threshold of greatness. We are not at the parting of the ways, but we are like a girl who is just entering her teens, using the years as a skipping rope. Here let me quote from the London 'Times' of February 16, 1905, the greatest paper in the world referring to proposed United States protection law :

> There should be no misunderstanding. Great Britain is shortly to be called upon to face an effort to wrest from her her commercial supremacy at sea beyond all measure more determined and more formidable than any effort which has been made within the memory of the present generation.

That says the London 'Times' of February 16, 1905. We have our share in that, Mr. Speaker, and how can we best play it? I do not wish any one to think that I am talking against imperial federation with the old land, but I think we can best help our mother country and best help our foster mother France to keep peace among nations by looking after ourselves and improving our own position. Now here is a statement from the crop report of the United States, found in No. 38 of the Congressional Records, page 3 :

> No other class of producers for export has as great an interest in the problem and facilities of transportation from the farm to the primary market and from that to the sea-coast and final markets as the farmers have. Three-fifths exports are from farms or manufactured from farm products.

Two years ago the United States of America appointed a commission consisting of five senators and five congressmen who went through the country looking into the merchant marine business. They took eighteen hundred pages of evidence and here is a part of it :

> The merchant marine commissioners in United States after taking evidence from Atlantic to Pacific, and from the Great Lakes to the Gulf of Mexico, say : Public sentiment throughout the United States is practically unanimous, not merely in desiring, but in demanding an American ocean fleet, built, owned, officered, and so far as may be, manned by our own people.

The London 'Times' of February 16, 1905, says :

> As a United States president said in his message : There is nothing more humiliating to the national pride and nothing more hurtful to our national prosperity than the inferiority of our merchant marine compared with that of other nations whose general resources, wealth and sea-coast lines do not suggest any reason for their superiority of the sea. It was not always so, and our people are agreed, I think, that it shall not continue to be so.

Now we can take every thing that is said by that report of the Merchant Marine Commissioners to ourselves, because we are in a better position than that great nation to the south of us. They are handicapped by millions of people in the interior who do not know anything about marine affairs, who do not know anything of what is going on outside of that country. That is not our case in Canada. Now why are Japan and England so far ahead ? Because they have a large maritime community ; they have not so many people in the interior, not so many voters who will overrule those on the coast who are seeking what is best for the country. I will cite a case to show that the best men in the United States advocate what I am advocating to-day. I am not moving any resolution, I am just bringing these facts before the House. Here is another quotation from the London 'Times' :

> With the question of freights and trade routes is inseparably bound up the question of financial exchange.
>
> Rightly or wrongly the belief in America to-day is that Great Britain holds her commercial position, not by virtue of her present ability or manufacturing industry, but by reason of her position, won for her by a generation that

is gone, as the 'carrier and broker of the world.' It is, they believe, on her accumulated capital in money and ships that she is living to-day, by the leverage that those ships give her, in securing foreign trade, and by the toll which she levies on freights and exchange on the business of other nations.

Now I quote from page 239 of the American Merchant Shipping Report :

This industry calls for products of and furnishes employments to nearly every other industry in the country. If others can carry freight cheap, is it not better to let them do it?

Here I quote again from page 243 of that report :

Washington, Jefferson, Madison and Jackson said no. England has said no for 300 years. Bismark said no. We are far better suited for a shipping nation than Germany. It is for the ultimate good of all.

That is the policy of Bismarck laid down years ago and is now bearing fruit in the German nation. I quote again from page 246 of the American Merchant Marine :

Some one said we did not know how to build vessels. Look at the United States fleet on great lakes, 1,000,000 tons of specially built craft that carry freight cheaper than any other water craft afloat, and still the crew are paid higher wages and fed better than any ships afloat. We have 8,000 vessels less than in 1868 water craft afloat, and still the crews are paid to other countries (how many millions ?), and which if we did our own freighting would be spent at home are still large considerations.

I contend that every ship that leaves our shore is like a delivery wagon leaving a store. If a store in Ottawa, Montreal or Toronto starts employing the wagon of another store to deliver its goods, you know what the result will be after a while. Let us send our own produce in our own ships, Canadian ships built by Canadian labour, out of Canadian materials, manned by Canadian sailors, and the money will be returned, every dollar of it, into the coffers of our own people. The encouragement of our own navigation has at all times been important.

It is incumbent on us to consider by what mode our commerce and agriculture can be best relieved from an injurious dependence on the navigation of other nations.

England has a potential tonnage of 36 million or more than one-half that of the entire world ; Germany 7 million. England leads as she has done for a century. Howe in Encyclopedia Brit. Vol. 21, page 827 ed. of '88 says, that the ships of Italy excelled in the middle ages. In the 16th century Spain was ahead, but Elizabeth and Charles offered bounties for the building of large ships ; preference was given to English ships ; English built and English manned. In 1830, England had 2,199,959 tons and the United States, 1,191,776 tons. England to-day receives $380,000,000, as her share for carrying the world's goods. She has to build 800,000 tons every year, not counting ships built for foreigners, equal to $100,000,000 in construction expenses alone. Before I go any further, I wish to state in advocating the payment of bounties to ships, I also advocate that our waterways be increased and improved. There has been a proposal that we should make a 22 or 20 foot waterway from salt water, to the great lakes. It has been said that ships going from the head of lake Superior to foreign countries would simply make Montreal a place of passage. That is not correct. Lake shipping is of no use on the ocean. It will carry grain, ore or coal cheaper than the shipping of any nation in the world, because our lake vessels have been built especially for that purpose. These are a hull of steel hoppers with sometimes as many as forty hatches separated only by a narrow beam sufficient for strength and the bottom of the vessel is built out to form the hopper. This is not a ship ; it is simply designed to carry grain and cargo on the great lakes. In August of last year a gentleman at Sault Ste. Marie made the statement that the American ship had got to be so strong that it could stand any storm. But, shortly afterwards that was proved not to be the case. Last fall, unfortunately for the poor men who were in charge, a number of these steel ships were cast upon the rocks in lake Superior, and a great many lives and millions of dollars were lost simply because the boats were not loaded and prepared for stormy weather. They have to be loaded and looked after specially to withstand bad weather. These boats would be no use on the ocean. They can carry grain to tide water, they can carry coal back and they can carry ore, but they cannot carry cargo across the Atlantic. What is wanted on the Atlantic is a boat that will carry from 20,000 to 30,000 tons. I have here a statement taken from the official records of the American Mercantile Marine Commission, showing the purposes of the movement re ships.

1. To aid in a practical way. To bring our own foreign trade into our own hands and thus save to our citizens the millions of dollars paid by our citizens to increase the wealth of others. (United States freight yearly over $200,000,000.

2. To increase the exportation and sale of our rapidly increasing productions in the great markets of Africa and Eastern Asia. This trade will go to the country that has its own ships and postal and commercial agencies.

3. To increase the number of that highly skilled and valuable class of citizens the 'mariners.' It will take considerable time to do this, but the sooner we begin the sooner and easier will be its accomplishment. All our citizens will benefit by this. Any measure or movement which tends to increase our exports and augment our foreign trade and build up our depleting merchant marine is worthy of the most serious, painstaking and patriotic consideration of every citizen.

Mr. Wm. Livingston says :

Not one appropriation of the United States has resulted in net results so great as that for

harbour and river expenditures. I know of nothing on the face of the earth that will accomplish so much good, that will benefit so greatly the nation and all the inhabitants of the United States as to devise some means by which the United States flag can be found in every port on this round globe.

Instead of inserting in there the United States flag, I would put in the Canadian flag. Mr. Wm. Bird, testifying before the American Merchant Marine Commission, said :

Exporting, &c., 66 years, trade follows the flag. No amount of effort by mails or through salesmen is as efficient as ship.

Mr. J. K. Oldham says :

The British sea-going screw steamship has been the means of largely increasing British export trade by placing British machinery and other products cheaply and quickly in foreign markets. It has increased Britain's commercial connections in all parts of the world to an extent that could only have been accomplished by ships of her own country.

Mr. Geo. D. Gray, San Francisco, says :

While the operations of marine are only seen upon the boundaries of our country it is beneficial to all, or otherwise. A blow upon any part of the body is felt all over ; so a blow to our merchant marine reaches in a more or less degree to every hamlet and township in the land.

Mr. John D. Farquhar, of Buffalo, who is the originator of a Bill, says :

It is a commercial question, and a national question. It involves our well being, and may involve our national existence some day. It is nation against nation, fighting for commerce of the sea. We are in a position as a steel manufacturing country to build ships.

I contend that these words should apply to Canada. The London 'Times' contained the following :

The way to get the trade of any country, said Mr. Blaine, is to send our own ships there to fetch it. Our ships and seamen, our merchants and mechanics, our labour and capital should be employed to earn our own commerce. These treasures, as precious as they are simple, should not be destroyed. If wisely cherished they will always furnish indisputable evidence of our greatness. They are essential to our power. These truths are self-evident, and I wish to say to you and impress on you that this question is wider and greater than any other problem before the people to-day. When you take into account the small pittance ships have received from the American government compared to what railroads have received, it alone is enough to set people thinking.

I apply that to Canada just as much as it applies to the United States.

Admiral Harrington of the United States Navy writes :

Trade is a natural condition of human life and trade is an essential element of national greatness. Our exchange with foreign countries forms the true cause and measure of our prosperity alike in the products of the soil, mines, manufactures, and science.

The Hon. R. G. Bickford says :

Proximity to the sea and dependence upon it have their natural effect upon shipping, when these conditions concur unless retarded by ill-considered legislation the marine progress of such a people is assured, and when under these conditions wise and provident laws exist progress will be rapid.

In the year 1582 there were 136 English ships, but that far seeing woman, Queen Elizabeth, put on discriminating duties and in ten years the number of British ships was trebled. Adam Smith in his 'Wealth of Nations,' says :

English navigation laws are unpopular among nations, but they are the wisest of all the commercial regulations of England.

It is also stated that the growth of a great carrier nation cannot but result in giving such a nation a disproportionate influence among the nations of the earth. Mr. Tyson, of Savannah, Georgia, made the statement that United States merchant shipping was handicapped by political jealousy at Washington. I cite that statement to show that this is a national and not a political question, and that we should all combine together for the good of Canada. It is also said that cheap labour makes a difference in cost and we do not want cheap labour here. Mr. Wright, of Galveston, Texas, says :

Let each nation bring in its own imports free, but tax all nations to carry other nations' imports.

Just hear let me ask why should Norway and Sweden come over here and bring their ships into our ports where the British load line and navigation laws prevail and which prevent our ships carrying as large a cargo as the Norwegian ships do. Why should not every ship that comes to a Canadian port be subject to our law, why should we not put a discriminating duty on every pound of freight that comes here from any other nation and which is not carried in that nation's ships. Mr. Porch, of Galveston, says :

The Atlantic ocean rolling between two mighty hemispheres is a German, French and English sea, but the Pacific with twice the area of water, washing the shores of two nations containing two-thirds the population of the Globe, is henceforth to be an American sea covered with American ships and laden with the products of American industry.

The commerce of half the world realizing the dream of Columbus will go westward to the Indies.

Why should we not say that the Pacific is a Canadian sea; we are nearer to China we are nearer to Japan, we have the coast line, we have the iron, we have the coal and we have the men, and I am glad to say our capitalists have the money ; we have all the advantages and why should we not say that the Pacific ocean is a Canadian sea; that we should

carry our own products in our own ships, and then half the commerce of the world, realizing the dream of Columbus, will go westward to the Indies, and go in Canadian ships. We all know that at the time of the Spanish war the United States took over the Philippines, Porto Rico, Hawaii, and Cuba, and prevented foreign shipping from carrying goods to these countries, thus giving an advantage to American ships. In five years the Philippine trade increased from nothing to five millions of dollars; Porto Rico increased from nine millions to fourteen millions, Hawaii increased from four millions to eleven millions, and Cuba from seven and one-third millions to twenty one millions. I would ask the Minister of Customs to take a note of that. These are facts pregnant with great possibilities. The total United States exports of domestic manufacturers increased from $228,000,000 to $407,000,000 yearly, and during the past five years United States tonnage on the lakes increased 570,600 yearly, and yet Canada has gone back. United States report says :

It is well known that British colonies have possible capacity to produce a very large part of such articles as may be needed by Great Britain. Trade once lost to us and gained by Canada cannot be regained by us except at a tremendous disadvantage and sacrifice with consequent suffering and trouble in American agricultural states.

And here is a statement from the London 'Times' of February 16, 1905, which is of the utmost importance to our national welfare. It says :

While in every other direction, in population, in wealth, in power and in size, we are growing in all but our marine interests which are going down.

For the first time in United States history, no square rigged vessel for deep sea trade was launched on either Atlantic or Pacific coast line, and only one steamer for foreign trade under construction in United States shipyard. United States shipyards have not received an order for a steamship for foreign trade since 1901.

President Arthur said, as quoted in the article of the London 'Times' :

With no United States steamers on principal ocean lines or in any foreign ports, our facilities for extending our commerce are greatly restricted, while the nations which build and sail ships and carry the passengers and mails, obtain thereby conspicuous advantages increasing their trade. More recently President Roosevelt said the same thing in a characteristic way : Ships work for their own countries just as railways work for their terminal points.

The way to get the trade of any country is to send our ships there to fetch it.

Mr. John Craig, a gentleman whom I have met and who was formerly established at Trenton, and has now one of the largest ship building yards in the United States, said in his sworn evidence :

I say to you that if the opportunity is given to the shipbuilding interests in this country with its soil and climate, with such a people as we have here with their birth, their habits, their ambitions and their opportunities, and we have as bright men here as anywhere in the world, in ten years we will build ships for England as we did years ago.

Formerly every farmer on the navigable waters in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick was engaged at ship building in the winter time, and I want to know why it is that they are not engaged at that business to day ?

Jas. W. Porch of New Orleans, said :

Steamers chartered by those at a distance and sent here to be loaded with cargoes because it is cheaper, do not materially add to our upbuilding. Our best interests can be handled and developed best by those whose interests are identical with our own. Foreign aid should not be called on to carry the result of our brain and brawn.

Ships of 6,000 to 7,000 tons dead weight are best for present investment.

It takes from 5 to 10 years to put any new trade on a paying basis. Our ships should be on an equality, if not preferred. Put a duty on all transports not carried in our ships.

England limits the subsidy to ships built in British yards—this is new—because she is afraid of Germany.

England has paid $250,000,000 of subsidies ; that is the way she protects her shipping. Formerly she gave a subsidy to ships sailing under the British flag. Now it is limited to ships built in British yards. Mr. Porch said further :

The English navigation law was a great protective measure and was an immense success.

Captain Mahan says : 'A ship becomes a sort of commercial traveller for whatever country it belongs to.'

We must first get the ships and acquire the ship-building habit. Then other matters will right themselves.

Von Humboldt's famous conclusion was : That contact with the ocean has been one of the chief influences in forming the character of nations as well as adding to their wealth and power.

The absolute argument for the protection of the great lakes is that United States shipping is absolutely protected there, and the rates are the lowest in the world, and the men are better fed and paid than in any other industry.

Here is an answer one of the prime ministers of England sent to the British Minister in Belgium :

In matters of commerce the fault of the Dutch is giving too little and asking too much. With equal advantage the Swedes are content So we'll clap on Dutch bottoms 20 per cent.

It is not to moderation of justice of others we trust for a fair and equal access to markets for our own products, or for our due share in carrying our own, but to our own means of independence and business get-up.

There is another matter of serious moment which I wish to bring to the attention of this House, but before I go into that, I wish to quote some extracts from an article which was quoted at the half Centennial of

the Sault canal on the great lakes, by William Livingstone :

In an address delivered by Henry Clay to Lafayette, in Washington, December 10, 1824, on the occasion of Lafayette's last visit to America, Mr. Clay opposed the canal, Mr. Livingstone used the following language :

The vain wish has sometimes been indulged that providence would allow the patriot after death to return to his country to contemplate the intermediate changes which had taken place; to view the forests felled, the cities built, the mountains levelled, the canals cut, the highways constructed, the progress of the arts, the advancement of learning, and the increase of population.' Could he stand here to-day and witness the celebration, view this beautiful city, with its many industries, happy homes, progressive people, and the city but yet in its infancy, and destined to be beyond a doubt, with its great natural advantages, one of the great cities of this nation, and when comparing the present with his prediction of sixty-two years ago, who could paint the emotions which would surge through his brain.

A short review of lake navigation, the subject on which I am to speak, reveals a transformation scene even greater. While statistics are necessarily dry, it is an absolute necessity to use a few of them in showing and demonstrating the tremendous increase in the tonnage of the great lakes during the past fifty years. In 1855, fifty years ago, the total tonnage of Lake Superior, not only the cargo, but the ships that carried it as well, could be comfortably stowed away in the hold of any of the largest modern steamers that have come into commission during the past year, and that are daily passing through the canal.

The tonnage of the Detroit river is equal to five times the foreign tonnage of New York harbour, and greater than the combined tonnage of Liverpool, London and Hamburg, and with tonnage to spare in addition. And it must also be borne in mind in connection with this that our season of navigation on the great lakes is 230 days, whereas on the sea-board they have the entire 365 days. In no other place in the world can so animated water view be obtained as the Detroit river. It is a constant procession ships never out of sight.

The progress in the loading and unloading facilities of our vessels has increased in equal proportion. In the inception of the ore trade it was put aboard little schooners by hand labour of severest sort, and at a cost per ton that to-day would be fabulous. It took about four days to load a cargo of 300 tons, and the unloading of the cargo was an even greater undertaking. To get a cargo out of the hold staging had to be built. The ore was shovelled upon this staging, then from the staging to the deck, and then from the deck to the dock, making three handlings in all. By this process it took nearly a week to unload 300 tons, and the next move was by means of block, tackle and a horse. Only a few days ago the steamer 'G. W. Perkins' unloaded 10,514 gross tons of ore in four hours and ten minutes, with only 32 men, the bulk of this being unloaded by clam shells. This is over 50 tons per minute and 1,800 pounds per second and is equal to 260 cars of forty tons capacity, making six trains of forty cars each. Ten years ago this would have been shovelled into buckets, taking a number of days and there is not a dock on the coast to-day could unload this cargo in a week.

Our waterways have acted as a most powerful regulator of rates. When it is considered that a diminution of one mill per ton on the railroads of the country effects a saving of nearly eight hundred millions to the shippers of transportation, the value of this restrictive power cannot be over-estimated. And as Professor Lewis M. Haupt stated in a paper recently at a meeting of the American Philosophical society held in Philadelphia, that had the distinguished senator added as a recognized fact that such regulation by water does not reduce but greatly increases the revenues of the railroads, he would but have emphasized the commercial paradox which comparatively few persons appear to recognize.

As far as I understand it, the reason is the cheaper water transportation. As coarse freight, such as the grain of the farmers and the ore of the mines, is more and more carried by water, the first-class freight, which is carried by the railways, and from which they make their money, increases also. Consequently, by deepening our canals and enlarging our waterways, we increase the earning powers of the railways at the same time.

Another matter on which there has been considerable discussion is the load line This is a serious matter. For a number of years there have been very few wooden ships built in Canada. But some owner of a factory or moneyed man takes small wooden vessels, cuts the masts out of them, and converts them into barges, and then sends them out with a tug, with men in them, in many cases to be drowned like rats in a barrel. Our best ships are inspected and their officers, engineers, captains and mates, require certificates ; but barges are not inspected, and the men who go out in them do not require certificates. This is an outrage, not on the government or on us, but on the whole country. The result is that many a fine seaman is lost, and no one knows the reason.

I am not going to refer to any case in point on this side of the line, for that might lead us into a discussion of other matters. But there are cases on the other side of the line that I can give. A boat will go out of harbour with four barges, the boat herself 150 feet in length, and each of the barges from 200 to 220 feet, and floating 200 fathoms apart. That is to say, five or six vessels will make a tow, with a length of from a mile to a mile and a half. That length is dangerous to the finest ships, and yet these vessels will go out to face the dangers of these thickly studded waters and add to them. Let a storm come up, and the captain cannot see even the first ship behind him, and the whole tow becomes completely unmanageable. These ships should be absolutely prohibited from going out on the lakes except in June or July. There should be a load line, and our shipping should be protected on the maritime province coast, because the lack of that protection is killing a great industry. Foreign built ships carry the traffic between our ports and foreign ports ; but in Nova Scotia they are still

building small ships to carry produce in a small way between ports that the large vessels cannot enter. These small vessels should be protected from the grasping monopoly to which I have referred. The Americans are in the same position that we are in. Why did our shipping disappear in 1878 ? It was because of the Plimsoll Act. To prevent the vessels coming under the operation of this Act, the owners transferred them, so that they would be registered under the flag of Norway and Sweden. Under that registry they have rights in our ports that they ought not to have. This national load line is a sinking line, not a floating line. This is not a party question. South and east and west and north are interested. Put our seamen on an equal footing with others and they can compete with any. Dr. Smith, the United States agent to Japan, says that the prowess of Japan is due in no small degree to the skill, bravery and loyalty of her fishermen. And that applies with even greater force to the fishermen of Canada. Dr. Smith says that the unit of Russian ship companies are brave, but, as a rule they are wanting in high sea experience, and in that elasticity that enables British and American seamen to adapt themselves to new and difficult responsibilities as they arise. And the Toronto 'News' of December 2, 1905, says—and I suppose there are other similar items in other papers, but I quote what happened to come under my own eyes :

> Year after year brings its tale of disasters on the lakes, caused by sending out overloaded and undermanned vessels in the stormy weather of November and December. The lives of sailors are sacrificed not to necessity but to pure greed.

The sailors want the Plimsoll line and 'watch and watch outside.' That means that, while outside of port, the sailors should have watch and watch about. This should be fixed by law. Remember, I am talking about the sailors and not about the masters and mates. The sailor is liable to be called up at any hour of the night—storms generally occur at night. His watch, including the dog-watch will make fourteen hours one day and ten the next. He has his four hours off at night. The rule now is to turn him out at eight bells in the morning and to keep him on deck all day, even though he may not be required to assist in navigating the ship. The starboard watch should have the right to be below when not absolutely needed for the navigation for the ship, while the port watch is on deck. There is another contention which the Americans strongly make as shown by the report I have referred to. They say : Stop worn out vessels being brought here. You stop, or should stop diseased immigrants. Keep out diseased ships and help our own labour. You compel a first-class steamer with powerful engines and all that to have captains, mates and engineers all certificated and inspected yearly. Why, a law is a farce that lets a rotten hulk to be made into a tow barge, overloaded, undermanned, neither officer nor boat inspected.

There should be a Plimsoll line for vessels on the lakes. Vessels would be preserved, and what is far better the seamen would be preserved. Page 281 of the report says :

> Is the sailor not entitled to consideration? To whose fidelity, staunch and steadfast courage and heroism do you confide your lives when on the deep ? Who cares for you, your son and daughter when on a voyage through darkness, storms, collisions, wrecks, and, most dreaded of all, fire at sea. Even now they ask for no charity, they only want a chance to work—to get work at fair wages and live on their own earnings.

Now, here is a point to which I ask special attention. Felix Foley said under oath, 'There is no Plimsoll line in the United States.' He added : when the water is coming in the scuppers on deck she is loaded, that is well understood on the American coast. Let me explain what that means. A one-deck vessel has bulwarks, and the scuppers are little doors above the deck and level with it, and opening outwards. When the vessel is so deeply laden that the water comes in at these scuppers, then she is considered to be loaded. At page 1703 of the report of the American Merchant Marine Commission evidence is given of a 1,500-ton coal vessel on the Atlantic coast with only four men before the mast ; and at page 1705 it is testified that sometimes there are only two or three men all green and cheap. Why, the number of men per ton should be fixed by law and undermanned vessels should not be allowed to go to sea at all. The report that I have quoted, page 1706, shows that no industry pays as much to labour as ship building does. The labourer, the mechanic, the farmer, the merchant all benefit. The revival of shipping will benefit the whole country : First by the employment of mechanics and labourers in the ship yards, and second by the employment of these classes in rolling mills, lumber mills coal fields, and factories. And we in Canada can furnish everything that goes into the construction of vessels. Mr. Gorman, whose evidence is to be found at page 1709 of the report referred to, speaks of a vessel of 200 tons, of Rockland, Maine, manned by a captain, cook and two men. Consequently there was only one man on deck at a time and the time at the wheel was four hours. No look-out was kept. At page 1717, Mr. W. B. Barton, of New York, says that an American schooner loads the scuppers down to the water nine times out of ten. These vessels are also undermanned, and in a gale heave and toss ; they are clumsy and awkward and with the strain to which they are subjected are very apt to spring a leak. Here are two instances that are referred to—the wreck of the 'Mears' and the 'Midnight' towed by the

steam barge 'Wilhelm.' The wreck occurred on November 27, 1889, on Lake Huron, in a blinding snow storm and northeast gale. All hands perished. The cargo in these cases was lumber. On January 25, 1905, the 'Sea King' lost four barges out of a tow of five, loaded with coal. All hands were lost. The barges were all insured. On September 30, 1896, the 'Sumatra', in tow of the 'B. W. Arnold' and loaded with coal was lost off Milwaukee—all hands lost. From 1890 to 1903, 472 barges were wrecked, with a loss of 118 lives. The causes were overloading, and undermanning. The fault was altogether with the seamen, although these were as a rule men picked up anywhere and engaged at from $14 to $16 per month. At page 61 of the report it is stated that tows are dangerous to sailing vessels. Tows are sometimes a mile long. If the law can make vessels burn green and red lights and otherwise direct details of navigation then it can limit the length of tows.

The law says there must be certain whistles, one long and two short, when a vessel is going in a fog with a tow, but there is nothing as to the length of the tow which may be 300 feet or 6,000 feet.

Then he says :

Seamen should be placed on the same level as our skilled mechanics on shore.

Seamen should have watch and watch day and night, one day, ten hours, the next fourteen. This will not hurt the ship, it will improve and better the condition of everybody, both officers, men and owners.

Standard of efficiency. Deck hands should not be allowed to ship as able seamen.

I cite this one case, the case of the 'Rio' which was lost in San Francisco bay with great loss of life.

Now if you recall this was a large ocean steamer coming in from the Pacific ocean with a great many people on board. She was going through the Golden Gate, there was a little fog and no sea whatever. She ran on a rock and there was an enormous loss of life, although it was 20 minutes after she struck before she sank. What was the reason ? Because the crew were Chinese cheap labour. Here is another case, the 'Queen,' a large ship with a crew and passengers. She caught fire in a heavy sea but very few were lost and the ship was eventually saved. Why? Because the crew were good Anglo Saxon seamen, A. B's every one of them. These are two cases which speak for themselves. In the interest of human life in the interest of property, in the interest of our working people, we think that men who ship as seamen to do seamen's work should be seamen, and that the government of this country should see that they are.

Now here is the English House of Common's report, a very recent report, (1901). Mr. Arthur Norman Hill, not the great J. J. Hill, whom I shall quote later, but an English authority, at page 121 says :

If you put restrictions on foreign traders and they keep away or retaliate we have enough ships to do the business.

That is speaking of British business.

What the British ship wants is a fair field. Then we are able to fight and will fight.

Load Line Act is a good Act, but shipping regulations are fifty years old and want overhauling. For instance Merchant's Shipping Act of 1854 requires ocean vessel to carry salt for seventy days.

This is one reason why we should overhaul our shipping Act. Mr. Hill at page 122 says that in England if a vessel is lost, the owner is responsible for part of the cargo. In Germany it is different in case of overloading or collisions. The German says: take the ship. Colonies enforce regulations against British but not against foreign vessels. Mr. Hill says that subsidies are a last resort, but there are many cases of new trade routes where it is absolutely necessary to give subsidies to start trade until it has been worked to pay.

Great Britain has a complete system of training lads for sea. The German government assists the Hamburg-American line in maintaining two large sailing vessels that seek trade all over the world and carry a large number of apprentice boys. At page XXII it says :

Vessels are nurseries for seamen. They are the pioneers of commerce, visiting new ports where trade is too small or channel too shallow for a steamer. Cheapest carriers of certain important cargoes, and their presence is everywhere a check upon exorbitant steam rates. Steamers do not produce sailors in the strict sense of the word, men who not only have sea habit steps, but skill in all exigencies, contempt for danger, self-reliance under difficulties and adaptability to all sorts of conditions if circumstances, sea-found men, resourceful under any of the thousand liabilities of a sea life.

When we have the ships we will have the sailors. There is no country in the world that is better able to give our boys a chance in the merchant marine than we should be able to do.

I shall now refer to some American evidence, Mr. Harry Coulby, of the Pittsburg Steamship Company, said that this is the most vital issue before the people today. There were 292 ships passing Suez and only 1 United States flag which beat 16 to 1 all hollow. He said that the merchant marine is sick. He said also that transportation which connects producer and consumer and which is the very life blood of commerce, is a science pure and simple, and nowhere is carried out more scientifically than on United States lake side. He said : Let all the people contribute something for the good of all the people; this is an economic, not a political question. Mr. Julius Bleyer spoke of the steamer 'Augustus B. Wolvin,' which is 560 feet long and which carried up the lake 10,500 tons of coal, and brought down 12,289 tons of ore

to Chicago. The 'Wolvin' has 33 hatches, and is practically one long steel hopper, built to suit the sweep of dredge scoops for discharging. She and other ships of the same class can carry cargo cheaper than any other vessels in the world, because she has practically a long steel hopper with 33 hatches built so that one man can get out from her 3,000 tons an hour. She can do that on the lakes but she cannot on the ocean, so that Montreal and Quebec should be one on this. In 1903, 18,526 vessels carrying 34,674,437 tons of freight, passed through the St. Mary's canal, and I understand that this year there were 10,000,000 tons more.

Mr. David Vance, one of the most experienced men on the great lakes says that every dollar spent in improving the great lakes waterways has benefited the people of the west, reducing freight 20 cents to one cent per bushel. Ship building and ocean freighting, he said, are domestic industries as much as wheat raising and manufacturing.

Mr. Baker, of Baltimore, said there never was a more opportune time for any country to assist its merchant marine than at the present moment. Ship yards and ship builders need some help to start. New ship lines, skin-resistance, and flat bottoms were best. A ship 20 years old could not compete with the ship of to-day. Steel outlasts iron, the latter is thicker and heavier. Steel was suitable for the North Atlantic and cheaper than iron. He said that $2,500,000 a year for 20 years would put the United States away ahead in the way of ordinary merchant marine, and in carrying United States products.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if $2,500,000 would do that in the United States much less than half of that would do it in Canada. Mr. Baker also said that to cheapen transportation you have to keep up with modern construction. If our ocean transportation could be carried in 20,000 ton ships it could be done for 20 per cent less.

It is probably not known to a great many in this House that no ship ever crosses the Atlantic that takes such a quantity of grain as has been brought into the port of Midland by one ship. The biggest cargo that sails out of Quebec would average 125,000 bushels of wheat, but Midland takes in 216,000. A forwarder took me to task when I told him that a vessel had gone out of Fort William with 350,000 bushels of grain. He laughed at me and said it was and absurdity. This has been exceeded.

Now the reason the Americans can make freights cheaper is because, instead of spending three or four days or a week loading or unloading, they say that the ship is not earning money unless she is at sea, and so they have put all their skill and ingenuity to provide that she should not remain more than one day at a dock. To cheapen transportation you have to keep your vessel going.

Orient business should belong to the United States.

I say it should not, it should belong to Canada, we are nearest.

Price of material that goes into a ship is the small end of the constructive cost. It is cost of operating plant and cost of labour must be mainly considered.

We have all the talent and natural energy to obtain our share of carrying trade of the world if this energy can be directed into a proper channel, but we must first put our own ships and mrecantile interests upon an equal footing with other carrying nations of the world. It must be made possible for a man to build a ship and come out even. It must be made possible for a man to own a ship and come out even.

The issue I lay before you is one between foreign and outside and American labour.

In September, 1903, Mr. Prentiss, of Cleveland, went around the world to find the American flag and a whale. He says: I saw the whale but I have been around the world three times and never saw an American flag.

In 1903, South America used $800,000,000 gold of farm products, all from Europe.

You must nurse an infant for a few years.

We have an infant here, and we have another infant started in the town of Welland; the town of Welland paid some thousands of dollars for a site for another steel factory. We have a thousand men employed in Collingwood building large ships, we should have 10,000 men there. That is an infant which we should nourish. Here is another evidence on page 1870:

English boat same trip in twelve months as lake boat in 7 months. Banks will loan to build ships if government protects them. Ore for centuries must be carried down the lakes.

On that point, there is some question as to whether we have ore in this country. We have ore, according to the Canadian Hand-book. But irrespective of that, if there is no tariff on ore we can buy it from the United States and we can bring it on Lake Superior. England has to get her ore from Sweden a thousand miles away at a cost of $2.50 a ton. We could bring it from Sweden to this country in ships just as cheaply as England does, if we carried it in our own ships.

Measures which have for aim upbuilding of industries of the country, should appeal to great body of citizens regardless of party. Every single industry within our national jurisdiction have received concerted aid of whole nation, except ships.

The interests of the whole country, the enlargement of foreign markets for our surplus products of the farm, the increased work in the mine, factory, ship and boiler shop for labour, and the training of able seamen will all be pro-

moted by the restoration of our merchant marine. An enlightened policy through which we would find an ample reward in the increase of our commerce, and in making our country more favourably known abroad.

Now I will quote from Mr. James J. Hill. I am glad to say that Mr. Hill is reconsidering his opinion of this country, where he was born, because I see he is going to build another transcontinental line in three years. I am glad of it, the more railways we have in the west the better:

Our public domain is gone. To-day people by tens of thousands are leaving their own country and going to the country where I was born, Canada. They do not want to go, but people flock into Canada from Iowa, South Minnesota, South Dakota and often from Nebraska, Kansas, Michigan and Wisconsin. Reason: they often sell their land at from $60 to $75 per acre and buy equally as good at $6 or $8 per acre. I think the agricultural portion of our nation has always been its sheet anchor, and I think it always will be. I think it has its full share of intelligence and patriotism and every thing that goes to make good citizenship. A man loves a little money and wants to buy a farm and sit under his own fig tree.

I will now quote from a great Canadian since passed away, the Hon. Joseph Howe. We know how when he appeared in the great reciprocity convention held many years ago in the city of Detroit, he stood out prominently among all the prominent gentlemen there. He was a man amongst ten thousand, there were few who could compete with him on this continent. On page 730, the Hon. Joseph Howe said:

You don't know your resources. Your debt will fade away in the presence of the great resources which you have. And fifteen years afterwards, he said he had lived to see his words realized.

I say, Sir, that if we have to go to England or to the continent to borrow money for this purpose we should do it. We do not know our resources. It will cost us very little. It will be like a farmer who has to take the products of his farm away and has no wagon of his own to do it with. Do you mean to say he is going to leave them there, or let his neighbour come along and carry them and make money out of them? No, he will borrow a little money and buy a wagon, and make more money in carrying his products himself and get a bigger price. We all know that no man can attend to his business as well as he can himself.

Page 38. Canadian Handbook.

Assets of Canadian lands if sold at $1 per acre, would pay the national debt.

Public buildings, canals, public railroads, and lands are not placed against public debt.

Coal, Alberta, varies from high grade lynite to highest anthracite, supply inexhaustible.

Page 55. Great industry of Canada is agriculture, it employs more people, and has a greater output than all others. Nature has marked Canada for greatest agricultural country of the world, vast expanse of country, fertility of soil, rain of summer, and snow and frost of winter and all climatic conditions are peculiarly favourable to largest possible production of grains, roots and fruits.

Bismarck inaugurated the German policy and the present Kaiser is carrying it out. In other words the present emperor is a far-seeing and wise man and he knows a good procedure when he sees it.

Mr. Thayer says:

Repairs on steamships alone is a large industry. No ship can survive 20 years without a bill of repairs much over her original cost.

Mr. Thayer also says:

England is free trade on land and protectionist on sea.

The report of the secretary of navy of the United States, says:

It requires much more time to produce a marine officer than it does to produce a ship.

In Bullen's 'Men of the Merchant Service' we find this statement:

An able seaman properly so called is a skilled mechanic with great abilities.

Mr. A. Chesbrough says:

Decay of shipping is harder on the masses than on the classes, but it knows no distinction in its influence. It penetrates the nation.

Mr. W. H. Seward said 50 years ago:

The Pacific ocean, with its shores, its islands and the vast region beyond will become the chief theatre of events in the world's great hereafter.

I am speaking not solely for the great riding of West Huron to which I belong, because I believe that the people in sending me here to represent the people of West Huron, sent me here to represent Canada. What benefits Canada will benefit West Huron.

Mr. W. M. Killingsworth, Oregon, U.S., says:

Pacific coast is no longer our back door it's another front door. Business is a warfare without blood. We must use a proper gun. When our people realize that sailors are not made like soldiers. It takes time to become familiar with the roll of ocean waves. We must look at this matter in a national, not a provincial spirit. Young men go to sea in preference to offices and stores.

In my early days, when the spring time came, we had an exodus from our town to the water. There is very little chance now for our boys to go sailing, because there are no boats.

Mr. James Rolph, Jr., Pacific Coast, says:

Commercial supremacy of England has been maintained for many years through her shipping and the knowledge which the leading minds of England have of the law of commerce and the law of trade, the necessities of the marine have resulted in the protection of vessels carrying the flag.

I am now going to quote Mr. August B. Wolvin, the man who started the trade from the west end of lake Superior to Quebec. He said :

The export is going to turn largely through the St. Lawrence if the Dominion government opens the channel.

The people of Sweden said : If you do not take our boats we will put them over there. There is nothing to prevent them coming in here and carrying the grain from Fort William to Quebec. The Swedes have 400 little boats that will go through our canals, they have cheap labour, they have no Plimsoll line, and they have cheap food that we do not want in this country. Mr. Wolvin says:

I do not believe there is any line of traffic by which the exports from the lake country can be carried to any better advantage than down the St. Lawrence. It is hard to be brought to that conclusion, but after wrestling awhile with the question I am convinced that it is so. All year there was no mishap except to one tow barge. Insurance on the St. Lawrence is three-eighths per cent higher than on the lakes, but as compared with the value of the commodity it is small.

In 1838, United States steam vessels represented 193,432 tons and Great Britain 74,-684 tons. In 1860 United States 867,937 tons and Great Britain 452,320. Almost incredible; I could hardly believe it when I looked at the book. But what then appears ? Great Britain then began to protect her interests. The United States were prevented by political jealousies at Washington. Mr. F. M. Todd, of San Francisco, says :

It takes more men to work a ship and handle her freight than it does to build her. When a ship is launched that only begins her expense account. Her owner likes to see her and repair her at home, and in a ship life there must be repairs. Her arrival provides work for pilot, tug, watchmen, stevedores, freight clerks, teamsters, commission men, shipwrights, riggers, caulkers, for sail, block and spar manufacturers, machinery men and boiler shops. dry docks, painters, grocers, boarding houses. &c.

Capt. I. E. Thayer says :

I began in 1855, the palmy days of United States shipping, when to be a shipowner, a master, a ship builder, even a boy on a fishing schooner was a matter of pride. I often paused from my work to watch the launching of the finest specimen of marine architecture the world has ever seen.

——the tea clippers of Baltimore.

The celebrated clipper ships of the day, created and fitted out for the premier trade of the world. The reputation of Boston builders was world-wide, they built for Britain as well as United States.

In that prosperity they had the natural outgrowth of existing conditions ; nothing short of a change of condition could destroy that prosperity.

Now, here is a statement of one of the greatest marine authorities on the lakes, Harvey D. Goulder, of Cleveland. Harvey D. Goulder observes:

After a line once meets with success it goes on from great to greater. The cost in England is about the same as in the United States for boats for the lakes where standardizing is in vogue. One yard builds passenger ships and can build cheaper than anywhere else because of specialization. The cost of moving a ton of freight on the lakes is eight-tenths of a mill per thousand, probably one-fifth of the cheapest cost on the most favoured railroad. Hatches are constructed to suit unloading machines, and floors are specially designed to help steam shovels.

The protection of the United States navigation laws made the United States shipping on the lakes ninety-eight per cent, while only two per cent goes to Canada, but the United States on the ocean carriers only eight and a half per cent of its own produce. Mr. Goulder stated:

Canada by reason of great development of her resources is growing up commendably, wonderfully, splendidly, and we are not jealous, and we are not envious.

Let no man be afraid of extending conservatively, wisely as it is given to human wisdom to do, beneficent aid and protection to our merchant marine.

Well, Sir, I expect to see the Georgian Bay canal built before I die, I expect to see a railway built connecting with the navigation of the Hudson's bay, I expect within ten years to see the depth of the Welland canal increased to twenty feet, and I say that we will have traffic in Canada for all these great waterways. The traffic on the Welland canal at the present time is, of products of the forest fourteen per cent, of the farm fifty per cent and of merchandise and manufactures thirty-six per cent. The greatest benefit we derive from canals is the regulation of railroad rates and in the grain business canals are supreme until closed by ice. The coal on Vancouver Island is superior to all the Pacific coast coal, and it is said that Vancouver island is entitled to be called the Britain of the North Pacific. We have within fifty miles of Ottawa 917,403 horse power for electricity; there are 700,000 horse power along the Georgian Bay canal; Niagara has 7,000,000 horse power more than half of it Canadian; the St. Lawrence river has 10,000,000 horse power; the canals of Canada over 20,000 horse power, but capable of developing more. Mr. W. Downey when sworn said :

A ship costs $350,000, 90 per cent, or $315,000 would be spent on labour from the time of starting to dig coal and iron, to hoist of flag. Look at the money spent out of that. We pay $200,000,000 a year to foreign shipowners for carrying trade to and from the United States. We should make an effort to earn this ourselves and distribute it through all the coal miners, ore miners, mechanics, finally through

the sailors and officers of the ships and back to be spent in building other ships.

It is a direct loss to us. We have spent blood and money to develop that foreign commerce.

If money and land are spent to develop railroad, to help the farmer, why should not money be spent on ships to continue the chain.

And, Mr. Speaker, if money and land are spent to develop railroads for the farmer, why should not money be spent on ships to continue the chain of transport and thus raise the price of grain to the farmers. On the question of freight rates I may mention that it costs $4 per thousand to haul lumber 820 miles on the Pacific coast, and $1.75 to haul it the same distance on the lakes. I will wager that there are small ships on Lake Huron that would carry for fifty cents less; the price generally on the Georgian bay to Chatham and in that vicinity is from $1 to $1.25. The freight rate on freight passing through the Soo in 1899 was eighty-seven cents which meant a trip every ten days, there being three days terminal detentions. In 1867 it cost $8 per ton to carry ore and steel rails 1,000 miles, and in 1904 the same transportation only cost eighty cents. The value of goods increases with every increase of transportation facilities and decrease of rates. It is a remarkable statement which has been verified, that an ordinary cargo vessel sailing on the upper lakes will take freight to the sea-board quicker than will a freight train. The cost of freight per ton per mile in Great Britain averages $2.30; on the continent from $1.90 to $2.10, in Russia $1.75 and in the United States seventy-two cents, notwithstanding the fact that train hands and workingmen are better paid in the United States than any where else in the world. There are lower freight rates on the great lakes than in any place in the world and this has been helped out by human ingenuity. In 1859 it cost 15·75 cents to carry one bushel of corn from Chicago to Buffalo; in 1871 it cost 7·50 cents and in 1890 it cost 1·88 cents. In 1867 it cost $4.25 to carry one ton of ore from Escanaba to Erie, in 1870 it cost $2.50 ; in 1890 it cost 82 cents, while during part of 1890 it was as low as 55 cents per ton. Mr. E. C. Plummer of New York on being sworn, deposed :

Fifteen years ago cost 15 cents per bushel grain Duluth to Buffalo. To-day you get it carried 1,100 miles for 1½ cents. Why ? United States brains and ingenuity have done it.

Andrew Jackson, in his message to Congress, said :

Any industry which would be of national importance was entitled to be protected if there was any chance it could compete with foreigners.

The men who are freighting are making money as the 800,000 new tons of shipping built in Great Britain yearly shows. The regular liners carry as cheaply as tramps and they must sail on time, full or not full, and so lose at first until trade is established. At page 432 it was deposed that the cost of carrying grain was cut from fifteen cents to one and one-half cents per bushel, which of course is a great benefit to the farmer, and that a ton of coal could be carried 1,000 miles for about the price you can put it into your basement from the road.

Walter D. Sayle, of Cleveland, said:

Earnings of Britain's fleet are 550 millions yearly or equal to all the earnings of the railways in the United States, or the entire wheat cost of United States. In 1838 Great Britain had a steam tonnage of 74,684 and the United States, 103,423 tons.

Alex. E. Brown said:

The shipping business depends on the regularity with which you receive and discharge cargoes every day.

On the Atlantic coast, in New York, &c., they are as behind as Europe in handling freight. The general method is 2,000 years old, handling freight by hand.

From $2 to $13 per ton was charged in the fall for carrying a ton of ore ; the price now is fifty-five cents.

Labour objected to the first automatic machinery on the lake, but now approves, as it has placed labour on a much higher plane. The charge of nineteen cents for loading comes out of the freight charge of fifty-five cents to seventy cents per ton. The three cents per ton for trimming is not required on large ships.

With a machine at Conneaut, one man can take out 3,000 tons in ten hours, and put it in cars.

Ore is carried from Sweden to England 1,000 miles, for $2.50 per gross ton. The highest rate on the lakes for the same distance is $1.20 to $1.25.

The exports in 1904 from Atlantic ports were 9 millions, and twenty-four millions from gulf ports.

The traffic is changing from the Atlantic ports to the gulf ports and the Pacific ports. For twenty years up to 1903, New York exported about twenty-seven millions, but in 1904, New York exported only three millions.

For twenty years to 1903, Baltimore exported about eleven millions, but in 1904 Baltimore exported only three millions.

From 1899 to 1903 Pacific ports exported from one-sixth to one-third of the total wheat, during 1905 nine-tenths of the total went from the Pacific coast.

Exports of wheat in 1905 were the smallest since 1860, and the total exports of wheat and flour reduced to wheat were the smallest since 1872. This does not necessarily presage a decline in the wheat business. The farm price of wheat in December, 1904, was 92·4 cents per bushel, the highest since December 1, 1888, and the crop harvested in 1904 was by no means a small one. In the fiscal year 1905, Baltimore was the largest. The Atlantic ports shipped only 116,000 bushels. In 1892 the wheat exported was 157,280,351 bushels.

What does that show? It shows that Canada is going to be the granary of the

world, and that we should use our own delivery wagon.

The gulf ports' improved methods for handling flour are heping them, especially at New Orleans.

Gulf of Mexico has four large grain and cotton ports. The Atlantic has five or six of each.

In wheat, the Atlantic ports carried fifty-nine per cent from 1884 to 1888; only twenty per cent in 1904. The gulf ports increased from two to fifty-five per cent in the same time but the latter dropped from fifty-five to one per cent in 1905.

For twenty-two years ending 1905, Atlantic and gulf ports handled eighty-seven to ninety-one per cent of corn and considerable wheat and flour, but in 1905 only six per cent of the wheat exported went by Atlantic and gulf ports and ninety-two per cent by Pacific ports.

From 1904 on, cotton began to be exported from the port nearest to where grown. Railroad competition has reduced the rates on the unimproved canals to starvation almost. A few years since the audacious men who ventured to hope a ton of freight might be carried on long routes for two cents per mile were laughed at and pointed out as radicals and enthusiasts, but they have been left far in the rear, one-sixth of a cent per ton per mile being the rate from Chicago to Boston.

Railroads could not carry the coal and iron, but lakers have cheapened railroad freights.

Ocean vessels generally take freight, high-class freight.

Fast liners carry little freight. Most freight is carried in large slow liners with greatest freight capacity.

Geo. Y. Wisner, whom a great many members of this House will know as one of the most efficient civil engineers on the lakes, says:

We have on the great lakes the best conditions in the world for gathering material and labour for ship construction.

A. B. McNairn says:

Cleveland has been a builder of and founded by ships since Moses Cleveland first pushed his boats against the bank of the site of the city that bears his name.

H. D. Goulder says:

Without government aid a revival will not be accomplished.

W. S. Sayle says:

Shipbuilding is an industry which consumes a great many products and furnishes employment to nearly every other industry in the country. For a shipyard revived a hundred correlated industries are stimulated.

Mr. S. Hartman, of Scotland, says:

The building of a ship involves practically every trade and nearly all the materials and manufactures in existence, and there is no industry which needs a greater number of people.

England manufactures ships—you cannot call it building.

The United States has 10,000 miles of sea-coast and twenty steel ship building yards; Great Britain has 1,000 miles of sea-coast and 100 steel shipbuilding yards.

These yards are building tramp steamships cheaper than any other country in the world—not that they get bounties for them, but because they get bounties for the better class of ships, they can build tramp ships cheaper at the same time. The more a man manufactures the cheaper he can do it.

On the great lakes the United States build as cheaply as ships are built on the Ware or the Tyne.

H. C. Calkin said:

Ninety per cent of the cost of a ship goes in labour. It commences in the forest, on the mine and on the farm, and it winds up with the sweat of the man who puts the finished material together.

Wm. D. Sewall said:

Bath, Maine, has been a shipbuilding centre for 150 years. In 1859, fifty-nine square or full-rigged ships were built there, but in 1903-4, not one. Our yard was the last to give up. To-day it is closed after building over 100 full-rigged ships.

Mr. Smith, New York and Cuba mail lines, said:

We have five ships costing three millions; over eighty per cent of the labour to build them was spent in the United States, because foreigners cannot trade there.

Mr. Smith, president of the Mail Steamship Company said:

For five years ending December 31, 1903, we spent in the United States on our four steamers, $397,144.87 to United States workmen.

The United States does not protect ships, but she is going to by a Bill, S—529, now before the United States Congress, brought in by Mr. Gallagher, chairman of the Merchant Marine Shipping Committee. Why can the United States build steel bridges and steam engines in competition with Great Britain, and send them to Africa or Australia or any other country in the world? Because these things are protected, though shipping is not. The United States can put bridges on the Cape to Cairo Railroad cheaper than England can—why? Because the men who build these bridges and these engines are protected. The only unprotected industry in the country, shipping, is going to be protected, by bill S. 529. And that is what called forth from the London 'Times' this statement to which I have referred, that Great Britain is face to face with a very serious problem. Thomas Clyde, of New York, representing the Clyde Line which is known to many hon. gentlemen present says, page 10:

Although not absolutely necessary ships are usually repaired where the owner lives. A vessel costing $450,000 requires yearly $12,000 to $15,000 over-hauling.

And at page 16 it is shown that the standardizing of building is the fundamental element of cheap ship-building. British tramp ships are all similar. At page 23 it is stated that the United States beats the world in loading and unloading—a vessel never makes any money when she is at the dock. The combined tonnage on the great lakes is 55,000,000 tons.

Now, here is a point to which I ask special attention. At page 703, C. E. Creamer, of Chicago, says that lake vessels are not a success on the ocean. The vessel is lame and lopsided when she gets back and is glad to be there in any condition. At page 706, R. H. Ferguson, of Chicago, says that in the past five years, 175 vessels with a combined carrying capacity of 1,000,000 tons were built on the lakes. The modern laker is 560 feet long, 56 feet beam and 32 feet deep. She will carry 10,000 tons of coal and grain at a depth of 17½ feet. Joseph R. Forde, says—page 503—that the United States manufactures and builds and sends bridges, aqueducts, locomotives, engines and agricultural implements all over the world in competition with all others.

At page 578, Wm. F. Humphrey says that in the construction of bridges and locomotives the United States producers have become adepts: continued application makes the hand cunning and the head inventive, and years of experience and experiment reduce construction to a science. Lewis Nixon, marine architect, says that on the great lakes are built the best boats suited to the service for which they are intended—vessels of large dimensions splendid boats of their kind. And, as they are practically all of one kind, a shipyard can apply all its brains, energy and attention to one kind: He does not believe that the same boats could be built abroad at the same cost—this is an age of specialties. Vessels on the lakes are built quicker and cheaper than elsewhere all of one type. And F. W. Wood, Baltimore—page 476—speaking of standardizing, asks how could the manufacturer build at the same time a locomotive, a mowing machine and a stationary engine: where would he come out? At page 478 it is stated that it would take 800 men two years to build a ship of 10,500 tons, at a cost of about $800,000. At page 479 the work of the shipyard is represented as a focus, a head centre; it represents work going on all over the country, in the woods, in the mines, on the farm in a great many other industries. At page 1146 it is shown that free trade England protects her ships. At page 1148 the transportation business is spoken of as the greatest in the world and labour as the greatest factor in the whole question. At page 1150-1 is a strong argument in favour of paying a bounty, if necessary to the seamen: If each person should pay an infinitesimal amount on account of an enhanced freight but would receive a greater benefit in a multitude of ways, certainly the individual and general good would be benefited: If, in the body circulation is not equal suffering is bound to come, and the same with the body commercial. What do we see in Canada with regard to the paying of a bounty. Canada pays in the neighbourhood of $160,000 a year bounty to fishermen. This system began in 1885, and, in five years, instead of having 55,000 fishermen in the maritime provinces we had 77,000. Here is an object lesson for us in our country. At page 871 of the report it is stated that it is a strange thing that a country like the United States with 10,000 miles of coast line and with an export trade of $1,500,000,000 has no ship engaged in carrying its commerce. A British ship or German ship will work for British or German houses in preference to American. This is shown by our Canadian experience. The vessels that were sold abroad owing to the coming into force of the Plimsoll act were originally manned by Canadian sailors, but now they are manned by cheap Norwegian sailors who come here, and by the acceptance of lower wages keep our own men out of this class of work. There has been a similar experience in England where vessels have been transferred so as to sail under another flag. Now, we have in Canada, in the lighthouse service 2,027 men. And who are the men in this service? Are they the sailors? I am not saying a word against hon. gentlemen opposite on this point, because I believe the practice of all governments has been the same. When the sailor gets gray and unfit for this work at sea, why should not he enter the lighthouse service? What else can he do when he leaves the ocean? The nature of his occupation is such that he cannot find employment on shore. It should be a standing rule with governments in this country that men employed in the lighthouse or marine service of the government should be picked from the sailor class. As we have party government, let the party in power pick from among their own men—I would not object to that. At page 1011 of the report I have quoted before me are the figures to which I have referred showing the increase in the number of our fishermen as a result of the bounty given. In 1885 our fishermen numbered 59,483, and in 1902 they numbered 77,801. The fact that these figures appear in this report shows that the Americans are looking into this matter. Our neighbours in the United States are spending hundreds of thousands of dollars investigating the question whether they should build a water-highway from Lake Erie to New York or from Lake Ontario to New York. They estimate the cost of one at $200,000,000 and of the other at $225,000,000.

With the improved facilities for building canals that exist in these days, the cost of these works is greatly reduced, especially if you have a small canal already built. To compete with the American route we may well build the Georgian bay 20 foot and

enlarge the Welland canal. But, when you have got that, you are pretty well at the end of your tether, for there are certain probabilities which have been looked into by the United States that show that this is about the limit for the lakes. But up to that limit, every improvement of this kind decreases freight charges and helps the farmers of Canada, for it is our grain that is going to supply the world.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. LEWIS. I have a few more references which I desire to present to the House from the report of the steamship subsidies, 279, House of Commons, 1880, paragraph 37:

British Commissioner Hill, page 1986 maintains sale of British vessels, may cause very serious results.

I quote this with reference to the sale of our own vessels to Sweden and Norway which then come back and take commerce from our Canadian ships:

If purchasers are backed by their governments they may develop new trades which British owner cannot do without assistance. Giffen (1902) 293.

Substitution of British officers and men. Hill (1901) 1986 North German Lloyd bought in 1900 Scottish Oriental and Holts East Indian Ocean Steamships Company. 24 capts., 49 officers and 72 engineers all replaced.

Paragraph 38.

Sir Geo. Drummond states the great advantage to Canada of fast direct inter-communication.

Sir T. Walpole said: If the British government thought desirable, they would be justified in sending mails to Quebec in place of New York, and he would advise the government to carry out that policy.

One of the most effectual means by which Great Britain, the greatest free trade country on the face of the globe, protects her shipping is by giving large subsidies for the carriage of mails.

Paragraph 50.

That granting of subsidies has favoured competition against British ships.

That granting of through bills of lading via state railway and steamship lines has had a great effect to develop trade in Germany.

No British subsidy granted except for conditions that vessel cannot be sold or chartered without consent of the government and the crew should be British subjects (all officers and part of men).

In 1885 men, 59,493; in 1902 men, 77,801. In 1885, total amount invested in Canadian deep sea fisheries 3½ mil in 1902, $11,300,000.

In reference to subsidies and bounties for building ships. Where the ship owner receives a bounty for building, that ship must remain under the flag—until it is wrecked.

Under protection United States marine grew and became a menace to England. Under free and non-protection it went to pieces.

Page 143.

Our industries born, reared, grown to vigorous manhood, but the ship is a foundling denied all shelter.

Why should not a sailor be protected as well as a tin plate roller, &c., &c.

Page 1,113 of the Merchant Marine investigation:

Subsidies lessen as business of line improves.

Report 279 on Subsidies.—IX. From German point of view policy of direct and indirect subsidies have been that of a good investment, but element of success is energy and enterprise of recipient.

Page 513:

Success of England, Germany, Japan and other countries lies in regular steamship lines to all practicable trading ports.

Page 539:

They build up trade and lines soon become paying.

England though claiming to be a free tariff country is the greatest protectionist of any country on earth as to her merchant marine, and the result is she is to-day mistress of the seas and the marine transportation of the nations.

Page 629:

In 1840 England gave Saml. Cunard £60,000 a year to run two ships a month to Boston and Halifax. Increased soon to £90,000.

See what the result has been. Within the last year England has given to the Cunard Line $13,000,000 to build two of the finest ships in the world. Originally a ship of the Campania style cost $3,000,000, then the cost rose to $5,000,000 for such a ship as the Deutschland of the German Line, and now it takes $7,000,000 to build a large ocean steamship.

Great Britain pays bounties to fast mails and many thousand of her seamen.

She has over 30,000 seamen who receive from $30 up to $100 every year, and she finds it a good investment.

XV. Great Britain began in 1839 or 40 and since then has paid between $260 and $300,000,000 in creating and sustaining lines to every great port and market on planet.

XVI. United States line San Francisco to Asia get $63,902 per year, 5 steamers.

Japan has for 3 steamers, $600,000 per year.

Germany pays $1,340,000 per year to East Indies, Australia, N. G. Lloyd.

Great Britain pays $1,660,000 to Peninsula and Oriental.

Indirectly: tramps, benefit, being built in large shipyards created for the subsidized lines.

Those who are not acquainted with marine phraseology may not know what a

'tramp' steamer is. It is a steamer which does not belong to any line, but it carries freight from port to port wherever it can get business.

F. D. Adams, Philadelphia, says :

One of the very first measures George Washington signed was one to give a rebate on duties for goods carried in American ships.

It is impossible to build up our foreign trade without our own ships. One American line to Brazil increased the exports there one million dollars in two years.

But they dropped the subsidies and the line dropped out.

400 million in China need our machinery, our appliances, our manufactures, &c., &c.

In a United States book termed 'Transportation on the Lakes, 1880,' there are certain references touching this question which I wish to bring before the House. In one of them these words occur :

Influence of a large waterway prevents variation of rates resulting from alternate competition and combination of transportation lines, especially upon bulky freights. The increased demand for a higher class of freight created by the business prosperity which would inevitably follow the construction of a great waterway would more than compensate the railways for the loss of the low class traffic.

Considered by high authorities very doubtful whether a vessel can be so constructed as to navigate successfully and economically the ocean, the lake and the canal.

Now some experts and engineers may say that is doubtful, but if you go to any man who owns these vessel and has tried the experiment, he will tell you that it is impossible for a lake vessel safely to navigate the ocean. I read about one of these ships that went to the Pacific coast and managed to get round the Horn, but she was lost and no one knows where.

Big canal would make big ship building for ocean on lakes. 1,258 steel vessels built on lakes in 10 years ending 1900, U. S.

Distinguished authority says : 'Life of any public work is practically with that of the generation which began it.' Reason why it is true, is because in such construction future necessities are almost invariably underestimated.

The traffic is so great in the three locks at Sault Ste. Marie that the construction of a new lock is under consideration. I may say that the United States government has set aside $1,000,000 and has bought land for building a new lock at Sault Ste. Marie canal. Any such work should be of a national not a local character, benefiting many and varied commercial interests, and exerting its influence over the whole country. Debt incurred by Canada since 1867 for canals (capital account) is $66,694,740, and for railways (capital account) $128,534,490, An exhaustive study of relative advantages by the board shows that the benefits from waterways are so well defined that further inquiry would add but little force to the conclusion. A waterway connecting the great lakes with the sea is an instrument of commerce for the purposes of increasing the value of merchandise by transporting it from one side to the other. Comparisons between routes are too narrow and limited if taken from a cost point of view.

Senator Grosvenor says :

You are boasting now of cheapness of freight rates. The primal fact is the size of ships. Each enlargement cheapens the freight and benefits the farmer. Necessities of the people should drive us to sink our differences and join hand in hand.

Now, I am an optimist as to the future of Canada, the lakes are the water arteries of the continent. The Soo has three and a half times the traffic of the Suez canal. The Suez canal is open all year, the Soo two-thirds of the year or less. Thirty-seven years ago 20,000 bushels of corn passed through Welland canal. I have already mentioned the steamer 'Wolvin' as having carried 400,000 bushels in one load. From the St. Lawrence to Lake Superior the distance is 2,382 miles included in which are 67 miles of canals. Lake Superior is the natural outlet and key to the traffic of the west. Fort William is 828 miles nearer Liverpool via Montreal than Duluth is via New York. I have here a statement taken from last week's edition of the 'Canadian Journal of Commerce' in regard to freight traffic :

The domestic freight traffic of the Detroit river, covering the season of lake navigation of 1905, shows a total of 53,639,086 net tons of domestic freight. The freight traffic through the canals at Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan, and Ontario during the same period aggregated 44,270,680 net tons, of which 36,778,738 was south-bound. Of these two canals the total freight movement through the United States amounted to 38,800,190 tons, while that through the Canadian canal totalled 5,468,490 tons. During the lake season of 1905 the difference between the amount of freight carried respectively, through the Detroit river and the Soo canals amounted to 9,368,406 tons in favour of the former route. The total freight of the Welland canal showing the volume of water traffic between Lake Erie and Lake Ontario, aggregated in 1903, the last available date, 979,807 tons, of which only 263,213 was up-bound.

Now, here is a quotation from an American transportation paper some years ago :

New York and Boston now hold Montreal in check by the Erie canal and Central Railroad. After the enlargement of the canal, New York will be obliged to make strenuous efforts to hold its own. Should it fail it will doubtless be its policy to open a ship canal from the St. Lawrence into Lake Champlain and to the Hudson.

Now, that has happened. The grain that was carried through the United States ports in 1905 was 160,000,000 bushels as compared with 127,000,000 bushels, but the Americans are going to build a canal 200 miles in length from Lake Ontario or Lake Erie

to the Hudson. As to the value of canals, 2 centuries since Paterson, who founded the Bank of England and the colony of Darien, wrote thus as to a canal to unite two oceans :

> It will be the gate of the universe and enable the proprietors to give law to both oceans.

If the government of Canada, whoever may be in power, improve the waterways from the head of Lake Superior to the St. Lawrence they will provide the key that will unlock the traffic route of the whole continent of America. The first canal on this continent was started in Canada, in 1779, completed in 1781 and enlarged in 1804 and in 1817. The first canal at the Soo was built in 1797. The Welland canal was begun in 1824 and finished in 1829. It was enlarged between 1841 and 1850, and deepened in 1873 to 12 feet. In 1887 it was deepened to 14 feet. Since 1821 the government of Canada has spent upwards of $80,000,000 on canals. After looking into these matters, talking with a number of experienced men and examining many books I am firmly convinced that it would take very little over $10,000,000 to enlarge our canals between Montreal and Lake Huron to an extent sufficient to provide a depth of 20 feet of water. The first suggestion of the construction of the Erie canal was made in 1803. Governor Morris in 1803 regarded it 'as an effusion of an eccentric mind'. In 1808, $600 was appropriated to survey a canal from the Hudson to Lake Ontario, and another canal around Niagara. At that time it was proposed to construct a canal around Niagara through the United States. This was deemed impracticable on the ground that freight having once reached Lake Ontario it was cheaper to take it to Montreal than to New York. That is an argument which is still an important factor in determining the location of a waterway from the lakes to the sea. The United States have spent a large amount of money, they have consulted the most experienced engineers and they have even gone so far as to get contractors to estimate on the cost of constructing a canal according to the Wilson route from Lake Erie and according to the Olcott route from Lake Ontario. They estimate that a 21-foot canal from Lake Erie will cost $206,000,000 and that a 30-foot canal will cost $317,000,000. For divers reasons principally on account of the influence on the depth of water at the Lime kiln crossing it has been decided that it will be impossible to construct anything more than a 21-foot canal. In 1895 the commissioners reported again as follows :

> It is entirely feasible to construct such canals and develop such channels as will be adequate to any scale of navigation that may be desired between the great lakes and the seaboard.

Harper's, 1879-80, page 579, says :

> Under the influence of her canal New York outstripped the rival cities of the Atlantic. The progress of the railroad in this country has been gradual but constant, as steel replaced iron and mechanism improved.

It should be noted here that vessels would not suit ocean, lake and canal. Then Harper's proceeds :

> Indirect advantages and benefits may result from the establishment of a great transportation line which may be of such importance in their influence upon the production, commerce and general prosperity of the whole people that the question of a greater or less return of direct value may become comparatively insignificant.

One-third of east-bound lake freight is exported to foreign countries, the remainder being distributed to domestic markets. The most strongly marked feature of navigation, both on the ocean and on the great lakes, has been the increase in the size of the ships. On the St. Mary's canal in 1882 out of 4,384 passages the average tonnage was 543; in 1891 in was 862, and in 1889 1,146. This does not give an accurate idea of the character of the change, which while on the whole continuous has been the greatest when harbours and channels were deepened. Every time you deepen a canal so that vessels can carry two or three hundred tons more, you lessen the freight charges on the railways and you increase the amount that the farmers of Canada will get for their grain. The time of lockage at the Soo is 37 minutes each way, but it is less on the Canadian canal, which is worked by electricity. The Niagara ship canal, the canal from the lakes to the Atlantic, has been before the public for nearly a century. New York people want it to cross New York to aid in keeping up commercial and financial New York, but western people want it where it will be handiest for lake traffic. The growth of trade in all the lakes has been steady and rapid. Lake Superior is exceptional, due in a large part to the opening of St. Mary's canal. General Poe says:

> For two centuries this brother of the sea, this greatest of all inland seas lay in distant isolation, enfolded by a wilderness, the coming civilization heralded only by the missionary and fur trader coasting along its silent shore.

This is the dictum of a gentleman who had charge of the navigation on the United States side of the lakes; he was as large in mind as he was in body, and he foresaw what the future would bring forth, and had it not been for his efforts they would not have had the last lock at the Soo. The Welland canal up to 1892 cost about $25,000,000, and up to that date the largest vessels to go through were the whalebacks, 265 feet long, 38 feet beam, and 15-foot draft loaded. The report of the government of the United States says that the total cost of all harbour and river improvements up to the close of 1890 was $40,912,-

975, but the saving effected by transportation by lake marine more than pays this back in a single season. I wish to say that the three government vessels that have been built on the lakes, the 'Vigilant,' the 'Lurcher' and the 'Anticosta,' are the best boats that could be built for that purpose. I do not say anything as to their cost, but better boats you could not have. The boats built at Collingwood and other places on the lakes for our merchant marine are better than those built in the old country, because the latter are built as ocean-going vessels and are not suitable for navigation on the lakes. Mr. Speaker, I believe firmly that I have a good case. This is one of the most important matters that has been brought before parliament in a great many years, and my only fear is that I have not been able to present it to the House as strongly as I should. Had I the eloquence of the Prime Minister combined with the eloquence of my own leader, I am afraid that even then I would fail to put these facts before parliament with sufficient force. But I have a good case. It reminds me of an incident that occurred when as a young man I used to be on the lakes myself for a while. I wish I had remained there, because I liked the life and if I had done so I would not be obliged to give up the trust which my constituents have reposed in me in case a certain Bill passes which is designed to cut out all we poor men who come to parliament. Nowadays a vessel makes 23 trips to Lake Superior, but in the olden days a vessel only made 12 trips or 13 at most from Buffalo to Chicago. There was an old owner at Lockport, N.Y., who had a number of vessels that were making money; in those days they got 5 and 6 and 7 cents for grain. This owner noticed at the end of each year that the captain put in each of his trip bills $2 for a horse to the customs-house. One year the owner went to Chicago on one of his ships called the 'Moonlight,' a noted boat, and he found there was a small customs station right at the wharf and that all the captain had to do was to walk upstairs and enter his boat. However, the owner was making good money and he said nothing about the $2 charged for a horse. On the way down he said: 'Captain, I do not think it is any use to have a horse to go up those stairs.' Next season the captain was successful in making 14 trips and when he brought in his bill there was no $2 for a horse to the customs-house. The owner remarked this and the captain replied: 'Well, boss, the two dollars is there all right, but you don't see it.' And so I say I have a good case here whether or not I have been successful in making gentlemen on both sides of the House see it. We in Canada have our cod fisheries on the Atlantic, our salmon fisheries on the Pacific, our endless forests, our inexhaustible iron deposits, our uncounted acres of the finest wheat land in the world, our coal areas unfathomed in British Coluimba and Nova Scotia, and finally the best half of the greatest inland waterway on the globe which must ever be the channel of a stupendous and constantly increasing commerce. Through the administration of this inheritance more than any other perhaps, is the proper destiny of Canada to be achieved. I am reminded of a story told by a German doctor of a capitalist in the west who became ill on a train and when he asked the doctor what was the matter with him the doctor said: 'Vell, I cannot tell you until I get you on the table.' And when they did get him on the table they found him full of undigested securities. I trust that will not be the case with Canada. We can supply England with grain, and after the Nile cataracts have been dammed, Egypt will give her cotton. No one nation is going to allow itself to be dominated and controlled by any other nation. Here is an extract from one of the highest authorities on marine matters, Froude's 'English Seamen in the Sixteenth Century:'

> Viewed from whatever standpoint we may assume, it is impossible to arrive at any other conclusion than that the British merchant marine is not only the greatest British industry, but that for its overwhelming importance and far-reaching effect upon mankind, it is the most stupendous monument of human energy and enterprise that the world has ever seen. Take away her merchant fleet, take away the navy that guards them, her empire will come to an end, her colonies will fall off like leaves from a withered tree, and Great Britain will become an insignificant island in the North Sea, for future students to discuss the fate of, in their debating societies.

This speaks of the navy. I am not discussing this question from a naval point of view. The Beaver and the Maple leaf are emblems of peace. I am discussing the question from a commercial standpoint, and in that respect nation fights nation for the supremacy of the sea. I trust that this parliament, on one side and on the other, will bend its energies and bring in legislation to enable Canadians to build Canadian ships to carry Canadian produce, and bring back the freights to be spent in Canada. Canadian ships must be manned by Canadian men and boys. There is more interest in one old wind-jammer that pounds her way from the Bay of Fundy or the St. Lawrence Gulf to Hull, or from Port Arthur at the western end of Lake Superior down to Kingston, or from Vancouver to Alaska or Honolulu, provided it carries the flag of Canada, than in the proudest liner afloat, if she is a foreigner and is manned by Chinese. Under that flag the hearts at home will go out to the hearts at sea; and, in the language of Lord Dufferin, one of the finest men that ever graced the office of Governor General of Canada, as that ship

returns from a foreign clime, the girls at home will have hold of the tow rope.

I move that the House do now adjourn.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry that I have not been able to follow as closely as I would like the remarks that have been made by the hon. member. I was able, however, to hear the greater part of his speech, which was very interesting, especially to me, who happens to be a new minister in charge of the marine affairs of this country. I cannot pretend at this time to discuss all the questions that have been brought forward by my hon. friend; and I am under the impression that I could not deal with them as fully as he has done, or, I am sure, as interestingly. One or two points, however, I would like to draw the attention of the House to for a moment. My hon. friend has referred to the industry of ship building, and has advocated the adoption of a policy for increasing the tonnage and the number of vessels built in this country. We all agree with him in that respect. We all agree that every effort should be made to increase the ship building industry in Canada. Unfortunately, during some years there was a great decrease in that industry. I find that in 1879 the tonnage of Canadian built vessels was about 100,000 tons. In 1896 that had decreased to 16,000 tons. I do not know what the cause of that was. Some people claim that it was on account of the policy which was in force during those years, which tended to decrease our export and import traffic. I do not want to express any opinion on that question just now, especially as my hon. friend has treated the question in a very dispassionate way without touching upon party differences, and in that respect I must congratulate him. The tonnage of Canadian vessels has increased from 16,000 tons in 1896 to 43,000 tons a year ago. I do not know whether that is due to the policy of the existing administration or not, but if my hon. friend looks at these figures I am sure that, with the great knowledge of the subject that he has, he will be able to express views which will enlighten the House.

Mr. LEWIS. A great deal of that has not been kept in Canada.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend has also referred to the question of transportation. I do not wish to discuss that question just now, especially as it does not pertain to my department. He also refers to questions relating to masters and mates and the inspection of barges. The question of the inspection of barges is a very important one, and I may say is now engaging the serious consideration of the government. We must consider, however, that the inspection of barges would probably result in increased taxation upon the shipping trade, and consequently increased cost of transportation. My hon. friend is aware that water transportation is receiving to-day very serious competition from the railways. There is no inspection of the railways, and there are no charges made upon them on that account. Would it be advisable to impose on water transportation additional charges to those to which it is subject to-day? It is a question to be considered; and I am sure that my hon. friend (Mr. Lewis) who has given to this question so much consideration must have examined that feature of the situation also. As to the question of masters and mates, that matter is now before a committee of this House, which committee will probably report in a few days. Some important interest might be affected by the policy suggested by my hon. friend. I am sorry that he is not a member of the committee to which these Bills have been referred; but I suppose he will attend the sittings of that committee and that we shall have the benefit of his views upon these questions.

I think it would be useless for me to dwell at length now upon the remarks of my hon. friend. I did not expect that he was going to bring up all the questions to which he has referred. But, there is one other subject to which I would like to refer in a word before resuming my seat—the question of ship building. During the sittings of the Tariff Commission, representations were made by several speakers in favour of granting some bounties to stimulate the construction of ships. This question of course, will engage the attention of the Tariff Commission and the government when the time comes to deal with the tariff, and my hon. friend (Mr. Lewis) may be sure that the government will take into consideration in his connection the remarks he has made on the subject.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toront). I would like to ask the Minister of Customs whether he has yet received that German tariff about which inquiries have been made on several occasions.

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs). I have not asked since the matter was last referred to, but I will try to inquire to-morrow. The hon. gentleman refers to the tariff supposed to be in effect on March 1st of this year?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON. These tariffs go to the Department of Trade and Commerce and I have not yet asked.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) that long promised and long delayed return?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). The report was brought before me yesterday; but I noticed that something which was mentioned in the order moved by my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) was not covered by the report, and so I kept it back and gave instructions to have it completed.

LORD'S DAY OBSERVANCE.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). With the permission and indulgence of the House I desire to move

That the Bill intituled an Act respecting the Lord's Day be referred to a committee composed of Messrs. Daniel, Ames, Pringle, Roche (Marquette), Macdonell (Toronto), Piché, Smith (Nanaimo), Miller, Geoffrion, Macdonald (Pictou), Sinclair, and the mover, with authority to examine the said Bill, summons and hear witnesses and report thereon to the House.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER. Before that motion is carried, there are one or two subsections of section four concerning the meaning of which I would like to inquire. Subsection (g) provides for :

The continuance to their destination of railway trains in transit when the Lord's Day begins, which are loaded exclusively with live stock destined for immediate shipment at any ocean port, or with perishable goods, or with both.

What is the 'destination' of a train such as that described in this section ? Is it the ocean port from which the cattle are to be shipped for export, or is it simply the point to which the train runs with the men then in charge of it, and where a new engine is attached and another set of train hands take charge to make their run ? If it is the ocean port, the objection which occurred to my mind would not arise. But, if the 'destination' is some point this side of the ocean port, and if the train is to be held during Sunday, it seems to me the point requires some consideration. Everybody who has observed these matters must be aware of the hardships endured by live stock in transport even with the best of treatment and under the best conditions. It does seem to me that it would not be to the advantage of the stock or that it would accord with humanitarian considerations to have the live stock held at an intermediate place during the Sunday. If they are compelled to remain in the train, the exhaustion and discomfort of a hard journey are increased. If they are taken out of the train, they must be herded into a place which may be inadequate for the number it has to accommodate. It may be in inclement weather and in a place where there is little shelter and no comfort. In any case it is a great hardship to the stock, and we cannot leave that point out of consideration. It is also a great disadvantage to the shipper of the stock, because the delay and constant expense tells in two or three different ways. When live stock are shipped for export all speed that can be made in order to shorten their journey and land them as quickly as possible is necessary both for the profit of the trade and for the comfort of the animals themselves. That, it seems to me, is worth careful consideration. No Christian man, no matter how much he reverences the Sabbath and wishes to have it observed, desires, in the observance of it and of his wishes, to inflict unnecessary loss and much less to inflict suffering which can otherwise be avoided. If the cattle remain, there still has to be help in order to take care of them in a temporary place. If they go on, it is doubtful if the amount of help employed is very much greater than it would be at the temporary stopping place so far as those cattle are concerned. I would like to have the opinion of the Minister of Justice as to what that word 'destination' means in this clause.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The suggestion which my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has made is one that naturally comes to any one who has in mind the conditions to which he refers. The intention was, and I think there is very little ambiguity about the clause, and if there is we can remedy it in committee, to make the point the destination of the goods, not of the train. What is intended is, that the goods, cattle or perishable goods, should reach their destination. I presume the destination of the train and of the goods must be considered as identical ; I imagine there might possibly be confusion and it is our duty to make that point absolutely clear.

A difficulty which has presented itself to my mind, but which I do not think I mentioned when I moved the second reading of the Bill but which seems to me to be a very real difficulty, is what is to be done with the cattle or perishable goods when they have reached their destination. The case of the goods while in transit I think is fairly covered. Take for instance a carload of fruit which leaves the Niagara district on Saturday. Of course fruit gathered on that day must be disposed of, it is sent forward, say to Montreal, as a point of destination. When that fruit has reached Montreal it cannot be allowed to remain a whole day on the sidings in Montreal but must be taken care of. The same thing would apply to fish and other articles of that sort. Therefore I would ask the attention especially of any members of the House interested—and I suppose we are all interested in this Bill, I am sure we are interested in making it a workable measure,—to see how we are to provide for this contingency. What is to be done with these goods at the point of destination ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is most important, I realize, in the interests of the Bill

that we should have a workable, reasonable measure, such a measure as will have behind it the force of public opinion, and not a measure that the judges and other people may consider it practically their duty to endeavour to evade as far as possible.

Mr. FOSTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BARKER. I would like to call attention to subsection (f) of that same section. It refers to smelting works and requires the furnaces to be 'banked down', as it is called, on Sunday, so that the process of smelting must be checked on Sunday, resumed on Monday and so on until completion. But I call the attention of the minister to the fact that by banking down on Sunday the process of smelting is hindered and checked and that the iron so produced will not be of the quality that it would be if the process were continuous. That is a very important point to consider, especially at large smelters, where the work is continuous, and I think evidence should be received upon the point because it is well known that a large portion of the iron that is produced after such a check is not of a good marketable quality.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My attention has been called to that very real difficulty which my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) has pointed out, and one of the objects which I had in view when I suggested to the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) that this Bill might be referred to a committee was that we might have the advantage of the experience of practical men who would come before the committee, make their suggestions to us and enable us by their co-operation and by conferences with them to reach a solution for the difficulties and produce a workable measure.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I would like now, if I may be permitted, to give notice at once that it is desired to have this committee meet on Monday. I make a public statement now in order that all interested parties may take notice of the fact.

SAFETY OF SHIPS.

Mr. SINCLAIR moved the third reading of Bill (No. 48) respecting the safety of ships.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I think it was understood that all these Bills to which an amendment was made in committee would be referred to the law clerk. I think it would be a good practice to follow that all Bills which have been amended in committee should be submitted to the law clerk immediately after the amendments are made and should not receive their third reading on the same day. I do not know if it has been done, but if it has been done we must wait until the law clerk has seen if it is correct. I move that the debate do now adjourn.

Motion (Mr. Brodeur) agreed to.

MONTREAL HARBOUR BOARD.

House resumed consideration of the proposed motion of Mr. Rivet:

For copies of all documents, correspondence and resolutions received by the government or by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, from the Chamber of Commerce and the Board of Trade of Montreal, or from any corporation or private individual, respecting the reorganization or abolition of the Montreal Harbour Board.

Motion agreed to without discussion.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For copies of all correspondence, reports, telegrams, valuations and memoranda in possession of the government, or any member or official thereof, with reference to damages for lands expropriated for railway purposes on the line built between Montague and Cardigan, Prince Edward Island; also names of commissioners or valuators, or both; copies of all valuations made, by whom made, giving the names and the amounts separately awarded to each; also list of names of persons who accepted valuators' awards, and also of persons whose valuations have not been accepted by the government; also list of persons who have been paid or accepted valuations.—Mr. A. A. McLean.

For a copy of all petitions, letters, correspondence, reports, memoranda and any other documents respecting the dismissal of Mr. Patrick Walsh from the postmastership of East Roman Valley, in the county of Guysborough, Nova Scotia.—Mr. Lancaster.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Indians in the Yukon—relief and medical attendance, $6,000.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). This is the same amount as last year, and is necessary to furnish relief to destitute cases in the Yukon. The number of Indians in the territories actually located is 702. The expenditure for destitute Indians and medical attendance in 1903-4 was $4,611.11; for 1904-5, $5,977.

Mr. J. D. REID. Are not the prices of supplies decreasing each year? The cost of transportation is much less this last year.

Mr. OLIVER. There is not much difference in the last two years, but there is a great difference as compared with former years.

Mr. BARR. How many medical men are employed, and are they on salary or otherwise? It seems to me this is a very large figure. There must either be a great deal of sickness or the physicians charge very high fees.

Mr. OLIVER. I find from the Auditor General's Report of payments in the preceding year that there were four officials who were paid each $50 a month. They are officers of the mounted police, and receive fees to compensate them for their extra duties in connection with the Indians, aside altogether from their duties in connection with the police. These Indians in the Yukon are not on reservations but are scattered over the territories. Of course, medical attendance and services of all kinds are very high in the Yukon. There are over 700 Indians.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Why is it that from 1896 to 1905 the number of physicians has increased to 106, while the Indian population has not increased to any extent? The salaries paid to physicians in 1896 was $33,000; in 1905 they were $69,000.

Mr. OLIVER. A number of those who had hitherto been paid by fees were placed on salary since the date first mentioned. That had the effect of increasing the expenditure somewhat, but I think we have a better service. Our information shows that the results of the change are for the better, although a little more expensive.

Mr. J. D. REID. Are these Indians in the Yukon increasing or decreasing in number?

Mr. OLIVER. They are decreasing. They are not gathered on reserves, they roam at large. We have not very accurate statistics of their number.

Mr. KEMP. Was any money spent for this purpose previous to the discovery of gold in the Yukon?

Mr. OLIVER. No, there was not.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I do not wish to prolong the discussion at all but I certainly believe that it is very unreasonable for the hon. minister to merely make the statement that it is necessary to have 106 more doctors for practically the same population and that instead of $33,000 being expended as was the case when the doctors were under fees, now that they are under salary, the cost to this country is over double—$69,000. I think that some fuller explanation should be made than that which the hon. minister is giving.

Mr. OLIVER. I understand the hon. member to say that that is the increase in ten years?

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Yes.

Mr. OLIVER. Well, during these ten years there was taken under supervision the additional treaty 8 and there was assumed responsibility in regard to a large part of British Columbia where responsibility had not been assumed before, and of course within these years the responsibilities of the Yukon were also added. While I still say that there was no doubt an actual and apparent increase in the expenditure for medical attendance upon the Indians which we believe was justified by the necessities of the case and has also been justified by the results a large part of the increase is due to the extension of the operations of the department over treaty No. 8, over the Yukon and over the part of British Columbia over which we did not exercise the same supervision before.

Mr. FOSTER. I might ask the hon. minister whether or not the Yukon council has anything to do with the Indians in that district.

Mr. OLIVER. For schools and relief the Yukon government act as the agents of the Indian Department. For medical attendance the work is done in connection with the Mounted Police. The Mounted Police are given an additional fee for their attendance on the Indians.

Mr. FOSTER. This being an item in the Yukon perhaps it would be as well for us to raise the question which has been two or three times raised here as to whether or not there is any medium of communication between this parliament and the Yukon council as regards information required here in reference to expenditures made under the council. I understand the hon. Minister of the Interior takes the ground that if we want information about the Yukon we are to get it the best way we can, that he does not consider that he is bound to look after that or to get it unless he is compelled to. Now, that was not always the minister's proposition. He did not always maintain that the council was absolutely its own master in the matter of these expenditures, and that there was no supervision over it by this government, and consequently by this parliament for in July, 1905, when he was passing his estimates for the Northwest on a vote of $134,000, I, myself, asked him the question:

> Is there any supervision by this government over the expenditure?

And the answer was that,

> The accounts are audited by our Auditor General.

Then asked:

> What guarantee is there that they spend the money for that purpose?

And the hon. Minister of the Interior answered:

> The commissioner is an officer of this government responsible to us and he is president of the Yukon council?

Recently I asked that we should have some information in reference to an extraordinary expenditure by the Yukon council, or a proposed extraordinary expenditure, news of such coming to independent members of parliament as only such news can.

I notice an hon. member for British Columbia smiles when I talk of independent members of parliament. I can quite recognize why he should. That word, may be, is not in his vocabulary, but vocabularies differs with different members and some may have such a word, some may use it and properly use it as well. I was going on to say that the only source from which we can gather a great deal of our first information is from the press, and the enterprising members of the press who ferret out certain things, get at them very closely or get at them altogether and finding their way into the columns of the press they catch the eyes of members of parliament as well as others. Thereupon inquiries can be made. Now, in a very circumstantial way the information came that an extraordinary expenditure was authorized by the council and would be carried out during the coming summer—no less than making rain through the instrumentality of a gentleman from the United States of America. This rain, I suppose, was to come down from above. This government has had a good many different kinds of experiments. About $50,000 of the people's money was spent by the predecessor of my hon. friend in stopping rain from coming up from below ; in other words, in plugging up a hole that some enterprising prospector had bored in his search for the yellow metal, and the former Minister of the Interior, always humanitarian and always large and expansive in his ideas of expenditure, immediately issued an order that the hole was to be plugged, and if it was not plugged he would know the reason why. Whether he was an expert in the matter of plugging holes or not I do not know, but he went to work on it with the resources of the Dominion behind him and before he stopped $50,000 of the people's money is said to have been spent. Whether the hole is plugged for ever and ever or not, I do not know. Now, not to be outdone by the preceding Minister of the Interior the present Minister of the Interior is himself to make a hole in the heavens and bring down rain from above in order to supply the parched earth and help the miners to wash out their mud. This extraordinary expenditure is proposed to be made by a Christian and intelligent people who have outlived superstitions and who, having had some common school education and some of them a chance to look into a college or a university, might very well be supposed to have passed that stage of old time credulity when it was supposed that by mumming, or prayers, or incantations, or anything at all of that kind the courses of nature could be changed or diverted from the way that an all ruling Providence had ordered them long before the creation of this world. I had supposed that we had got out of the idea that such things could be made to interfere with the beneficent laws above us. Of course, our comprehension being limited, may be sometimes, we may consider these laws to be inpinging on what we thought were our selfish rights but on what our long experience had proved to be best for every part of the world for all time. But the hon. minister had an ambition that vaulted clear of everything. He wanted to revive that old time period and under his aegis and regime the council over which he has control, over which he declares he has control, is said to have authorized an expenditure of $10,000 towards interfering with Providence and bringing down rain. Naturally an economical mind like my own is inclined to inquire whether this is a proper expenditure. Every intelligent mind wants to know what in the wide world has got hold of the machinery of government in this enlightened age in Canada, which impels an expenditure of $10,000 to get Hatfield up from the United States to bring down rain in the Yukon. When we asked for information it was treated with an altogether unbecoming levity. Anything which pretends to interfere with the ways of Providence is not a subject for levity. But, the Minister of Customs treated it with almost jocularity, and so did the Minister of the Interior at first ; afterwards he got a little angry at our repeated insistence to know what had been done, and he plainly said that we could go to Boston, and he would not get any information for us.

Mr. OLIVER. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon, I did not say ' Boston ' and I did'nt mean Boston.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps the vernacular would be stronger, but I selected the centre of culture and refinement of the United States as a more habitable destination than that to which the Minister of the Interior would have consigned us if his language would have been parliamentary. But leaving joking aside—

Mr. PATERSON. Surely you are not joking on such a subject ?

Mr. FOSTER. I am joking at the Minister of the Interior, I was serious on the providential side of the question. We would like the Minister of the Interior to kindly give us the information with reference to that alleged proposal, and if he has not got it we ask that he will get it as quickly as possible. I believe there is telegraphic communication with the Yukon and I believe the commissioner to the Yukon was here.

Mr. BERGERON. He is here yet.

Mr. FOSTER. It is quite impossible such a thing as this could have been talked about and that the minister and the commissioner did not have some conversation with reference to it. Will the minister gratify our well based curiosity, and not send any of us to Boston for asking this information which we should have.

Mr. MILLER. Whether we listen to a clown in the circus or to the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) we are always interested and we usually laugh. But some of his wit it is rather difficult to understand at times. What did the hon. gentleman mean when he said he did'nt know whether the Minister of the Interior was an expert at plugging holes.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon gentleman will get his information at first hand if he applies to the ex-Minister of the Interior.

Mr. MILLER. The ex-Minister of the Interior did not use the language ; the hon. member for Toronto did.

Mr. TAYLOR. The ex-minister got $50,000 voted for plugging the hole.

Mr. HENDERSON. And I am not very sure that the ex-Minister of the Interior did not use the expression. Quite a lengthy discussion took place here about plugging up this hole and my recollection of the language of Mr. Sifton was, that after the people of the Yukon had tried to stop the flow of water by putting down bags of peas and beans which they hoped would swell in the hole, they wired to the Minister of the Interior telling him they had failed, and asking what they should do. My recollection is that the minister wired back : 'Plug the hole.' And so he became the author of the expression. At all events the expression was used by more than one member of the House as the debates will show, and the Minister of the Interior regarded it as a very good joke. And more than that, after they had filched $50,000 out of the treasury of this country to plug the hole, it was found that the hole did not require plugging for the water continued to flow, and those in charge of the plugging wired to the minister to know how much rental he would charge for the use of the water. I have no doubt that the present Minister of the Interior recollects very well that during the election of 1904 the issue was raised on the platforms of Alberta, that while the Yukon people could get $50,000 to plug a hole which did not require plugging, the Alberta people could not get any money out of this government at all. It seems to me these two questions are akin. In one case the Yukon council spent $50,000 to prevent water coming up, and now they are spending other thousands of dollars to get rain to come down. We are entitled to information about this. I believe it is another scheme to get money out of the treasury of this country for which no value will be received.

Mr. OLIVER. I presume my hon. friends opposite are not desirous of being taken seriously because if so they would have discussed this question when the vote for the government of the Yukon was up, rather than on a vote for destitute Indians, which whatever may be its merits or demerits the government of the Yukon is not responsible for except as the agents of this government in distributing the money. I think this is the third reference of my hon. friend from North Toronto to the question, of rain making in the Yukon, and he has been so anxious and urgent on the subject that he could not wait until the matter might have been fairly brought up in its proper place and at the proper time. I therefore take for granted that he is more desirous of airing his oratorical ability, ventilating his supposed wit and impeding the progress of business in this House than he is to arrive at intelligent conclusions in regard to an important matter. I understand that the position the hon. member takes now is that business is to be impeded until certain information that he demands shall be secured. In regard to that, I will say this, that there is no member of this House more anxious to facilitate the business of the House and to place before it all proper information than I am; I think I have given ample evidence of that since holding the position I do. But there is a very important question at issue in this matter—the question of responsible government; and, as I took the liberty of remarking on a previous occasion, the hon. member and his friends on that side of the House hold a radically different view from that held by myself and my friends on this side, in regard to responsible government; and we may as well have that question tried out here and now, if my hon. friend wishes. We hold that having established a government in the Yukon, having established a legislature there, and having given that legislature powers of taxation and of expenditure, that legislature is entitled to exercise those powers in regard to the money raised by itself by its own means of taxation, without let or hindrance on the part of this government. That is our position ; we believe it to be correct.

Mr. FOSTER. Do you speak for the government in that ?

Mr. OLIVER. I take the liberty on this occasion of speaking for the government. We are quite aware that it is part of our responsibility to see that money that is voted for any purpose in the Yukon by this government shall be expended for that purpose; but there is money voted to the control of the Yukon Council, and there is money raised by the taxation of that Yukon Council; I take the position that it is the principle of the party on this side of the House that that Yukon Council shall be free to exercise its own best judgment in the expenditure of what is practically its own money. In regard to the position taken by my hon. friend on a previous occasion, if I may allude to it here, we again take issue with him in regard to the authority he may be expected to assume over the Yukon Council and its legislative action, because of the fact that certain members of that council hold salaried positions under

this government. When those gentlemen were appointed as legislators for the Yukon, they were appointed to legislate for the Yukon, and not to act as the legislative agents of this government. Their responsibility in regard to legislation and in regard to expenditures agreed to by them, is to their position as members of the Yukon Council, and not to their position as judges or other officers under this government. We take radical ground on that point, and the people of the Yukon thoroughly understand our position, that these men are appointed to legislate for the Yukon, and not for the government at Ottawa. As I said before, if my hon. friend and his leader disapprove of the action of the Yukon Council in this matter—and I am not here to defend the Yukon Council on that or any other matter—it would be, I think, fairer on their part to this suffering country if they combined a portion of their wealth, and telegraphed their distinguished disapproval to the Yukon Council, when I have no doubt it would receive all the consideration it deserves.

Mr. FOSTER. Why, then, if this present version given by my hon. friend on behalf of the government is correct, did the minister use the language he did on the 11th of July, 1905, when I asked him, 'Is there any supervision by this government over that expenditure ?'—that is, the expenditure of the Yukon vote—and when he said : 'The accounts are audited by our Auditor General' and when he was asked, 'What guarantee is there that they spend the money for that purpose ?' he answered : 'The commissioner is an officer of this government, responsible to us, and he is the president of the Yukon Council.' Now what change has taken place since July 11, 1905? Any in legislation? None. Any in constitutional principles ? None. No change has taken place. If the minister uttered the truth and the proper principle on the 11th of July, 1905, it is the proper principle now, and it is true now. Which horn of the dilemma will the minister take? English language is English language, and it is perfectly plain. No statement could be more definitely made than the statement of the minister which I have just read, that the commissioner is an officer of this government, and as such is responsible to this government.

The principle that was affirmed there was that this money was voted for that service. But it is expended under an officer of this government as president of the council which expends it ; and he, being our officer, is responsible. If he is the officer of this government, he is the officer of this parliament. The only means of communication we have with him, however, is through his responsible minister, the Minister of the Interior ; and the government which appointed him and which pays him, and which can dismiss him at any time it chooses to do so. A portion of that money is expended, or proposed to be expended in a certain way. Keeping directly in mind the question and answer of July 11, 1905, we say to the government : If he is your officer and responsible to you, you are the medium through which we must inquire as to expenditures, alleged or real, which have been made under his supervision as president of the council. Cannot this parliament follow its own money and its own officer just as far as that officer can go ? Surely that is a principle which nobody can dispute. Yet the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who leads this government, who has had experience of the constitution and of the policy, and who knows what has been the practice, is made to stand in his place, through the Minister of the Interior, and declare that if we gentlemen are anxious to find out anything as to the expenditure of the money by the Yukon council, we can club together and send for the information. Does the Prime Minister of this country really take that position ? The hon. Minister of the Interior says he does. Does the Liberal government, of all governments, take that position ? The Minister of the Interior says it does. He spoke for himself, but when I questioned him he also spoke for the whole government. If that is the position, we want to know it. If that is the position, I have no hesitation at all in saying that it is a position that is absolutely indefensible, that it has no constitutional or legal ground ; and I doubt very much, if the Prime Minister were here to-night, that he would take that position himself. I know that I am bound to take the word of the Minister of the Interior.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Which word ?

Mr. FOSTER. That is a very important and very pertinent question. Which word am I to take ? To-night he says that they are perfectly independent, that they are a legislative body; that they do their legislating and their expending, and we have no control over them—we have nothing to do with them. A few months ago he said the exact opposite.

But here is the simple position : Under our right as members of parliament—as an opposition if the hon. members on the other side do not care to vindicate the right of parliament on this point—under our responsibility to look after the expenditures of this country and to exercise our influence with regard to them, we ask whether such a thing has been done or such an amount expended by order of the Yukon council. We put that question to the only man whom we can ask, the Minister of the Interior in whose department this officer is and under whose department the Yukon is administered. And what answer do we get ? The simple answer—the simple insult, that is what it is—that, if we want to find out, we

can club together and cable to the Yukon. The members of parliament have no executive authority; this gentleman is not our officer, he is the officer of the government. We have no right to go to the department of the minister and take any of his officers by the collar and demand of him such and such information. He is the officer of this parliament, the officer of the public; but he is an officer under a system of government, and the man to get the information that he has is the responsible head of the department—the minister can give instructions and demand information. Then, if we cannot go to the officers in the department, we certainly cannot go to the Yukon and order any officer there to send us a cablegram giving certain information. No one on that side of the House, outside of the minister, would attempt to maintain such an absurd proposition as that put forth by the hon. gentleman. I say again that it is unconstitutional; I say again that it is simply an insult to this parliament as it has been put by the Minister of the Interior.

Mr. OLIVER. I am more fortunate in this debate than in the debate of the other day, for then my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) was at liberty to say what he pleased, and I had no right to reply to him. Allow me to suggest that the hon. gentleman has to-night absolutely misstated the words I used; and he has done it deliberately for he made the same misstatement on a previous occasion——

Mr. FOSTER. What is the misstatement?

Mr. OLIVER. I did not say that the hon. member (Mr. Foster) and any others would have to club together and cable for the information. What I did suggest to them and what I do suggest now is that, if they wished to express their distinguished disapproval of the action of the Yukon council if they would cable their disapproval it would avoid a waste of the time of this House and of the country, and I had no doubt that it would receive all the consideration that it deserved. In my opinion the expression of their view is quite different from a request on their part for information. As to information, there is no member of this House who is more anxious to give all the information that can be desired than I am. As soon as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) will demonstrate that the information that he asks for is a matter of parliamentary right and not of idle curiosity, or an occasion for ribaldry, he will get the information and get it quickly. But, so far, he has not attempted to demonstrate that point. My hon. friend suggests that there is a difference between my word of last year and what I have said now. There are none so blind as they who will not see.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) being one of these.

Mr. OLIVER. Oh, I can see all right—I can see right through the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster). I said last year that this government had the right to follow its own money and to call to account its officer for the expenditure of money. And I say so still. But, if this parliament votes money to be expended for certain purposes for the Yukon, the matter to be administered by the Yukon council, that council is responsible to this government. But when we vote a sum of money expressly for distribution by the Yukon council without let or hindrance on our part, I submit it is not constitutional and it certainly is not in accordance with Liberal principles, that we should call the Yukon council to account for the use they have seen fit to make of that which we have placed in their own hands as their own money. Besides that, as I pointed out, the Yukon council raised money on its own account and surely my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) will concede to the Yukon council the privilege of expending as it pleases the money that it raises from the people of the Yukon under the authority vested in it by this parliament. If they will not concede that to the people of the Yukon, to the Yukon council, then they certainly will not concede that to the Yukon people which this government would desire to concede to them and which it does concede to them.

Mr. FOSTER. Let us try that matter out a little and see how it works. My hon. friend (Mr. Oliver) tried to make a distinction and draw himself out of a position which even he saw was untenable.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I must ask your protection.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not going to hurt you.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, I need not quote Shakespeare to the hon. gentleman; he understands well enough that when he undertakes to misrepresent and misstate what I say in this House I am entitled to your protection and I claim it.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I put myself under the Chair's protection. The hon. gentleman, seeing that he had got into a rather tight place and trying to draw himself out of it—

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Chairman, I did not try to draw myself out of a tight place but I objected to being put in a wrong position by the misstatements of the hon. gentleman.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. FOSTER. I will accept the hon. gentleman's statement that he did not try to draw himself out of a tight place. That is my conception of it, and with all due deference to my hon. friends knowledge of constitutional principles and the rules of debate I have a right to my own conception

of the hon. gentleman's position. My conception of it was that he saw he had got into a very tight place and that he tried to draw himself, as gently and as quickly as possible, out of that tight place by saying that he did not suggest we should club together and ask for information but that we should club together and telegraph to the council our distinguished disapproval of the council's action in this respect. I said before, that I had no right to go over into the hon. gentleman's department and by force compel one of his officers to do something which I wanted done but I suppose the hon. gentleman would think I was quite within my right if I should address a most savage remonstrance to one of his officers, his deputy or otherwise, hauling him over the coals for not doing something in the department which I wanted him to do. There would be a distinction in my hon. friend's mind between these two. There is no distinction in my mind ; when you give me the right to do one you give me absolutely the right to do the other. The minister thinks I am prolonging the discussion and that I am obstructing the estimates. The example has been given before in this House and during this session of parliament where a minister deliberately obstructed his own estimates and did not do so with any great advantage to his estimates or to the time of the House.

Mr. PATERSON. Don't look at me.

Mr. FOSTER. No. And I will just by way of kindness suggest to the Minister of the Interior that he should be careful not to fall into the same pit that his brother minister fell into and be guilty of obstructing his own estimates. We are not obstructing estimates for the sake of obstructing estimates, we are trying to get from the minister either the information, if he has it, or a promise from him that he will get us the information ; we are getting it on the constitutional grounds, and if the minister chooses to obstruct his estimates by refusing to do that the responsibility is on the minister and not on us on this side of the House.

Mr. OLIVER. We have been discussing this matter for some time. I have said to the hon. member before and I say to him again that if he will demonstrate that the question he asks is a parliamentary right, and not a matter of idle curiosity, there will not be one moment lost in securing the information; but does the hon. gentleman suggest to this House and this country that he proposes to hold up the business of this House from time to time as may suit him in the interest of idle curiosity or revelry or ribaldry as he has done ?

Mr. FOSTER. I am afraid I will have to call for the protection of the Chairman. Mr. Chairman, will you look this way once in a while and when you see the Minister of the Interior abusing an independent member on this side of the House will you not throw the mantle of your protection over him ? I know you will, for I know your kindness of heart, but I object to the Minister of the Interior, or any other minister, charging me with idle curiosity. Who is to be the judge of my position here as a member and of the information that I think I require and that I think I have a right to ? Will any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House, be he minister or not, take it upon himself to charge me or any other member on this side with idle curiosity, simply because it suits him to do so, when in the pursuit of our duty we ask for information to which we are entitled ? He invites me to demonstrate to him my right to ask him. I decline to do it ; I stand here on my right as a member of this parliament, representing just as good a constituency, representing it just as intelligently, and representing it with just as long an experience as my hon. friend represents his, and I object entirely to his reading into my action and my speech his own motives, be they worthy or unworthy. I also will not undertake to demonstrate to him my right because I have come to the conclusion that the jury is not a jury to which I would like to appeal. I would like to appeal to a jury of my equals in intelligence and in knowledge of constitutional procedure, and I am sure if the hon. minister takes the position which he has just lately taken and perseveres in it, that he can hardly call himself an equal of other members in this House with regard to constitutional principles and practice. Therefore, again I ask that the minister will give us this information being the responsible head of the appointed officer who administers in part the vote which this parliament gave for general purposes, not for special purposes ? What right has the minister to say that the $5,000 or $10,000 which is to be spent on this rainmaking business is out of the particular portion of money which they raised from taxes in the Yukon? They raise a part of the revenue, we give the rest of it, but it all comes into the one treasury and the $10,000 is just as much a vote of what we vote as it is out of what they receive there.

The Prime Minister is here now and I propose to ask him a question or two in order that we may get out of this dilemma. I have taken the position as a member of parliament with a duty to perform, that we have a right to information as to the proposed expenditure by the Yukon Council of a sum of money for rainmaking purposes. I think I have that right because of the position the Minister of the Interior took on the 11th of July, 1905, when he was trying to get his vote through parliament. The vote was for $134,000, a general vote. I myself asked him :

Is there any supervision by this governmen over that expenditure ?

Mr. OLIVER. The accounts are audited by our Auditor General.

The accounts of the province of New Brunswick are not audited by our Auditor General, the accounts of British Columbia are not audited by our Auditor General. There must be, therefore, some difference generical and actual between the position of the Yukon and the position of a self-governing province. Then Mr. Bergeron asked:

What guarantee is there that they spend the money for that purpose?

Mr. OLIVER. The commissioner is an officer of this government, responsible to us, and he is president of the Yukon council.

That was the answer of the present Minister of the Interior, of your Minister of the Interior. Now that is a fair and plain position. I do not think anybody can draw from it any other conclusion than this: We vote the money, we appoint the officer, we have a right to follow the money and to make requisitions on the officer for information as to how it is spent, and the minister being an officer of this parliament is the means through which parliament or any member of it can communicate in this respect. To-night and on previous occasions the minister takes directly opposite ground that we have no supervision at all over the expenditure of the Yukon council, that they are a legislative body, that they are responsible only to themselves, that they are not responsible to us, and he has kindly invited us, if we do not approve of this expenditure or any other, to draw out of our pockets a certain sum of money, to club together and telegraph our distinguished disapproval to the Yukon council of the methods they are pursuing. I asked him if he represented the government in that, or if it were only his own opinion, and he stated that undoubtedly he represented the government in that respect. I put him right on this basis, that we here as members of parliament authorize all expenditure, we make these votes, we have a right to follow these votes out wherever they are expended under officers appointed by ourselves, through the committee of the cabinet who represents this parliament as an executive. I simply asked your Minister of the Interior if he would give us the information, if he had it, as to whether such an order had been passed and for such a purpose, and if he had not, if he would kindly communicate with his officer there, the president of the council, and get us the information. He flatly refused to do it. He says he is practising Liberal doctrine, and that he voices the opinion of the Prime Minister and of the government in that respect. That is where we are.

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to correct my hon. friend in one remark he made. In speaking of the authority of the Yukon council and of the authority of this government in regard to the expenditure, I did not say that the Yukon council had absolute control of all the money that was placed at their disposal.

Mr. FOSTER. Who has?

Mr. OLIVER. I said that the money that was voted by this government for a specific purpose to be expended by the Yukon council for a specific purpose had to be expended for that purpose by that council; that the governor or the commissioner was responsible to us that the money was spent in that way, and it was to that end that the accounts were audited, but that when we voted a certain sum for general expenditure by the Yukon council, then I held that we could not hold the governor of the Yukon responsible for the distribution of that sum.

Mr. FOSTER. What did you hold on July 11, 1905 ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am holding exactly what I held then. Further, I did not flatly refuse, nor did I refuse at all, to bring the information. I said that if the hon. gentleman would demonstrate that he had a right to the information it would be brought as quickly as it could be brought, and nobody would be as glad to do it as myself.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has appealed to me, I do not know in what capacity, whether as arbiter or not. I must say that I am surprised at the views advanced by the hon. gentleman. He has certainly advanced doctrines to which I am not able to subscribe, and I do not think he would subscribe to them himself when he had analysed them. The Yukon territory is administered by a council, and, if I remember right, this council is partly nominated by the Crown and partly by the people; therefore, it is an independent council. Does my hon, friend expect that members of the council who are appointed by the government and those who are elected by the people are to expend money which parliament puts at their disposal at the bidding of this government and are responsible to this government? We may be held responsible for the conduct of members that we appoint ourself, but are we to be held responsible also for the conduct of those who are elected by the people of the Yukon?

Mr. FOSTER. But which is the majority?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is not the point. Is it or is it not an independent body; is it or is it not subordinate to this government or parliament ? My hon. friend assimilates the expenditure of this money by the Yukon council to the expenditure of money by officers subordinate to ourselves,

as if we had the power to say to them: You should do this and you should not do that. I appeal to the judgment of both sides of the House. If the members of the Yukon council are entrusted with the duty of expending the money we place at their disposal, if these members misbehave, if they expend the money in a manner which in our judgment is improper, if they expend it negligently or in an unwarrantable manner, then it would be our duty to revise the expenditure, but we have not to say whether they have acted wisely or unwisely.

But in this case what does it amount to after all? I understood from the paper which was read by my hon. friend that the Yukon council agreed to pay $5,000 to a certain rainmaker, and I understood, rightly or wrongly, from the paper which he read that a certain number of citizens of the community also agreed to pay $5,000. Well, Sir, I ask my hon. friend from North Toronto if in the Yukon territory there are five men so credulous, or at all events with such faith in the powers of the rainmaker, that they will each of them put his hand in his pocket to the extent of $1,000 in order that the experiment may be tried, should we be so severe upon the members of the council if they have the same faith? Does he think we should censure the men who paid out $5,000 of the money which we voted them in order to supplement the money contributed by the citizens? They may have been very unwise. My hon. friend thinks they were unwise. I think they are unwise also. I do not think they will have the value of their money. But, at all events, it would be simply an error of judgment. There was no corruption in it. He and I know as others know that the experiment was tried in California and in some of the other western states and that it did not succeed. At all events they thought they would try and make one more experiment; that they would take $5,000 for this purpose if five leading citizens would contribute a similar amount. Under such circumstances my hon. friend thinks these men are liable to censure. I do not think they are. I say unhesitatingly that I would not have them censured. I might tell them that they have made a great mistake, that I think they will have no benefit from the money, but because they did that I am not prepared to say that they should be visited with condemnation or censure. That is my view of this matter.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, my right hon. friend would never have been a very stern reformer in the old days—a John Hampden or a man of that stripe. He does not look at principle as principle but it is only whether it be a little thing or a big thing. I wonder where the world would have been if all its foremost men had gone on that principle or had based their conduct on grounds of that kind. No one was asking to censure the council or to visit them with condemnation. That has not been the question we have been arguing here. It was simply the question of our right to information. That was the basis, that was the important demand, that was the attitude of hon. gentlemen with me here. That is the only demand we have ever put forward. In arguing for information and in having ourselves rudely stopped from it by the Minister of the Interior we have canvassed such other grounds and such other arguments as came up but there was no expression in regard to censure. The whole thing from first to last has been that we have a right to the information and should get that information. Now, that we have a right to that information my hon. friend has proved up to the hilt by two remarks that he made. He says: What can we do? Part of them are elected and we appoint the majority. Then he says: There is one thing we can do. We cannot tell them how they are to expend their money or the like of that, as unfortunately we cannot successfully do to the government that is opposite to us, but there is one thing we can do, says the right hon. gentleman. What is that? we can, if we consider that they have made a bad use of the funds, dismiss them and appoint others who will make a good use of the funds. Pray, how are we to know whether they have made a good or a bad use of the funds? Will something or other occult in its nature inform the right hon. gentleman's inner consciousness that they have made a misuse of public funds? It does not come in that way. The only way we can find out is to make an inquisition. That is all we are making tonight. We are making an inquisition and if it turns out that they have made a misuse of public funds it will then be first for the government and afterwards for this parliament to see whether these men shall be punished by being dismissed or shall not be punished, but it is absolutely necessary to make an inquisition before we can pass judgment on their conduct and either condone or punish them by the only mode of punishment that my right hon. friend says exists. Does not my right hon. friend see that when he makes the admission or the statement that for a certain misuse of public funds they may be punished by dismissal and the misuse stopped for the future in so far as it can be by that method that he has conceded the whole demand of hon. gentleman on this side for information and toppled over completely the house of cards that the Minister of the Interior has built?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend says that evidently I am not of the stern stamp of John Hampden or Pym. I have to confess that it is true I have fallen into degenerate days and with so many examples before me I cannot expect to live up to those high examples mentioned by my hon. friend,

but allow me to tell him that it is a far distance from John Hampden to the rain maker of the Yukon territory. I agree with my hon. friend. But he has somewhat fallen from the tone of the discussion that he started with. He wanted to know what were our powers over this Yukon council. I have told him what our powers are. We have the power of supervision and that is the only power we can exercise over them. We cannot undo anything that they do but if we find that they are not up to the mark, that they do not come up to our expectations, that they are guilty of malfeasance, or negligence, or stupidity, we can dismiss them. My hon. friend says: Very well, you concede that you are bound to give information. Yes, we do not deny that nor do I understand that my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior denied that it was his duty to give my hon. friend the information which he gave us. But, there is a method of doing this. Every year we receive a copy of all the ordinances which are passed by the Yukon council. It is the duty of the Minister of the Interior to look over them and ascertain whether or not the money has been well expended. It is not simply the duty of the Auditor General to pass upon them and see whether the money has been spent according to the appropriation, but I go further and I say that it is also the duty of my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior to see that the men whom he has appointed and who are in receipt of our confidence have been worthy of that confidence.

Mr. FOSTER. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We shall receive these ordinances in due time and we shall find then whether or not there has been money spent for rain making. But in the meantime, my hon. friend is impatient to have that information. He has not been able to tell us whether there has been such an ordinance passed by the Yukon council. He has only newspaper report for it. If my hon. friend tells us that there has been such an ordinance passed, that there has been such an appropriation made we will telegraph for this information. It may be so that such an ordinance has not been passed.

Mr. FOSTER. I will answer my right hon. friend if he will allow me. His memory will carry him back not very many days ago—oh, in fact, his memory will recall hundreds and hundreds of instances where an hon. gentleman has got up on either side of the House and has read an article from a newspaper in which some statement is made—for instance, that a Canadian subject has been unlawfully detained in Uruguay, or Paraguay, or somewhere else. Now, Canadian subjects have certain rights. The Minister of Justice, or the Prime Minister, will at once rise and say: yes, it is only a newspaper report; it may not be true; I hope it is not true, but you have given prominence to it by rising in your place in the House and the government will inquire into the matter. Either the British authorities, or the British Consul or some one else will immediately look into it. Why such an easy, quick, treatment of the subject in that case, and why such an almost obstinate drawing back from anything of the kind in this case? Must a member of parliament rise in his place and declare that the news is true before the government will take any measures to see whether it is true or not? Every week, every member of the government promises to get information of that kind. Why should there be an indisposition to do the same in this case? I know my right hon. friend wants to let down his minister easily; I am quite willing he should make the place as soft as possible on which the minister is to drop, but concede to us our right for information in this respect. The Prime Minister really has conceded our right, but he wants to postpone it until the season comes round. We may not be here then? Now is the time. The government can telegraph easily for the information, and why does not the minister do so? I may state that it is said this order in council was passed last August; at what period of the year do these orders in council come in.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. At the end of the year I suppose; I do not know whether it is the fiscal or financial year.

Mr. FOSTER. It is probably in the pigeon holes of the minister now.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) places a newspaper report announcing that some Canadian is in peril on the same footing as a newspaper report announcing that the Yukon council has made a bargain for rain, then I would advise the Minister of the Interior to do everything to gratify his rather fastidious curiosity.

Mr. FOSTER. I will do violence to my conscience just for the nonce by admitting that, on condition we get the information.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. Go on with your supply.

Mr. OLIVER. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) be good enough to state in a few words just what information he wants?

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend knows.

Mr. INGRAM. The members of the opposition are perfectly within their rights in bringing to the attention of parliament newspaper reports on public matters and asking the government for an explanation. The other day a newspaper report with reference to this rain making contract was brought to the attention of the government, and the answer of the Minister of the Interior was:

I would suggest to the opposition that they go to the expense of cabling to the Yukon authorities so that they may be aware of their sentiments.

Is that the way the government should answer when questions on matters of public importance are put to them. Surely not. The Minister of the Interior to-night charged the opposition with not being sincere; it is the minister himself who is not sincere. The commissioner of the Yukon has been living in Ottawa; I have no doubt that he has been in the presence of the minister every day since the question was first raised in this House, and if the Minister of the Interior wanted to do business in a business like way he would have obtained this information for the House long ago. Last year a vote of $100,000 was asked for the Yukon and the previous year a vote of $134,000 was asked, showing that the Yukon vote is on a sliding scale, and showing that we are within our rights in demanding to know if that money is properly expended, and if it is not properly expended then the officers who make improper expenditure should be dismissed. We are quite serious in that. When the Minister of the Interior is asked for information he generally replies with a stereotyped phrase that the members of the opposition are not sincere. He had better cut that out. We are as sincere, if not more sincere, than ever he could be.

Mr. PATERSON. I take it that this incident is closed, but as I give my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) credit for constitutional knowledge I would like to know is it his contention that every cent of the expenditure made by the Yukon council is to be subject to review by this parliament just the same as the travelling expenses of a clerk in the civil service? The hon. gentleman knows the constitution of the Yukon council; he knows that the Yukon has a member in the House, and if that is the theory held by the opposition with reference to the power of the Yukon council, the hon. gentleman who represents the Yukon (Mr. Thompson) would probably feel that the Yukon council would have something to say to that. I ask my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) in all seriousness if he means to declare that every dollar spent by the Yukon council is subject to be criticised by this parliament?

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) started out by saying that the incident was closed, but he thought it well to reopen it.

Mr. PATERSON. I was referring to the general principle.

Mr. INGRAM. The Minister of the Interior stated last year that the expenditure of the Yukon vote is subject to the Auditor General of the Dominion of Canada, and, therefore, it is not only the right, but the duty of this parliament to see that every dollar of that expenditure is properly made. That is an admitted fact. Then I ask the Minister of Customs, suppose we find that the amounts we vote for the Yukon are improperly expended, is it our duty to go on and vote large sums and allow the Yukon council to expend the money in the way I have described without raising our voices in this House on the subject? Are we to sit silent and say to the people of the Yukon, spend this money as you please, we have nothing further to say about it? I say that we are quite within our rights in protesting against the expenditure of money for rain making.

Mr. HENDERSON. I confess that I do not yet quite understand how the money expended by the government of the Yukon is audited—whether it must have the final approval of the Auditor General of Canada or not. My impression, however, is that the practice in the past has been such that there is reasonable cause for alarm in a case of this kind. We may be told by the minister that the Yukon council has no authority from this parliament to expend this money for the purpose of making rain. That may be quite so, but how do we know but that next year the minister will ask us for an appropriation to recoup the Yukon council for the money they have expended in this way? Take the case of the Eldorado gusher, to which the member for North Toronto has referred. The item reads thus: 'Amount to recoup the local council of the Yukon Territory for expenditure incurred in connection with Eldorado gusher, $50,000.' Now, I take it that the Yukon council did that work without the authority of parliament, though they may have had some quasi authority from the minister. They sent down an account to the minister, and he put an item in the estimates and asked parliament to vote $50,000. What reason have we for supposing that this will not be repeated, and that ere long we shall find an item in the estimates for $10,000 to recoup the Yukon council for an expenditure in an attempt to produce rain? To show how money is expended at the whim of the Yukon council without the authority of this parliament, let me refer to an expenditure for making roads. On page 7284 of 'Hansard' of 1903, in answer to a question of Mr. Sproule. 'By what authority did they make this expenditure?' The minister said:

There was no authority given by the department to the Yukon council to exceed their appropriation, but they went on and they spent the money. We have no doubt that value was received for the money, and that the work was useful work, and therefore we think we ought to acknowledge it and pay the expenditure.

Clearly, then, the Yukon council is expending money in the Yukon which has not been authorized by this parliament, and to my mind this is one of the instances in

which we shall be called upon to provide the funds necessary to recoup the government of the Yukon for the money so expended. My hon. friend from South Grey (Mr. Miller) seemed to call in question the propriety of the hon. member for North Toronto, in referring to the expenditure of $50,000 several years ago in the Yukon, ostensibly for the purpose of stopping the water that was flowing out of a shaft, in the term, 'plugging the hole,' and attributing it to the late Minister of the Interior, who the hon. member for South Grey seemed to think was not the author of the expression. I have before me these words of the late Minister of the Interior, on page 7276 of 'Hansard' of 1903:

> This is for plugging a hole in the first place, and afterwards making the ditches to let the water off.

And later on, he said:

> My information is that they let a contract to Matheson to plug up the shaft.

The term 'plug' was the term used by the late Minister of the Interior, and I do not know that he ever repudiated it; it certainly was not originated by the hon. member for North Toronto. I have nothing further to say on the matter, only I hope that the result of the operation now proposed in the Yukon for the purpose of producing rain will not prove as expensive to this country as did the attempt to plug the hole in the Eldorado gusher.

Mr. MILLER. I was not objecting to anything of the kind, but was simply referring to the joke of the hon. member for North Toronto. As that hon member seemed rather ashamed to explain his joke, I am quite pleased that the hon member for Halton has done it for him.

Mr. FOSTER. A joke is always spoiled when you try to explain it.

Mr. INGRAM. We might perhaps avoid a good deal of discussion if we had the ordinances passed by the Yukon council brought down and laid on the table. I notice at page L—151 of the Auditor General's Report certain accounts that are audited by the Auditor General; but the last paragraph of a letter written on January 12, 1906, reads as follows:

> I am sending you by same mail copy of the Consolidated Ordinances of the Yukon Territory, also a copy of the ordinances that have been passed since the date of the publication of the Consolidated Ordinances, which will no doubt be of use to you in your department.

This is signed by the controller, Mr. Lithgow, in January, 1906. Now, if these ordinances were laid on the table, hon. gentlemen on both sides would have the privilege of reading them and would understand how the money was expended. Perhaps the minister will be good enough to say whether he has copies of these ordinances and whether he will lay them on the table.

Mr. OLIVER. I have not seen the copies, but I presume that they are in the department. I shall have pleasure in laying them on the table.

Indians—Yukon—to provide education, $3,750.

Mr. OLIVER. The expenditure under this head in 1904-5 was $3,695. The department has not established any per capita rate for boarding or day schools within the territory, but last year gave the total amount under consideration to certain educational work being done in the district, the work principally carried on by the Church of England. The schools are at Forty-Mile, Cariboo, Selkirk, and Moose Hide. The number of pupils on the roll is 100. The school at Forty-Mile is a combination of day and boarding school. There are, six children in attendance.

At Cariboo crossing the school is conducted by Bishop Bompas. At Selkirk there are 50 enrolled, but the attendence is poor, as the Indians are absent on hunting and fishing expeditions for four months of the year. At Moose Hide there are twenty children in attendence for ten months of the year. The school buildings are represented to be large and comfortable. They are provided by the church authorities. In consideration of the earnest work of Bishop Bompas, and on the recommendation of Commissioner Congdon, a grant of $2,500 was given out of last year's appropriation. The expenditure of the current year's vote and next year's will be governed by the same general principle—that is, no specific rate per capita, but a bulk sum for work actually done.

Indians—general—J. A. Macrae, inspector Indian agencies and reserves, $1,350.

Mr. BENNETT. The other evening I took occasion to refer to the sale of an island known as the Giant's Tomb in Georgian bay. At that time, and for some time before, I had been assured that the timber, excepting that covered by the license of the Canada Furnace Company had been sold to Mr. Charles Beck, of Penetanguishene, or was offered to him at a certain price; but, owing to the fact that he was being assessed by certain go-betweens between himself and the government he had thrown up the chance of purchasing. I asked the question, and the minister's answer given in no uncertain terms, was that practically there was nothing in the sale. I asked first as to the sale to Mr. Peter Ryan, and the minister said:

> There had been no sale of the timber on the island to Mr. Peter Ryan and I am informed that there have been no negotiations looking to a sale to Mr. Ryan.

This will be found at page 968 of the unrevised 'Hansard'. Further the minister stated:

There has been correspondence in regard to it, but no transaction of any kind.

And, further on :

The negotiations have not proceeded at all. There have been applications for the timber on the island, that part of it which is not under license to the Canada Furnace Company, but no step has been taken by the department to license the timber, for the reason that it is now under license to that company.

Again the minister said :

As soon the Canada Furnace Company's right is disposed of, of course, the timber and the island will be for sale.

Nobody reading these answers would come to the conclusion that there had been an offer of this property made by the department. Now, this offer has been made by the department, and I say that when the minister said :

There has been no sale of the timber on the island to Mr. Peter Ryan, and I have been informed that there have been no negotiations looking to a sale to Mr. Ryan.

The minister stated that which was not in accordance with the facts—although I am willing to adimt that he sought to save himself by saying, 'I am informed' that there have been no negotiations.

The information of the minister at that time was information furnished him by his deputy, and there is the most positive statement that there had been no negotiations looking to a sale to Mr. Ryan. The minister cannot escape the fact that there were negotiations with Mr. Ryan on October 21, 1905. And, while I am willing to admit that the minister cannot carry every detail in his head, I have every reason to believe that the deputy minister was very conversant with the negotiations for the sale of this timber. I asked that a report made by Mr. Chitty should be brought down, and it is here now, and I would like to read it. It is dated October 21, and is addressed to the deputy minister. It says :

With reference to the letter from Mr. Peter Ryan hereunder, submitting an offer of $6,375 for Giants Tomb Island in Georgian bay, I beg to state that there is an application from Mr. C. Beck, of Penetanguishene, for the timber on this island, bearing date March 21, 1899. There is also a later application from him for the purchase of the island, dated March 31, 1902.

Yet, with this memorandum in his department, the minister is informed by his deputy that there have been no negotiations looking to a sale with Mr. Ryan. I say there was an offer to Mr. Ryan for something over $9,000. And, though the minister says there has been a correspondence, but no transaction of any kind, I say Mr. Ryan had the offer made to him and he could have been the possessor of that timber on the payment of this sum of money. Will the minister still say that there was no offer to Mr. Ryan ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am certainly informed that no offer was made to Peter Ryan, and that he never had the refusal of the Island at any price.

Mr. BENNETT. So, the minister has been informed by his deputy that there was never an offer to Mr. Ryan. This is a question between the deputy and Mr. Ryan, and I do not mind telling the minister that I prefer to take Mr. Ryan's word for it. Mr. Ryan rushed into print on this subject, as reported in the 'Globe' of Monday, April 2. He says ;

About a year ago I wrote the Interior Department on behalf of Mr. Beck to ascertain at what price the island could be purchased. A reply was received giving the price at something over $9,000, conditional on the existing license held by the Canada Furnace Company being duly assigned.

And Mr. Beck or Mr. Ryan could have been in possession had it not been for the toll-takers who intervened. A little later on, I wrote to Mr. Ryan, and he sent me this letter. It is not private so I will read a part of it :

I have had my attention called to your remarks about the Giant's Tomb Island. The government asked something over $9,000, which, after a personal examination by Beck months ago, was declined as too dear.

Will the minister say in the face of this that there was not an absolute offer, and that if Mr. Ryan had accepted it he would not have been in possession to-day ? It was notorious among the people who are conversant with matters of this kind, that, as Mr. Ryan says, he could have had the property at $9,200. And it has been the game all through to hand this over. So, when the minister tells me there never was an offer, I am going to take Mr. Ryan's statement as I find it in the 'Globe' and in this letter to me. Any one will be able to see that there was an absolute offer. Let us see the history of the whole thing and then we can better judge it. In 1900 the train was laid by Beck to become the possessor of this island with all its valuable timber. As long back as 1900 a report was made by Mr. Chitty, a government inspector of timber, in the hon. gentleman's department. Mr. Chitty went to Penetanguishene and what did he go for ? This report is dated May 1, 1900. He says :

Prior to leaving Ottawa for Penetanguishene I had been instructed to visit Giant's Tomb during my absence from headquarters, and to estimate the quantities of timber thereon which were not included in the license held by Messrs. Chew Brothers, of Midland, and the value of the same.

That is the license subsequently assigned to the Canada Furnace Company.

I met Mr. Beck frequently during my stay, and he expressed a wish to accompany me when I visited the island.

He then goes on to say that he did business with him. That shows that in 1900 Beck was after this island and that Chitty was deputed to go there to make a valuation.

Mr. Chitty in his report sets out this fact that as far back as 1883 this island was offered for sale at a price of $7,000. In his report Mr. Chitty values the timber on the property at $9,230, which was grossly inadequate valuation, and, as Mr. Chitty points out, throughout the prices were very small. When I tell you that he placed the basswood as being worth only $2 a thousand, gentlemen who are conversant with the price of basswood will know that it is practically absurd.

Mr. TAYLOR. It is worth $20 to-day.

Mr. BENNETT. He placed maple at $3 a thousand, which is equally absurd. And so we find that in 1900 this price of $9,230 was placed on this island and the timber on it by Mr. Chitty.

What happened next? Mr. Beck was not prepared to pay that price, but thought there was an easier way to get it, so he laid his train in another direction, and last year and this, when the minister was responsible for all acts as he was then in office, Mr. Peter Ryan, although the minister's deputy tells him now that Mr. Ryan had never been heard of in the transaction, entered the negotiations and here is a report of Chitty in reference to it. Ryan offered $6,375, and what is more, not only was the department offering, as Ryan declares they were, to sell the island to him at that figure of $9,000, but the minister has before him on that same report the warning of the secretary of the department. I see it here:

> The secretary's memo. on my report sets forth that if it be decided to offer the island for sale the sanction of His Excellency in Council will be necessary, and that he agreed that sale should be made by public competition.

Now, is it not odd that in the face of one of the minister's chief officer's report that the island should be sold by public auction that according to Ryan it was being sold to him privately? And more than that, the secretary draws attention to the fact. He says:

> Section 10 of the Land Regulations stipulates that nothing therein contained shall bar the department from disposing of small islands, except the Thousand Island group, in such manner and on such conditions as may seem to the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs best in the interest of the Indians.
>
> In view of the facts I am unable to recommend the acceptance of Mr. Ryan's offer.

And yet we have the deputy saying that Peter Ryan never took part in the negotiations. The deputy must be very dense, when he had this report of Mr. Chitty, or else there must be something wrong with the whole transaction. We have the records here of what Ryan has said, that the island was offered for something over $9,000. We have Ryan's personal letter to myself stating that it was offered to him at a certain price and that he declined it, and we have the memorandum of the secretary of the department practically warning the deputy minister and the minister that it was in defiance of the regulations to sell it by private sale.

A little attention is devoted to me in reference to this so-called exploded scandal by the 'Globe.' Here we have the statement of Mr. Ryan against that of the Minister of the Interior vouchsafed for by the deputy minister that no transaction was ever made, and I have here the report of the minister's chief officer, the secretary, advising the deputy and the minister that the sale under the regulations could not be made, it being contrary to the law, and if that is not a scandal, I think it should be considered so. As far as the comments in the 'Globe' are concerned, I care nothing for them. Anything that the smug-faced, hypocritical editor of the 'Globe' may say about myself does not interest me. When that worthy stood up on a public platform in Toronto and stated that he could view the blackest chapter of crime perpetrated and committed by the Ross government and pray for a continuance of them in office, I can only say that it is but one more illustration to me of the old saying that if you attempt to wrestle with a chimney sweep you will soil your clothes. We have nothing, therefore, to do with the editor of the 'Globe.' I leave the House to judge the position of the deputy when he states to the Minister on the floor of the House that a statement of mine is untrue when Ryan writes to me and when a statement in the 'Globe' says that he has taken part in these negotiations. I leave the public to read the letter sent to me which fully and conclusively proves that there was an offer made to Beck of these islands at $9,000. Ryan considered the price too high; it was not that they considered the price of timber on the island too high, but, as I am informed by gentlemen who were very close, it was the toll taker's price that was so increasing the value that they did not touch it. That is a fact, and I tell the minister that if it is put up to auction he will find it will bring a very much higher price than $9,000 and that there will be no toll takers to interfere. I have a letter only to-day from a gentleman who intimates that if he could purchase the island for $15,000 he would like to arrange it at once. Let the minister put up this island for sale at once, and for the future let the minister be very careful when he makes statements in this House directly contradicting the statements of mine or of any other gentleman. Let him take care that

there are not in his department such tell-tale documents as will contradict his statements and which are vouched for by his deputy.

Mr. OLIVER. As my hon. friend has referred to a certain report it might be as well to give the report as it was given to me for the information of the House and the country. This report is dated Ottawa, May 1, 1900, addressed to the secretary of the department and is signed by George L. Chitty.

Under date of March 21, 1890, Mr. C. Beck, of Penetanguishene, applied for the privilege of cutting timber on Giant's Tomb and Beausoleil islands, in the Georgian bay, Lake Huron, and he was informed that both of these islands were then under license to Messrs. Chew Bros., of Midland; the former for pine and oak and the latter for all kinds of timber. He was also asked to state whether he wished to acquire all the timber on Giant's Tomb other than pine and oak, or only the maple and beech, and he replied that he would like to purchase all the timber thereon, not covered by license. This reply was sent to me at Penetanguishene on the 4th April, 1899, at which place I was at that time acting as agent.

Prior to leaving Ottawa for Penetanguishene I had been instructed to visit Giant's Tomb during my absence from headquarters, and to estimate the quantities of timber thereon which were not included in the licenses held by Messrs. Chew Brothers, of Midland, and the value of the same. I met Mr. Beck frequently during my stay, and he expressed a wish to accompany me when I visited the island.

Being aware that he had been corresponding with the department on the subject of purchasing the timber, and that he had been personally applying for same, I thought it advisable to comply with his request. Prior to leaving for Ottawa I hired a small steamer and proceeded to the island where I made an inspection, the particulars of which will be given hereunder.

For your information I beg leave to submit the following items with regard to this island Giant's Tomb is distant from the harbour of Penetanguishene about twelve miles. It was surrendered by the Indians for sale on the 5th June, 1856, No. 71 Indian Treaties and Surrenders. The area was formerly estimated to be 2,400 acres, but it has been recently ascertained from a measurement of Boulton's chart, 1892-93. that this is largely in excess of the actual fact the correct area is 1,325 acres, of which 51 acres have been sold for lighthouse purposes. leaving the present unsold 1,274 acres.

In 1883 this island was offered for sale by the department to Mr. Hurdon, of Midland, at $7,000, which price was fixed by the late Sir John Macdonald acting as Superintendent General of Indian Affairs. Terms, one-quarter cash, and the balance in three equal annual instalments with interest at six per cent, and the purchaser was required to place at least six settlers on the island.

The license covering pine and oak was the current and held by Mr. H. H. Cook, of Toronto.

Mr. Hurdon offered $2.25 per acre for supposed 2,500 acres, $5,625, and agreed to carry out the conditions of settlement referred to in the foregoing, and he said he would pay more if Cook's license was not in force thereon.

Mr. Plummer, an officer of this department at that time, placed the value of the timber alone on this island at $5,900, and the late Mr. VanKoughnet, Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, valued the land at $1 per acre. $2,500, making the total value $7,500. It is not probable that either of these persons ever examined the land or timber.

The soil is sandy and gravelly, and it is not generally fit for cultivation. Surface boulders of large size abound in the wooded part or mound, but it is well adapted for pasture for cattle, sheep, &c., and could be quickly utilized by seeding with grass or clover seed. As it stands at present there is fair pastureage for a considerable number of cattle upon it.

It has been estimated that about 800 acres of the island were burned in 1880, the traces of the fire are still apparent, but a considerable part of the burned portion is now covered with small trees.

There have been several inquiries about and applications for the land and timber, the latest being from Mr. Beck. Considering that the licensees have removed from the island all the timber covered by their license, and that the price which may be obtained for it, if offered for sale, will be more or less affected by the continuance of the license thereon which expires on the 30th instant, I would recommend that it should not be included with the other islands in the next renewal of same.

The area of timber land on the island is about 400 acres, and the most of it stands on the summit, or mound, beech and maple are the principal woods, the former is clean and thrifty but many of the larger maples will not turn out well, owing to defects.

The Canada Iron Furnace Company will create an increased demand for firewood in that section, and even now good hardwood is worth on the dock at Penetanguishene $2 to $2.50 per cord. Estimating the product in this form at 30 cents per acre, which I believe is a moderate estimate, the quantity standing on the island is 12,000 cords, on which I place a value of 70 cents per cord, making $8,400. This valuation includes Crown dues.

The timber is worth more in the form of sawlogs than in cordwood, and I estimate the probable quantities to be as follows :

Beech, 2,457,600 feet B.M. at $2..	$4,915 20
Maple, 720,000 feet B.M. at $3	2,160 00
Basswood and birch, 259,200 feet B.M. at $2	518 40
Hemlock and other woods, 500,000 feet B.M. at $2..	637 00
	9,230 60

The values attached include Crown dues.

In view of this showing, I am of the opinion that if the island is offered for sale by auction an upset price of $7,000 should be placed upon it. As it is neither a new or a forfeited berth, sections 3 and 4 of the timber regulations do not appear to be applicable to it. Mr. Beck informed me that he desires to purchase the island as it stands, land and timber, and although the department might be justified in selling it without competition, it would probably be considered more satisfactory by those interested if tenders for same were asked in the usual way. through a limited number of Ontario news-

papers authorized to insert government advertisements.

GEO. L. CHITTY,
Timber Inspector.

On the 21st of October, 1905, Mr. Chitty made a further report as follows :

With reference to the letter from Mr. Peter Ryan hereunder, submitting an offer of $6,375 for Giant's Tomb island, in Georgian bay, I beg leave to state that there is an application from Mr. C. Beck, of Penetanguishene, for the timber on this island, bearing date March 21, 1899. There is also a later application from him for the purchase of the island, dated March 31, 1902.

The Canadian Iron Furnace Company, who hold a license from the department covering the pine and oak on this island, applied by letter of May 16, 1900, for the right to cut the remaining hard and soft wood on the island.

There is a large quantity of pine and beech on the island, as shown by my report dated May 1, 1900, the value of which is placed at $2 per thousand feet, which is simply the tariff rate for this timber. The maple is valued at $3 per thousand feet B.M., being only $1 per thousand feet over the tariff rate of dues, and the basswood and birch are valued at only $1 per thousand feet B.M. more than the tariff rate. The hemlock and other woods are valued at $2 per thousand feet B.M., being $1.20 per thousand feet B.M. over tariff rate.

It will be apparent from the foregoing that the values are not high, but very moderate. With regard to the beech I may state that it is not used generally for the manufacture of lumber, but it is coming into use for certain purposes under the diminishing supply of other hard woods. It is probable, however, that a fair proportion of the beech would be converted into cordwood, and assuming that all the woods were manufactured as cordwood, the estimated value of the wood would be, as stated, $8,400. and with the land added, $9,037.

If the Canadian Iron Furnace Company transfer their license to any purchaser of the island, including the timber, there would not be any necessity for issuing another license for the timber on the island in lieu thereof.

The secretary's memo. on my report sets forth that if it be decided to offer the island for sale the sanction of His Excellency in Council will be necessary, and that he agreed that sale should be made by public competition.

Section 10 of the land regulations stipulates that nothing therein contained shall bar the department from disposing of small islands, except the Thousand Island group, in such manner and on such conditions as may seem to the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs best in the interest of the Indians.

In view of the facts I am unable to recommend the acceptance of Mr. Ryan's offer.

GEO. L. CHITTY,
Timber Inspector

Now it is demonstrated by these papers that there is an island called Giant's Tomb, there there is certain timber upon it, that a certain value has been placed upon that timber. It is also shown that communications have been received from Ryan and Beck in regard to the purchase of this island. When I was informed that such communications had been received, my informant was undoubtly mistaken ; but inasmuch as there was no transaction resulting, I submit the information was not important either one way or the other. The important point is that there was no transaction in regard to this island and if there had been any transaction in regard to the island then this transaction, upon the reports of the officers of the department, would have been not by private sale but by public competition. Where my hon. friend sees a scandal in this connection I am as yet unable to discover. Is it because a certain gentleman is named Ryan or because he is named Peter ?

Mr. BENNETT. If the hon. minister will allow me I will answer him.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. It is because the department offered this island to Mr. Peter Ryan for $9,000 without tender in the face of the report of the minister's chief official, the secretary of the department, that it was illegal to make such a sale and the statement was made by Ryan that the island was offered to him at that price.

Mr. OLIVER. When my hon. friend was speaking of this matter the other night he laid very great stress and emphasis upon the name of Ryan—of Peter Ryan, and if I may judge from the tenor of his argument it was enough that Peter Ryan—this Peter Ryan, whoever he may be—should have applied for the island. Such was the character of this man Ryan. It was enough that he should have written a letter in regard to the island to thereby attach to it a most unspeakable scandal.

Mr. GUNN. Hear, hear.

Mr. OLIVER. He has certainly impressed one of his associates with that view of the case. Now he says that Mr. Ryan's assertion that we offered the island for sale at a certain figure is to be taken as being absolutely authoritative on that matter against the statement of all the officers of the Indian Department. Now, I cannot remove the prejudice that may probably exist in the mind of my hon. friend both in regard to this unfortunate man Ryan and against the deputy of the department, but as evidence that the offer was not made I can only present the file report of the responsible officers of the department recommending that Ryan's offer should not be accepted.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Was not Ryan's offer a certain figure and the price asked by the department another figure ?

Mr. OLIVER. Well, Mr. Ryan as I understand it, made an offer for the island. Mr. Ryan's offer was not accepted.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. But the department offered to take another price.

Mr. OLIVER. No, the department did not offer to take any price from Mr. Ryan. That is the statement of the officials of the department.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. As I understand it Ryan offered a lower sum, the department asked a little more and Ryan refused to take the island at those terms.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT. Hear, hear.

Mr. OLIVER. Just to show how accurate the reasoning of my hon. friend is in connection let me just recall his line of thought. In the first place Mr. Chitty had undervalued the island. He had valued it at $9,000 when my hon. friend said it was worth $15,000, and Mr. Ryan had refused to accept the offer of the island not because of the price that the department had asked for it but because of a middleman who was taxing him more. If the department offered him the island at $9,000 where was the middleman ?

Mr. BENNETT. I will explain to the hon. minister. If the wherewithal was not coming to the middleman then there was the report on file saying that it must be sold at public auction and if the wherewithal was coming to the middleman the sale was to go through without any public auction.

Mr. OLIVER. That, I am afraid is pretty far fetched. If the island was worth $15,000, as my hon. friend said it was——

Mr. BENNETT. Put it up for sale.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, and it may be—and if Mr. Ryan was offered it for $9,000, as he says he has been, if he wants this House to believe there was a middleman he will have to produce his middleman. I submit that that is hardly sufficient evidence under the circumstances.

Mr. LALOR. I thought I understood the hon. minister to say that Mr. Ryan made an offer. Would he kindly tell us what that offer was that was made by Ryan ?

Mr. OLIVER. I read the offer and if my hon. friend has paid as much attention as he is now paying he would have known that it was something between $6,000 and $7,000. It was $2,000 less than the valuation placed on the island by Mr. Chitty.

Mr. LALOR. Peter wanted a bargain.

Mr. OLIVER. But, my hon. friend says that Peter was done out of his bargain by some unknown middleman. Now, if my hon. friend cannot produce the middleman as between the price that Peter offered, the price that Mr. Chitty valued the island at and the value that my hon. friend has put upon the island I submit there is no room for the suggestion that he has made in any way, shape or manner. If it is a scandal that Mr. Ryan should have applied to purchase the island from this government then there has been a scandal, but if Mr. Ryan is a good enough man that his word will be taken in preference to that of the officers of the responsible department then surely his communication with the department cannot be a scandal. As a matter of fact, to remove from my hon. friend's mind any anxiety in regard to this island, I will tell him that the Canada Furnace Company have a license upon the island for a certain part of the timber. They own in connection with that license, licenses for a number of other such islands in that vicinity and until their term expires or until their license is released in some way the government is not in a position to sell the island if they wanted to at any price or to any person. I do not know whether my hon. friend's exceeding anxiety in regard to this matter is in order to protect the interests of the Canada Furnace Company but it would seem to me very much in that way. Now, let me tell my hon. friend that when this island is available for sale it will be sold and it will be sold by public competition and if Peter Ryan offers the most money for it Peter Ryan will get the island. No consideration of any suggestion of scandal because of the purchase of this island by Mr. Ryan or anybody else will protect in any undue degree the interests of the Canadian Furnace Company now withholding the island for sale by the government by reason of its timber license upon the island. If that is the point of difficulty with my hon. friend he may relieve his mind upon this subject.

Mr. LALOR. It seems to me that my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has done this House and this country a very great service in bringing this matter to our attention. Peter Ryan, the gentleman in question, seems to have offered $6,000 for this particular island, not Cap. Sullivan, as some gentlemen seem to insinuate, but Peter Ryan has offered $6,000 for the island. The Minister of the Interior has been asking $9,000, but the member for East Simcoe says he has a purchaser who is willing to give $15,000 so that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) has been able to place the minister in a position to make $6,000 more for the people of the country on the transaction.

Mr. BENNETT. A reference to 'Hansard' will show that I did not say a word in disparagement of Mr. Peter Ryan for whom I have the greatest respect. I admire Mr. Peter Ryan as a political lever who can make most of the ministers over there sit up when he wants to. Mr. Beck found he was making very little headway in 1900, and so he introduced Mr. Ryan on the scene, and Mr. Ryan did make the ministers sit up because he forced the minister to offer him this property at a certain figure without competition. The Minister of the

Interior talks of my veracity. I am willing to put Mr. Peter Ryan's veracity against his, and any one who knows them both will vote in favour of Mr. Ryan. Mr. Ryan says the minister offered him that without competition. Does the minister deny it ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, absolutely and unreservedly.

Mr. BENNETT. Did the minister tell Mr. Ryan the valuation was $9,000, but that he could not have it without a public auction ?

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Ryan was never told that the island was for sale at that time, for the reason that I have given that it was under license to the Canadian Furnace Company.

Mr. BENNETT. That did not debar the government from selling it subject to the rights of the company. The minister knows as well as I do that a deal was on between the Canada Iron Furnace Company and Mr. Ryan for the giving up of their claim. Does the minister not know that ?

Mr. OLIVER. I certainly do not.

Mr. BENNETT. Has the minister never heard of it before ?

Mr. OLIVER. Never in the world ; we do not all live in Penetanguishene you know.

Mr. BENNETT. We do not all live in Penetanguishene, but I know who saw the minister on behalf of the Canada Iron Furnace Company in this matter and I know his statement. We are asked to believe statements made by the minister and his deputy. Let us see. The hon. Frank Oliver said :

There has been no sale of the timber on the island to Mr. Peter Ryan and I am informed there have been no negotiations looking to a sale to Mr. Ryan

There is the solemn statement of the minister whispered into his ear by his political deputy.

No negotiations looking to a sale to Mr. Ryan.

And here is Mr. Chitty's report :

With reference to the letter from Mr. Peter Ryan submitting an offer of $6,375 for the Giant's Tomb, I have to state there is an application, &c.

Your deputy must have known you had that offer. The minister had better not talk about the veracity of himself and his deputy to people who know them so well. I am going to take Mr. Peter Ryan's word for it that he had an offer of this property at $9,000 and I am going to believe the common rumour that the go-between's assessment was so high that Mr. Peter Ryan threw it up—or Mr. Beck because he was the man who was looking for it. Perhaps the minister will tell me if Mr. D'Arcy Scott has seen him in connection with this matter ?

Mr. OLIVER. He certainly has not. I may say I had a letter from Mr. D'Arcy Scott yesterday or the day before—I am sorry I have not the letter with me—in which he states that he had no connection with the transaction as set forth by yourself in the House the other day.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the minister say that Mr. D'Arcy Scott says he made no application to the department for a sale of Beausoleil Island and Giants Tomb.

Mr. OLIVER. I will have great pleasure in bringing the letter down.

Mr. BENNETT. That shows the veracity of the department and the department's officials. The minister stands up and his political attaché, his deputy, sits alongside him, and he make the statement that there has been no negotiation looking for a sale to Mr. Ryan while here is Mr. Chitty's report saying that they cannot accept Mr. Peter Ryan's offer. We can well believe that anything that emanates from the deputy or from the minister must be received with caution, when the minister states solemnly that there have been no negotiations with his department while there is a report in the department that an application has been made. Who will believe the minister and who will believe the deputy. I will reserve my right to believe them. Have I the assurance of the minister that these islands will be put up to public competition by sale or tender ?

Mr. OLIVER. Surely.

Mr. BENNETT. Surely.

Mr. OLIVER. Surely. I have some other documents here that may be of interest to the committee. This is one.

Midland, August 24, 1894.

Hon. T. M. Daly,
Minister of Interior,
Ottawa.

Dear Mr. Daly,—There is an island called the Giant's Tomb some fifteen miles from here of considerable size which is in the group belonging to the Christian Indian Islands but upon which no Indians reside and I have been asked by some parties to learn upon what terms a lease of the island could be acquired for purpose of raising sheep in large numbers. The island is now fairly good pasturage and a liberal sowing of grass seed would make it very good pasturage.

Will you please let me know as soon as possible if you would feel disposed to give a lease for, say ten years, and at what rental ? It would be a great advantage to our vicinity if this could be taken in hand as success would mean the enterprise being followed generally if successful.

At present the island is lying unused and I hope you may see your way clear to advising

a lease upon easy terms as an incentive to a commencement.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) WM. H. BENNETT.

Mr. BENNETT. I see nothing wrong about that. I quite believe that the deputy minister has been industriously delving into the archives of the department. He has been a busy politician. People who come from that part of the country know that after the change of government your political deputy was very busy going about giving evidence for the decapitation of Conservative officials ; he was a handy man for that. He has delved a letter out of the department that does not hurt me in the least. I only wish that the department to-day would give a lease to some person for running sheep on this island, I did not ask Mr. Daly for anything that was irregular. I did not ask Mr. Daly to give the island to a political henchman without public competition ; I did not ask Mr. Daly to make a surrender of the right of $10,000 or $15,000 worth of timber to a political friend. I have at least shown to-night that very little reliance can be placed upon statements that come from the deputy minister of that department.

Mr. INGRAM. Would the minister be good enough to tell us when the lease was made out to the Canada Furnace Company ?

Mr. OLIVER. A license was issued in 1870 to the Canada Furnace Company, and has been continued down to the present time.

Mr. INGRAM. What do they pay for the license ?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot say what they paid as bonus, but they now pay certain dues on the timber they cut.

Mr. INGRAM. Are the conditions under this government different to what they were under the old government ?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot say whether the dues have been raised or not. That would be the only change, however, within recent years.

Mr. INGRAM. What are the conditions of leasing any of these islands ?

Mr. OLIVER. A bonus is secured for the timber by public competition, an annual ground rent is paid, and the licensees pay dues on all the timber they cut, according to certain rates.

Mr. LAKE. Can the minister tell me, whether a certain P. J. Hamilton, who was Indian farm instructor in the Touchwood agency, has been appointed an Indian agent ?

Mr. OLIVER. He has not been appointed an Indian agent, but he has been given charge of a reserve.

Mr. LAKE. Was he recommended for the position by one of his superiors ?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot say just on what recommendation the promotion was made. It was necessary to make provision for the supervision of that particular reserve, over which there had previously been no direct supervision, and Mr. Hamilton was taken from the position he occupied at Touchwood and placed in charge of the reserve.

Mr. LAKE. What reserve is it ?

Mr. OLIVER. Kinistino.

Mr. LAKE. That was in the Touchwood agency ?

Mr. OLIVER. I think it was. It is now in the Duck lake agency.

Mr. LAKE. What salary does he receive ?

Mr. OLIVER. $800.

Mr. LAKE. The minister cannot say who recommended Mr. Hamilton for this appointment ?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot say that there was any formal recommendation made ; but when it was decided to place a person in charge of that particular reserve, it was, I understand, with the approval of the inspector and the agent at Touchwood that Mr. Hamilton was placed in that position.

Mr. LAKE. Looking through the inspector's report, it seems to me that the farm instructors in the Touchwood agency must have had a fairly easy time of it. I find that the population of that agency is 1,012, say 1,000 Indians, and the inspector, when he went up there in the spring of 1905, found no land ready for crop ; but he remarks :

I regret to say that there is much room for improvement in the way the Indians of this agency care for their stock and do their farming. The agency has made no advancement in the last three years, and the set-back the Indians received through loss of stock in 1903-04 will be felt for some time. I am hoping that under the new management a decided improvement will be made.

Mr. Hamilton was one of four farm instructors who were teaching the Indians how to farm on that agency, and yet we find that in the spring of last year no land whatever was ready for crop. I would like to know what were the special qualifications of Mr. Hamilton for this appointment as agent. It seems to me that it would have been possible to find some farm instructor who had been doing some work that had shown some results in the way of getting the Indians to take to farming. The minister says that he has no definite information as to who recommended this gentleman for appointment. Well, I understand that Mr. Hamilton took a very active part in the recent local election—that he

did a lot of canvassing, and acted as poll clerk at one of the polls. Will the minister kindly inform us if he considers that Mr. Hamilton was earning his salary as farm instructor while going through the country canvassing and while acting as poll clerk ?

Mr. OLIVER. I have no information as to Mr. Hamilton having gone through the country canvassing or electioneering.

Mr. LAKE. Supposing he was doing so, would the minister consider that he was earning his salary as farm instructor ?

Mr. OLIVER. I would have to know the special circumstances before I could give an intelligent answer.

Mr. LAKE. Does the minister consider that that is part of the work of an Indian farm instructor ?

Mr. OLIVER. As to his acting as a poll clerk, I had occasion to say here before, and I say again, that there are in that country many places and many occasions when it is difficult to get a suitable person, that is, a person who understands the conduct of a poll, and that there is no particular reason why an officer of the Indian Department should be debarred from acting either as deputy returning officer or as poll clerk. The position of poll clerk is such a subordinate one that surely no harm need come to the friends or my hon. friend from his occupying that position on polling day, the payment for which is $2. In regard to the allegation that Mr. Hamilton canvassed, that is an offence according to its degree. If Mr. Hamilton dropped his proper work, and spent his time solely in canvassing, of course, he was not doing his duty to the Indian Department ; but if his duty to the Indian Department required him to go from one part of the country to another, and in conversation with the people he met he expressed himself in favour of the views of the Liberal party, I do not think he was going outside of his rights as a citizen or interfering with his duties as an employee of the Indian Department.

Mr. LAKE. Of course, when I make the statement I refer to active canvassing. I have no objection to any official expressing his opinions privately, but canvassing is a very different matter. I take it, then, that the minister says that when a public officer sets out to make a political canvass he is doing something that he has no right to do. I would ask the minister whether he has sent out instructions to his officials that they must not take any part in the elections either Dominion or local. This House passed a very strong resolution on that subject last summer and I assume that it would be the duty of the government to notify their subordinates that this resolution had been passed.

Mr. OLIVER. I issued no departmental order prohibiting the official from taking part in elections. Each official of the department must bear the responsibility of any action he has taken, and any official of the Interior Department or of the Indian Department who has gone beyond his rights must take the consequences.

Mr. LAKE. With regard to an official acting as polling clerk, I understand from what the minister says that he would approve of that where there is no other man of sufficient ability or education in the neighbourhood to take the office. But he would certainly disapprove of it where there were other men available. Is that right ?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not say that I would object to an official acting as deputy returning officer or poll clerk under any circumstances. What I said was that there were occasions when it was almost necessary—that is, when the official of the Indian Department was the most convenient person to be secured for the office.

Mr. LAKE. In this particular case, Mr. Hamilton's duties could not have been very onerous—at least the results were very poor. Can the minister tell us what his duties were ? He was farm instructor to these Indians, but last year there was no land under cultivation by them. In that case what would the farm instructor do?

Mr. OLIVER. The duty of a farm instructor of course, is to instruct the Indians how to farm. As to how successful they were of course, I have no personal knowledge. I am given to understand, however, that that particular agency was in a very undesirable condition. It was necessary, owing to circumstances which need not be detailed here, to dispense with the services of the agent and place some one else in charge.

Mr. LAKE. I presume there would be some recommendation on which the minister would base his appointment of Mr. Hamilton ? Is it the minister who makes that appointment?

Mr. OLIVER. Of course, the minister is responsible for it.

Mr. LAKE. I would like to know the ordinary course in making such appointments. The vacancy exists and some one must be appointed. To be appointed, he must be recommended, and it seems to me he should be recommended from official sources.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know that I can give the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lake) the information he really wants. If he wants to know merely the official course these matters take, I can tell him that the recommendation comes to me from my deputy, and I give my sanction to the appoint-

ment, thereby becoming responsible for it. But I suppose that that is not the recommendation of which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lake) speaks ?

Mr. LAKE. No. Of course, the minister takes the responsibility. I suppose the recommendation of the deputy was made on proper recommendations of the officials under whom this officer had served. That is all the information the minister can give us ?

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Can the minister tell us who is the medical officer for Twatt's band in the Carleton agency ?

Mr. OLIVER. The medical officer is, or was, Dr. Tyerman.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. The hon. gentleman who was supposed to be elected, and for whom these notorious ballot box stuffers operated ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Is he still medical officer ?

Mr. OLIVER. No, he sent in his resignation in October last.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. And who has been appointed in his stead ?

Mr. OLIVER. No one.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. And are these Indians left without any one to give them medical treatment all this time ? 'Lo ! the poor Indian' !

Mr. OLIVER. Let me explain. I am informed that Dr. Tyerman did not send in his resignation, that he was asked for his resignation and that he has not been paid since October. When I spoke at first, I was not giving the official information of the department, but I was basing my statement on what Dr. Tyerman had told me—that he had sent in his resignation. Apparently it has not been received. However, the fact is he has not been paid.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. And has the government determined whether they will give him an agency or hold this seat in the legislature for him ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am afraid that it is not within the authority of the department to hold a seat in the legislature for any one. We may have to accept the alternative.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. As to Dr. Tyerman I do not believe he had anything to do with the ballot box stuffing, that was the work for which some of the ex-members of parliament who are holding office up there are responsible. Dr. Tyerman is a very fine man as a medical officer, and I would like to see him continued in that capacity.

Mr. LAKE. There is a question which I omitted to ask the minister the other night, and which I would like to ask the minister now. It is with regard to the Muscowequan school, in the Touchwood agency. Has the minister any information as to whether that school is really located on private property or not ?

Mr. OLIVER. The information I have which was brought down in response to a request of the hon. member (Mr. Lake) was that, after looking up this matter it was found that a clerical error had occurred and that whereas it was stated that the school was on the reserve, it was really situated on the property of the Roman Catholic mission adjoining the reserve. This school was erected in 1894 and the department contributed $1,800 to the building, the total cost of which was over $3,500. Since that contribution nothing has been granted for buildings but $250 has been given for fire protection.

Mr. LAKE. Is it the policy of the department generally to make grants to build schools which are not on government property on Indian reserves?

Mr. OLIVER. The policy of the department is to assist boarding schools either situated on reserves or on property controlled by the department. This, of course, is an exceptional case.

Mr. LAKE. And I understood from the minister the other day that the department would take some steps towards getting some control of this property. Is the grant in aid of these schools given for half-breed children as well as Indian children?

Mr. OLIVER. The principle is that half-breeds are not admitted to the schools. There may be isolated cases of half-breed orphans or cases of that kind, but I am informed that the instances known to the department are very, very few and in such cases the allowance is not paid with respect to them as with the Indian children.

Mr. STAPLES. Has the minister received a petition from the citizens of the district of Swan Lake asking that that reserve might be thrown open for settlement?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot give the hon. member the information as to our having received any petition such as he speaks of.

Mr. STAPLES. In looking over the superintendent's report I find he has this to say about the reserve at Swan lake:

> Swan Lake reserve is situated on the north side of Swan lake in township 5, range 11, west of the 1st principal meridian and contains 9,634 acres. It is situated in a good wheat producing district and as there is plenty of water it is well adapted for stock-raising.

I may inform the minister that this reserve is located in one of the best wheat growing districts of Manitoba. It is within a mile and a half of the progressive town

of Swan Lake, and the citizens, they informed me, petitioned the department to have this reserve reserved from the Indians and opened for settlement. Will the minister endeavour to recover this and open it up for settlement ?

Mr. OLIVER. Is the Indian population small or large?

Mr. STAPLES. The Indian population on this 9,634 acres, and also on a section which is located south of the Assiniboine river and what is known as the Indian garden, is 99 Indians. There is a small portion of this reserve under cultivation and the people of Swan Lake would feel very grateful if it could be opened for settlement.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know that it will be posible to secure the release of all the reserve, as it is very difficult to get the Indians to remove, but as there seems to be more land than is of use to the Indians, I do not hesitate to say that we will make an effort to secure a surrender of such portion of the reserve as we can get.

Mr. STAPLES. Would it strengthen the citizens' case if they would circulate a petition and forward it setting out the facts?

Mr. OLIVER. No, I think not; we find that any agitation amongst their white neighbours in such a case arouses their antagonism and if the member will leave the matter just as it is I can assure him that a reasonable effort will be made to secure the release without any further effort on the part of the people there.

Mr. STAPLES. May I ask the minister when the effort will be made ?

Mr. OLIVER. We have a good many orders on hand and not very many men with special qualifications for negotiating with Indians, but we appreciate fully the desirability of securing a release of that reserve.

Mr. STAPLES. It will be reached some time during the coming summer?

Mr. OLIVER. I think the hon. member can depend on that, although to go into details of the matter we do not find that the summer is really the best time to enter into negotiations.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. All these Indian reserves taken back by the government are sold by public auction?

Mr. OLIVER. They are not all sold by public auction, it is either by tender or auction. In some cases where the reserve is not situated near a large population it is thought better to sell by tender.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. But they are all advertised?

Mr. OLIVER. Oh, yes, and where they are situated near a large population we think the better way is to sell by public auction.

Mr. WALSH. What right have the Indians to the timber on the different reserves?

Mr. OLIVER. Their ownership of timber is as absolute as is their ownership of land.

Mr. WALSH. Has not the timber been sold on some reserves to different companies?

Mr. OLIVER. Oh, yes, in many cases where the timber is of value, a release of the timber is secured from the Indians and then that timber is sold and dealt with as I described a little while ago. Practically it goes through the same process as timber on the public lands of the Dominion and the Indians of course get the proceeds.

Mr. WALSH. In that case have the Indians any right to timber for their buildings?

Mr. OLIVER. They have what rights have not been disposed of.

Mr. WALSH. I brought a question to the notice of the department to which I have not received any answer, that is with regard to the Doncaster reserve for the Caughnawaga Indians. I understand they have a right to cut timber for building purposes, and there is a lumber company who have a right to cut certain timber there. Last year some of the Indians cut timber which they said was for building purposes, and the company notified the department that these Indians had cut this timber. There is no agent of the department there, I am told, the company has taken possession of these logs, and the Indians are given no satisfaction. I have asked the department to intervene, but I have had no information so far from them.

Mr. OLIVER. I am informed that the matter is being looked into on representations made by the hon. member. The conditions, I understand, are that years ago a license to cut timber was issued to a certain company, that company had certain rights in that timber, and the position of the company is that the Indians, in cutting their timber, have trespassed upon the company's rights. Of course there is a collision, and the department is doing its best to settle their mutual rights.

Mr. WALSH. I understand the Indians are allowed to cut timber for building purposes.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not sure about that. It would depend, I fancy, on the original arrangement when the company was given its license. There would be some saving clause, no doubt, to the advantage of the Indians. with regard to timber. I cannot

say what that saving clause is. No doubt there is a difference of opinion as to what the clause means.

Mr. WALSH. The department have informed me that the Indians have a right to cut these logs for building purposes, I have that information from the department. They cut these logs and took them to the mill to be cut into boards for building. The department has no agent there. and they transferred to this company, who have a right to cut logs there, the duty of settling whether the Indians were going to use that for building purposes or not. I have asked the department to intervene, I have written them twice, and have no answer yet. I think the department ought to intervene on behalf of these Indians.

Mr. OLIVER. There is no question that it is the duty of the department to protect the interests of the Indians, and I am informed that there is an effort being made to protect their interests.

Mr. WALSH. Would the minister tell me who are the members of this Charlemagne and Lecouvreur Company ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I think the McLaren's are members of that firm.

Mr. LENNOX. Is it a fact, as the hon. gentleman has suggested, that the department has deputed to this company the right to judge between the company and the Indians ?

Mr. OLIVER. No, I think that is a mistake. Of course the department could not transfer their responsibility in the matter to one of the interested parties in the dispute.

Mr. WALSH. I may inform the minister that the department told me so.

Mr. OLIVER. Would the hon, member mention the name of the official ?

Mr. WALSH. I cannot recollect it at the moment, it was the deputy of Mr. Pedley. Another gentleman was with me when he told me so.

Mr. OLIVER. Was it the officer who is sitting near me ?

Mr. WALSH. No, it was the deputy of your deputy. I will get the name, I think I have it in a letter.

Mr. STAPLES. I would ask the minister if while investigating other Indian reserves, he would see if it is not possible to recover that section which is contained in the Indian Garden reserve.

Mr. OLIVER. I have heard of that small reserve, but I understand there is some difficulty about it, that it is considered a sort of common ground. I am given to understand that it is not altogether the reserve of the Swan Lake band, there are several other interests concerned. However, we will do our best to deal with it at the same time.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Before these items are all carried I wish to ask the minister how much money was gathered from the Indian trust fund and expended on Indian affairs last year. There is the general trust fund, and there is $1,200,000 expended in addition. I would like to know the amount that is taken away from the trust fund, or the amount received from that trust fund and expended.

Mr. OLIVER. The amount expended from the trust fund during the year 1904-1905 was $346,660. That is simply a special expenditure, and is not part of the general expenditure appearing under our vote.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I desire to make the statement that I believe the Indian Department is most extravagantly managed, and I think I can show the proof in a few moments. We have an Indian population of about 100,000, and at present there are 2,200 officers in charge. During the last ten years the number of officials of the Indian Department has increased by 359. The total expenditure for officials last year was $664,072.92, while the total amount these gentlemen had to expend was only $1,594,665. Now in addition to that we find that the reserves in British Columbia amounted to 1,000 in number, while the Indians in British Columbia were only 20,000, 20 Indians to a reserve.

Mr. OLIVER. That is a mistake. I said there were 25,000 Indians.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Well, we will say 25 Indians to a reserve. Is it not possible to place these Indians in larger groups and make them more comfortable than they are to-day, and take care of them with less money than we are expending on them ? It takes $664,000 to $1,594,665 and it certainly seems to me most extraordinary.

Mr. OLIVER. In reply to the hon. gentleman I find that his criticism will apply to the administration of the Indian Department ever since the beginning. A large proportion of the expenditure in salaries arises from the fact that the chief expenditure on Indians is for the direction of the Indians, for their education, for their management, for the supplying to them of that principle which is civilization.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Is it succeeding ?

Mr. OLIVER. Well, it is a question whether it is succeeding. I suppose that many hopes have been entertained that have not been realized. We are not arguing that point at the present time, but I am saying that by reason of its nature it follows that a large portion of the expenditure is in salaries because the work is largely that of direction and management. It does not necessarily involve the expenditure of money for other purposes in large amounts.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Why is the number of officials constantly increasing ? Why has it increased by 359 in ten years ? The population is not increasing to any extent while the officials are increasing in number year after year and the expenditure is constantly increasing. When is it going to stop ? What is the cause of it ? Why are we going to expend such a large amount of the money of the wards of the nation in trying to take care of them, while, if we were to place them in larger groups, we could make them much more comfortable with less money and with fewer officials ?

Mr. OLIVER. The difficulty of collecting together in large groups the Indians of British Columbia, I am afraid, would make the operations of the Indian Department very much more expensive than they are now. The experience of this and other countries with the Indians is that it is much cheaper to deal with them by gentle measures than by coercive measures and that so long as we are able to have amicable relations with the Indians we are really saving money although we may seem to be spending it with increasing liberality. As I have already stated one reason of the increase in the expenditure and in the number of officials is that we have added new territory. We have added treaty No. 8, we have added the Yukon and we have assumed jurisdiction over a part of British Columbia that we had previously paid no attention to.

Mr. FOWLER. Where is Treaty No. 8 located ?

Mr. OLIVER. Athabasca.

Mr. FOWLER. How many reserves have you in British Columbia ?

Mr. OLIVER. 1,040.

Some resolutions reported.

Mr. PATERSON moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. What will be the business to-morrow ?

Mr. PATERSON. Some Bills will be taken up and then we will go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. FOSTER. What items ?

Mr. PATERSON. The Departments of the Interior, Inland Revenue and perhaps Penitentiaries.

Mr. FOSTER. In that order ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. First the Department of the Interior ?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. That will do for to-morrow.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.20 a.m., Friday.

Mr. OLIVER.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, April 6, 1906.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 86) respecting the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamship Company.—Mr. Carvell.

Bill (No. 87) to incorporate the Vancouver, Fraser Valley and Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Macpherson.

Bill (No. 88) respecting the Mutual Fire Insurance Company of the counties of Rimouski, Temiscouata and Kamouraska and to change its name to the Mutual Fire Insurance Company.—Mr. J. A. Ross.

Bill (No. 89) to incorporate the Ashcroft, Barkerville and Fort George Railway Company.—Mr. Duncan Ross.

Bill (No. 90) to incorporate the International Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Pardee.

Bill (No. 91) to incorporate the Minnesota-Canadian Bridge Company.—Mr. Dyment, by Mr. Logan.

Bill (No. 92) respecting the Essex Terminal Railway Company.—Mr. Clarke.

Bill (No. 93) to incorporate the Alberta Northern Railway and Coal Company.—Mr. Clarke.

Bill (No. 94) respecting the Rio de Janeiro Tramway, Light and Power Company, Limited.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 95) respecting the Mexican Light and Power Company, Limited.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 96) respecting the Mexican Consolidated Electric Company and to change its name to the Mexican Tramway and Electric Company.—Mr. Calvert.

ACT RESPECTING SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 97) to amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Explain.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. This Bill is intended merely to remedy an omission that occurred last session when we passed the Act with reference to the indemnity to members of the House of Commons. Through my fault we omitted all reference to the case of a member who though in Ottawa to attend his duties during the session is ill and unable to be present at the sittings of the House. As the Bill stands now he would be deprived of his indemnity under such circumstances. This Bill is to restore the conditions as they existed previous to last session.

Mr. MORIN. That is all right.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved :

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

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT FOR EASTER.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved :

That when this House adjourns on Wednesday, the 11th instant, it stand adjourned till Tuesday the 17th instant.

Motion agreed to.

DELAY IN BRINGING DOWN RETURNS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton). Before the Orders of the Day are called I wish to bring to the attention of the government the memorandum brought down by the Secretary of State, showing returns ordered by the House of Commons during the sessions of 1904 and 1905 and not yet brought down.

The following returns were ordered by the House of Commons during the session of 1904 and have not yet been brought down :

Mr. Hackett.—Papers in relation to the construction of the railway from Southport to Murray Harbour, Prince Edward Island.

Mr. Lancaster.—Information respecting coal furnished to the government during the fiscal year ending 30th June last.

Mr. Lancaster.—Information respecting post offices, drill halls, armouries and other public buildings erected or improved since 1896.

Mr. Lancaster.—Passes on Canadian government railways and steamers from January 1, 1903, to January, 1904, other than those issued to senators and members of parliament of Canada.

Mr. Monk.—Correspondence and petition to the selection of a site for the new post office at St. John d'Iberville.

Mr. Bruneau.—Correspondence and other documents in relation to the dredging of Baie La Valliére.

Mr. Davis.—Correspondence and other documents relating to the navigation of the Saskatchewan river, Winnipegosis, Cedar and Cumberland lakes, also the amounts of money expended on the same.

Mr. Casgrain.—Correspondence and petitions in connection with the dredging and deepening of the channel to the landing at Beaton, British Columbia, on the Upper Lardeau.

Mr. Monk.—Particulars respecting prisoners allowed out on ticket-of-leave since the 1st May, 1903.

Mr. Taylor.—Information respecting buildings leased, rented or occupied by the government. other than those owned by the government in the city of Ottawa.

Mr. Barker.—All papers, not already brought down, relating to the proposed National Transcontinental Railway.

Mr. Tolton.—Return showing the number of official and private cars constructed or acquired for the government since the year 1880. How have they been used. Expenditure for construction or acquiring and using the same, &c.

Mr. Casgrain.—All papers, documents, letters, correspondence, petitions and decisions of the Department of Railways and Canals respecting the establishment and running of a passenger train on the Intercolonial between Campbellton and Causapscal, and between Campbellton and Ste. Flavie.

Mr. Bell.—Copies of all original monthly returns, reports, statements and other documents, received by or sent by the government showing the money spent and the work performed on the breakwater at Port Morien, Cape Breton, up to 31st May, 1904.

The following returns were ordered by the House of Commons during the session of 1904, and having not yet been brought down :

Mr. Macdonell. — Statement showing all moneys spent on the Toronto harbour and breakwater during each year from 1880 to 1904, inclusive.

Mr. Lewis.—Applications for the improvement of the lighthouse service, the establishment of additional aids to navigation.

Mr. Lalor.—Orders for works or supplies given by the Department of Marine and Fisheries since July 1, 1903, without having previously invited tenders by public advertisement.

Mr. Johnston (Cape Breton).—Information respecting vessels sailing for South Africa under the contract with the government of Canada for the establishment of steamship service with South Africa.

Mr. Lavergne.—Public buildings erected by the federal government in the differnt provinces since confederation.

Mr. Roche (Marquette).—Information respecting land in the Northwest Territories surveyed in block outlines for the years 1880, 1881, 1882, 1883, 1900, 1901, 1902 and 1903.

Mr. Monk.—Information respecting expenditure in equipping and provisioning the government steamship 'Canada.'

Mr. Ames.—Contracts or orders for supplies of commodities given by the Department of Marine and Fisheries during the year ending June 30, 1904, without public tenders being called for and all correspondence relating thereto.

Mr. Barker.—Papers, not already brought down relating to the harbour of Port Colborne, the breakwater thereof, and elevators or proposed elevators therein.

Mr. Foster.—Detailed information respecting rails on government railways covering the fiscal years from July 1, 1879, to June 30, 1904.

Mr. Lennox.—All papers in reference to the question of establishing rural delivery in Canada.

Mr. Lewis.—All memoranda since January 1, 1904, concerning the Lurcher lightship.

Mr. Lewis.—Information respecting price and conditions of contract for the lightship Lurcher and East Point Anticosti.

Mr. Barker.—All papers relating to the construction of the several sections of the Murray Harbour Branch Railway.

Mr. Foster.—Information respecting wharfs, docks, and piers constructed each year since 1896.

Mr. Belcourt.—All correspondence, &c., relating to the relief of the Earl of Dundonald from the position of General Officer Commanding the Canadian Militia.

Mr. Macdonnell.—Particulars of investments made by life insurance companies and all re-

ports of the deputy minister of insurance in regard thereto.

Mr. Grant.—All papers relating to the proposed deviation of the line of the James Bay Railway to the west of Lake Simcoe.

Mr. Costigan.—Correspondence against the passage of Bill No. 101 to incorporate the Winding Ledges Power and Boom Company, Limited.

Mr. McLean (Queen's).—All papers relating to the dismissal of James Power, late postmaster at Wheatley River, P. E. I., to the appointment of a successor and to the re-appointment of the said James Power.

Mr. Lamont.—Correspondence with the Rev. James Taylor, or any other person, on behalf of the retired servants, of the Hudson's Bay Company, in reference to their claim to a portion of the estate of the late Lord Selkirk.

Mr. Martin (Queen's).—All correspondence memorials, &c., from the government of Prince Edward Island, its legislature, or public assemblies since confederation concerning the matter of communication between the island and the mainland.

Mr. Crawford.—All papers relating to the closing of Lake Manitoba from summer fishing.

Mr. Daniel.—Copies of all or any reports to date by the Transportation Commission with regard to the port and harbour of St. John, N.B.

Mr. Lavergne (Montmagny).—Correspondence regarding the Canadian exhibition at Liège, in Belgium.

Mr. Borden (Carleton).—Papers relating to any efforts or proposals to authorize the investment of trust funds in the United Kingdom in the securities of any province of Canada, and the fulfilment of any necessary conditions to that end.

I thought it advisable to bring these matters to the attention of the departments in this way, by having the list placed upon Hansard. It does seem to me that a great many of these returns have been unduly delayed. As an illustration, I am perfectly satisfied that the papers relating to any efforts or proposals to authorize the investment of trust funds in the United Kingdom in the securities, of any province of Canada, cannot be very voluminous; and yet the motion for them was made last June.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. They were brought down yesterday, I understand.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is, to say the least, not very prompt. Some of these orders may relate to matters of no further interest to the House; the returns have been delayed so long that they would perhaps be of no use now. The departments, I suppose, will be able to judge of that themselves, or by correspondence with the members who moved for them. But apart from that, I would suggest that the attention of the departments be given to them. Some have been standing for more than two years, others for about one year.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. With regard to those orders which go back to 1904, I understand, though I cannot speak personally, that the practice has always been not to bring in a new parliament returns which were moved for in the previous parliament. With regard to the orders of 1905, my hon. friend is aware that very few papers are moved for with the view of having them laid on the table of the House, but most of them are moved for simply with the view of having a discussion on some subject. When papers are ordered and are wanted by the member who moves for them, he usually takes care to renew his motion until the papers are brought down; but my hon. friend will find that in many cases the member who moves for papers has served his object when he has made the motion and made his speech.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not think the departments should take that view. They are not to judge whether the object of a member is satisfied by the passage of the resolution. It seems to me that the departments should obey the orders of the House, and not take upon themselves to judge whether or not any useful object is to be served by bringing the papers down. Of course, the member who has made the motion does in most cases look after it; but he does not always do so. The very illustration the right hon. gentleman has brought to the attention of the House is a sufficient answer to that suggestion. In 1904 certain papers were moved for by gentlemen who are not now members of the House; nevertheless they might be of very great importance. I do not know whether the rule the Prime Minister suggests in regard to the lapsing of orders is one that has been acted on in the past or not; I have not looked into it. The same idea occurred to me. If the orders lapse, it would of course be necessary to repeat the motions so far as any of them are important. Perhaps Mr. Speaker will give us a decision in regard to that at some future day, after looking into the question, so that we may know what is necessary to be done in that connection. I would suggest that it might be well for some official of the House to keep in an accessible form a memorandum of all returns brought down. We should at all times have on the table of the House a record by which any member could ascertain at once, without running all over the building, whether an order of the House in which he is interested has been complied with or not. Perhaps that can be considered in connection with the proposed revision of the rules.

NAVIGATION OF NORTHUMBERLAND STRAITS.

Mr. J. J. HUGHES (King's, P.E.I.). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to some questions which were asked a few days ago by the senior member for Queen's county regarding the ice-breaking steamer

now being built in the old country. The question was whether that steamer was intended for service in Northumberland Straits or to take the place of the 'Montcalm' on the St. Lawrence river, and whether the 'Montcalm' would be sent to assist in the winter navigation between the Island and the mainland. I also asked regarding some remarks which were current in certain localities concerning the capabilities of the 'Montcalm' as an ice-breaker. The hon. minister said he would give me the information to-day.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). It is the intention of the department to utilize this boat, now being constructed in England, or the 'Montcalm' on the winter service in the Straits of Northumberland. Those two boats will be absolutely fit for such service. There were some doubts as to whether the 'Montcalm' would be suitable. I asked the opinion of the technical officers of my department, and am informed by Commander Spain and Mr. McElhinney that the 'Montcalm' is a far more powerful ice-breaker than either the 'Minto' or the 'Stanley.' She has 1,600 horse-power more than the 'Stanley' and 800 more than the 'Minto.' So far as strength goes, the work therefore could easily be done by the 'Montcalm.' The 'Montcalm' in the last two years has been engaged in breaking the ice bridge near Quebec and this year has been very successful. Last year, on account of an accident in the beginning of the year, she was not able to break the ice during the winter, but during the spring she did such splendid work that the floods which used to occur in the past, and which were due to a large extent to the ice bridge, did not take place. This year she was called upon to go to the Seven Islands during that part of the winter when the ice is thickest and she was absolutely successful. I would be very glad to show my hon. friend photos taken of her when in the neighbourhood of Seven Islands. He will see that she is certainly a boat which can do good service as far as strength goes.

Mr. SPROULE. What thickness of ice can she get through with ease ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Probably twenty-five inches, and perhaps more than that. My hon. friend also asked if the contract was given for the new boat. Well, tenders were asked for in the month of May or June of last year and were accepted by order in council passed last February.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queen's, P.E.I.). What is to be done with the steamers now on that route ? Why should they be withdrawn? The general belief is that either the 'Stanley' or the 'Minto' would be far more powerful than the 'Montcalm.' Why take these boats away, which have been fairly successful, and send the 'Montcalm' which has not been tested, except in the St. Lawrence ?

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend is absolutely mistaken regarding the 'Montcalm.' She is 1,600 horse-power more powerful than the 'Stanley' and nearly 800 more than the 'Minto.' Besides, I am advised by the officers of the department that there is not the slightest doubt she can do the service in a most satisfactory manner.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the hon. minister any data in his department indicating the depth of ice she can break ? That is very important as regards the harbours in the upper lakes. It is considered that if a good ice boat were sent up there, navigation would continue open much longer.

Mr. BRODEUR. There must be some data in the department and I shall be glad to supply the information. Owing to the work of the 'Montcalm,' the ice has entirely gone between Three Rivers and the port of Quebec whereas in former years the ice bridge at Cap Rouge prevented the ice from getting away and this caused the flooding of the upper St. Lawrence.

Mr. BERGERON. Where is the new boat being built and who are the contractors ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Vickers & Maxim in England—perhaps the best builders in the world.

Mr. A. MARTIN. Is it the intention to put the new boat on the Prince Edward Island route with the 'Montcalm' ?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, either one or the other will go there.

Mr. A. MARTIN. What do you propose to do with the 'Minto' and 'Stanley' ?

Mr. BRODEUR. We have not yet decided whether we will keep three boats there or not. That is a question to be considered.

REPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF MARINE AND FISHERIES.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Might I ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries whether we can expect the report of his department before the Easter holidays ? It is very desirable it should be placed in the hands of members before we adjourn. More than nine months have elapsed since the close of the fiscal year and there can be no good reason why this report should not be tabled.

Mr. BRODEUR. I expect to be able to bring it down Monday.

GERMAN TARIFF.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has my hon. friend the Minister of Customs any further information regarding the new German Tariff ?

That is a matter which affects this country very closely. It came into force the 1st March.

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). I made inquiry to-day of the Trade and Commerce Department. They have not yet received a copy of the tariff as finally passed. They have of course the original measure but that would probably be only misleading. I understand, however, that they have written Lord Strathcona for a copy, and as soon as it arrives I shall communicate it to the House.

WINNIPEG STREET CAR STRIKE.

Mr. J. G. H. BERGERON. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the Minister of Labour (Mr. Aylesworth) if the services of his department have been called for in the settlement of the strike in Winnipeg. I see by the newspapers of to-day that the strike is growing worse than ever. In former times the Department of Labour has offered its services towards the settlement of such difficulties; and what I desire to ask is whether the department has done anything in this case ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Labour). A telegram was received last week, or possibly this week, asking that the department should send an officer to Winnipeg with a view to enforcing the provisions of the Alien Labour Law. To that request, I replied that, under the amendment of the statute, the provisions of that law could be enforced by any person who chose to set the law in motion, with the assent of the Attorney General of the province. Since that time, I have had no communication on the subject from Winnipeg.

MONEY LENDERS ACT AMENDMENT.

On the order :

House in committee on Bill (No. 11) respecting money lenders.—Mr. Fitzpatrick.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). I move :

That this order be discharged and that the said Bill be referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce.

He said : Since this Bill was introduced, I have had representations from parties interested, calling attention to certain provisions in the Bill and asking to be heard. In order that parties may have the opportunity to be heard, I make this motion.

Motion agreed to.

SUPREME AND EXCHEQUER COURTS.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 67) to amend the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act. He said : This Bill is made necessary by the expression of opinion by the Supreme Court judges during the argument, and in the considered opinion, on the draft Bill in relation to the Lord's Day which had been submitted to the court. The doubt was expressed by the judges whether the court was a court of original jurisdiction in relation to such matters. The majority, while they answered some of the questions submitted, said that they did so notwithstanding the opinion they entertained to the effect that they had no jurisdiction to deal with the matter at all—that they might be called upon, under the statute as we have it, to deal with legislation that had actually been passed, but they could not be asked to express opinions with respect to legislation which was merely projected. However, as I have said, they did answer the questions submitted, and the reasons they gave were considered by the Privy Council. In order to remove any doubt with respect to the jurisdiction of the court I suggest the amendment embodied in this Bill.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I was not aware of the difficulty raised by the Supreme Court of Canada. May I ask in what the consideration of the proposed measure respecting the Lord's Day would differ from a question, for instance, with regard to the respective jurisdiction of the federal and provincial authorities over the foreshore—

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Or over railway crossings ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes. What is the difference ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I admit that, for my part, I do not see any difference in principle between the two cases. But their Lordships of the Supreme Court expressed the opinion—though, answering the questions afterwards—that they were not called upon to deal with abstract questions that they were a court of appeal, and that they ought to hear merely those questions that came before them on appeal from other courts. I, of course, do not accept that view myself. The court said, that, in view of the fact that they had dealt with these abstract questions before they would deal with the case, but would not continue to do so. To avoid doubt for the future, this Bill is introduced. To supplement what I have said I may explain that the Lord's Day case came before their lordships on a draft Bill which was submitted to them on the assumption that the Bill might be submitted to a local legislature, and they were asked the question : Assuming that this Bill had been submitted to a local legislature, whether it would be competent for that legislature to pass the Bill.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1 :

Section 3 of the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act, chapter 135 of the revised statutes, as the said section is enacted by schedule 'A' to chapter 16 of the statutes of 1887, is repealed and the following is substituted therefor :

3. The court of common law and equity in and for Canada now existing under the name of the Supreme Court of Canada, is hereby continued under the name as a general court of appeal for Canada, and as an additional court for the better administration of the laws of Canada, and shall continue to be a court of record.

The effect of this section is to add the words : As a general court of appeal for Canada and as an additional court for the better administration of the laws of Canada, and shall continue to be a court of record. The section as we now have it, reads as follows : The court of common law and equity in and for Canada now existing under the name of the 'Supreme Court of Canada' is hereby continued under such name, and shall continue to be a court of record. The doubt is expressed whether or not these words constitute a court of appeal and debar the court from sitting as a court of original jurisdiction. The added words are taken practically verbatim from section 101 of the British North America Act which provides for the establishment of the Supreme Court, and which is as follows :

The parliament of Canada may, notwithstanding anything in this Act, from time to time, provide for the constitution, maintenance and organization of a general court of appeal for Canada, and for the establishment of any additional courts for the better administration of the laws of Canada.

It will be seen that the last words of the section are practically the words of section 101, added to section three of the existing Supreme and Exchequer Court Act.

Mr. SPROULE. That is making two courts in one, is it not ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It makes a court which has original jurisdiction as a court of record, and also a court of appeal.

Mr. SPROULE. It is intended that you can initiate any case in the Supreme Court authorized by the Governor in Council without having it to go through the other courts.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is a question of law. The next clause provides the cases that may be submitted to the court.

On section 2,

Subsections 1 and 2 of section 37 of the said chapter 135 of the revised statutes, as the said section is enacted by section 4 of chapter 25 of the statutes of 1891, are repealed, and the following are substituted therefor :

37. Important questions of law or fact touching—

(a) the interpretation of the British North America Acts, 1867 to 1886, or

(b) the constitutionality or interpretation of any Dominion or provincial legislation ; or

(c) the appellate jurisdiction as to educational matters, by the British North America Act, 1867, or by any other Act or law vested in the Governor in Council ; or

(d) the powers of the parliament of Canada or of the legislatures of the provinces, or of the respective governments thereof, whether or not the particular power in question has any Dominion or provincial legislature ; or

(e) any other matter, whether or not in the opinion of the court ejusdem generale for the foregoing enumerations, with reference to which the Governor in Council sees fit to submit any such question;—

May be referred by the Governor in Council to the Supreme Court for hearing and consideration, and any question touching any of the matters aforesaid, so referred by the Governor in Council, shall be conclusively deemed to be an important question.

2. When any such reference is made to the court it shall be the duty of the court to hear and consider it, and to answer each question so referred ; and the court shall certify to the Governor in Council, for his information, its opinion upon each such question, with the reasons for each such answer ; and such opinion shall be pronounced in like manner as in the case of a judgment upon an appeal to the said court ; and any judge who differs from the opinion of the majority shall in like manner certify his opinion and his reasons.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the difference between this and the existing statute ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Practically no difference. The difference between this statute and the statute which we already have is a difference in words rather than a difference in subject, except with respect to subsections (b) and (e) of section 2. Subsection (b) provides in terms that a question may be submitted with respect to the power of the parliament of Canada or of the legislature of a province or of the respective governments thereof, whether or not the particular power in question has been proposed to be executed. That is to say we can submit a draft Bill or an abstract question. You are not obliged to submit a Bill that has actually been passed either by a provincial legislature or parliament ; you may submit an abstract question in the draft Bill. Then I seek to provide, by subsection (e), that the doctrine of ejusdem generis shall not apply. In the case of the Lord's Day Act, it was held that the matter must be ejusdem generis with the question enumerated but here I provide that the doctrine ejusdem generis does not apply.

Mr. BERGERON. I do not know whether it could be remedied in this Bill, but I wish to call the attention of my hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick) to a state of things that exists in the Supreme Court. It has frequently happened that the court has had to adjourn on account of not having a quorum of judges. That is a source of great inconvenience to lawyers and pleaders. There is also another question. The chief justice is away just now on leave of

absence and that leaves on the bench only one judge of the French language, the Hon. Mr. Justice Girouard. I understood the other day from my hon. friend (Mr. Fitzpatrick), in answer to my hon. friend (Mr. Monk), that he was contemplating some arrangement by which this difficulty could be obviated. I especially call his attention to the fact that in the case of one judge being absent who is of the French language, it would be very important that if there is a temporary addition to the court it should be a judge of the same language. I think it is imposing a very large responsibility on one judge when two of them should be there.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Of course strictly speaking, four judges of the Supreme Court are a quorum. The practice, however, is for five judges to sit, and I understand that while there is no rule to that effect, there is an understanding between the judges that in so far as those cases which arise in the province of Quebec are concerned, they are not heard except when the two judges from the province of Quebec are present, sitting on the bench, unless by the consent of the parties. With that exception the practice has been in the past to invariably provide that in cases from the province of Quebec two judges from Quebec shall sit. Of course there are very obvious reasons for that, because of the rules of law which obtain in our province, which are to a large extent, except in commercial matters, different from those of the other provinces. I understand that the judges so regulate the business of the Court that they invariably sit with the two judges from Quebec except when by consent of the parties they determine otherwise. My hon. friend will readily realize that cases arise in the province of Quebec where it is not necessary that there should be two judges involving questions of commercial law where all judges are equally competent.

Mr. BERGERON. Could not something be done as is done in Montreal where the Chief Justice, in case any judge is not competent to sit by reason of having heard the case before or having given an opinion or some other cause, has power to add a judge to the bench. If something of this kind could be done here, say by the Department of Justice, I think it would help a great deal.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I quite agree and the question is now being considered whether it would not be well to have some such provision. I have in mind my hon. friend's suggestion that when the absent member of the bench is from Quebec, the choice of a judge to take the position which he occupies should be made from Quebec, and I think it should be the same in respect to the other provinces. That is a matter which may be arranged for during the present session, but my hon. friend is aware that, in dealing with this question of the constitution of the courts, I like to proceed slowly and do not care to bring in legislation without considering it carefully and especially without getting the opinion of the Chief Justice and the judges of the Supreme Court on the subject.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The appeal to the judicial committee is by special leave in all these cases ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Oh, yes, there is no appeal to the judicial committee from the Supreme Court except by special leave.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Unless it is in admiralty.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In admiralty, I do not know how that stands.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think there is an appeal there.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Of course there the appeal is to the Privy Council because the admiralty in our country is really a branch of the admiralty in England.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I suppose it is desirable to have the judges certify their opinions for the purpose of the information of the Privy Council.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Apart from that consideration I would be inclined to have the judges answer the question and give the opinion of the majority of the court as is done in the judicial committee. The dissenting Lords of the Privy Council, may have strong opinions, but they do not express them. However, where there is a possibility of an appeal, it is desirable you should have the opinion of the minority judges for the use of the Court of Appeal.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I suppose in case of appeal the appellant would be entitled practically as a matter of right to have the opinion of the dissenting judges.

On the preamble,

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is just one other question I would like to ask. I think nearly all the provincial legislatures have enacted laws under which the opinion of a provincial court may be taken as to the constitutionality of a provincial enactment. That is the case I know in Nova Scotia, and I think that is the case in Ontario.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is the case in Ontario I know.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I suppose there is no danger of any conflict. There would be an appeal in any case from the judgment

of the provincial court I suppose by statute and certainly there would by special leave of the judicial committee.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Exactly. I know that under our system in the province of Quebec there is a direct appeal to the judicial committee, independent altogether of the Supreme Court. That is, when you have your choice between the Privy Council and the Supreme Court, and I suppose this would be a matter to be regulated by provincial statute.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. An appeal in our province from such a judgment as I have referred to, would only be by special leave, but in civil cases where the sum in dispute is beyond a certain amount, $1,500 or $2,500, then there is an appeal to the Privy Council, and the party can take his choice.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is exactly how it is in Ontario.

Bill reported.

CANADA EVIDENCE ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 68) further to amend the Canada Evidence Act.—Mr. Fitzpatrick—read the second time and House went into committee thereon.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). This Bill is introduced because of the judgment of the Supreme Court in a somewhat celebrated case that arose in the province of Quebec that is the case of King vs. Gosselin, in which the judges of the Supreme Court held that the word 'competent' in the Act as we now have it means 'compellable' and that a husband or wife is a compellable witness for the Crown before a criminal court. In order to prevent such construction being put upon the statute hereafter, which construction, I believe, never was intended, I have introduced this legislation, which makes a husband or a wife a competent witness for the defence, but not a compellable witness, and of course they cannot be asked to disclose anything arising between them during the marriage. I would like to suggest an amendment to this Bill. I would like to omit the words 'in addressing the jury' in the second subsection, which reads :

> The failure of the person charged, or of the wife or husband of such person, to testify, shall not be made the subject of comment by the judge or by counsel for the prosecution in addressing the jury.

It can very easily be conceived that counsel during the course of the trial might very well make a suggestion which would be as fatal to the unfortunate prisoner as if he made it when addressing the jury. I am indebted for this suggestion to one of the judges of the court of appeal of Ontario, who, having looked over this Bill, directed my attention to the matter, and I propose to amend it in that regard. I therefore beg leave to move that the words 'in addressing the jury' in the third and fourth lines of subsection 2 be stricken out.

Mr. LANCASTER. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Justice if this would apply to a case where a man elects to be tried without a jury as well as to a jury trial.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Certainly. I did not think of that, but there are many serious cases where persons elect to be tried without a jury.

Mr. LANCASTER. In defending people before our county court judges when they have elected to be tried without a jury, I have known the crown attorney sometimes to tell the judge that we did not want to produce a man who was competent to testify in his own behalf, and I have had to object more than once and point out that counsel had no right to draw the judge's attention to the fact that a man might have gone in the box, but did not go there. I would urge that provision be made that in a non jury trial counsel be not permitted to direct the judge's attention to the fact that I could have put the man charged in the box if I had wanted to.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That would be a direct violation of this provision.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the memorandum of the present law, which I have before me, is correct, it seems that there is a further limitation contained in the proposed amendment. The law as it stands at the present time is as follows:

> 4. Every person charged with an offence, and the wife or husband, as the case may be, of the person so charged, shall be a competent witness, whether the person so charged is charged solely or jointly with any other person.

The proposed amendment introduces the words 'for the defence' after the words 'competent witness.'

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Designedly, so that he will not be a compellable witness. The defendant may go into the box on his own behalf, or the wife or husband of the defendant may be a competent witness for the defence.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But, suppose a witness is perfectly willing to be a witness for the prosecution, under the proposed amendment, it seems to me that he would not be competent.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. He would not be competent.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is intended ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You want to do away altogether with the competency of husband or wife to testify for the prosecution ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Except in certain named cases.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Enumerated futher on ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Mr. BERGERON. In a case of murder ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes. Is there any particular reason for making that change ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The relation of husband and wife is such that it is not desirable that either one should be compellable witness for or against the other.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. They would not be compellable if you left the words in ; they would be competent.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They would be competent. It is not desirable that it should be the case ; it certainly is not the law in England and it was not the law here before the introduction of the Canada Evidence Act.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. They are not competent, even in England ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Not competent. I thought I had the English Act here, but I have not. But that is my recollection of it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps the hon. minister would permit this Bill to stand in order that we may consider this point. The tendency in England and in this country as well, is to have witnesses competent without any restriction whatever, except in so far as the communications of husband and wife are concerned, departing altogether from the original idea of the common law which was that a person who had any, even the most trifling, interest whatever, should not even be a competent witness. We are making a rather important change in the law if we adopt the amendment in this way, and it might be possibly a matter of consideration if we should go that far. Apart from that particular feature, I agree with the view of the Minister of Justice, as to the amendment which he has just made. If he would have no objection I would like time to consider that point.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I don't object at all. In civil cases it is quite desirable to make the door as wide as possible so as to get at the truth, and the tendency nowadays is to make all parties to suits—except in the case of those occupying certain relations one towards the other—competent as witnesses. In criminal matters, the law has always been, and it is desirable it should continue to be, as far as possible to protect the relation which exists between husband and wife.

Mr. FITZPATRICK.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Suppose a brutal husband who had been separated from his wife for a number of years should commit a very serious assault or even murder in her presence and she was perfectly willing to testify ; under the law as it existed before she would be competent, but not compellable, but under the amendment now proposed she would be competent as a witness for her husband but not competent as a witness against him. I would like time to consider whether or not we should go that far.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The case mentioned by my hon. friend is one which might occur, but is not at all a probability. Then again it may be possible that the wife may have some interest in being examined against her husband. I think on the whole the balance of wisdom would be on the side of preventing the husband and wife from being brought into conflict in a case of that description. It would require almost an unnatural condition of things to exist for such evidence to be at all necessary.

Mr. CLARKE. I would ask the Minister of Justice whether the exceptions in schedule C refer to the case of bigamy, so that the first wife could give evidence against her husband.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, sections 275 and 276 cover the case of bigamy.

Section allowed to stand.

Progress reported.

SUPPLY—WEST BLOCK—COLLAPSE OF NEW TOWER.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton). I ask the Minister of Public Works whether he has any further information with reference to the collapse of the West Block tower. Who was the inspector, what attention did he give to the work, what were his qualifications and experience? Even at this early date the minister should be able to give us that information at least. I ask also whether any investigation has been begun or completed, and whether the minister will lay the specifications before the House at his earliest convenience? I understood him to say yesterday that the specifications were exactly the same as had been used in the construction of the building originally. It is important that we should know something about this at the earliest possible moment, as the accident is not only of a very serious nature, but an extremely unusual one. That a building constructed of solid masonry, a tower 80 feet in height, should suddenly crumble and collapse without a moment's warning is certainly very extraordinary. It

appears that the danger to human life was greater than I mentioned yesterday, because some five or six men narrowly escaped by taking flight on hearing some stones fall and feeling a tremor in the building. It is due to the country and the House that the minister should give any further information that is available.

Hon. CHARLES HYMAN (Minister of Public Works). To my mind the seriousness of the accident is a reason why there should be the fullest investigation. I did not allow one moment to pass before starting an investigation in the way of calling in an outside architect. I am in telegraphic communication with Mr. Fuller, of Toronto, a man who stands very high in his profession. I have asked Mr. Fuller to come to Ottawa at the earliest possible moment and nothing will be done to prevent the fullest investigation by that gentleman. I have not taken any further steps in the meantime until I get Mr. Fuller's report, which I expect will enable me to make such inquiry as will place the responsibility where it ought to be placed. I can assure the House that I appreciate the seriousness of the matter and at the earliest possible moment after receiving Mr. Fuller's report I will lay it before the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I asked the minister who the inspector was, what his qualifications were, what was his experience, and whether he was engaged in any other work at the same time?

Mr. HYMAN. I have no further information than I gave yesterday. The architect of the department, Mr. Taylor, was in full charge of the work. I have not as yet looked into the question as to whether or not there was an inspector appointed. I would prefer that the House allow me to get Mr. Fuller's report before any further steps are taken. Mr. Fuller will be here to-morrow or Monday morning, and immediately thereafter I will have made a full investigation and bring the result down.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman has no investigation to make to find out whether an inspector was appointed and who he was.

Mr. HYMAN. I want to discuss first with Mr. Fuller the facts of the case and see if any officer of the department was to blame.

Mr. A. BRODER (Dundas). There is no expert necessary to see pretty plainly why that building fell. It is not to be presumed that right under the shadow of the department of government which has control of the public buildings in the country, a contractor would be allowed to depart one hair's breadth from the specifications laid down for the building. You can go over there and look at the building and you will find the brick wall lying inside completely detached from the centre or filling wall, between the brick lining and the outside finish about eight inches thick. There is no strength given the wall by this outer lining. The strength of the wall ought to be in the centre wall and the lining ought to be attached to it by proper mortar or cement. That is not the case in this building; there does not seem to be any bond at all in the centre wall which should give the building its strength. The outside finish gives the wall very little strength, as we know from the fact that three or four years ago the outside finish of the southern wall of the Western block fell away from the inner wall and had to be taken down and put up again. Now, is it possible that the department over which the hon. gentleman has supervision would allow a building to be constructed under specifications that gave a building of that kind no strength at all? I do not mean to say that my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works should give the work his personal attention; that is not expected, but the department is full of officials—experts as they are called, and the more refined the expert is, the less effective, apparently, is the work. We have got science down so fine that we can see better than other people, but the trouble is that in the end we are all wrong. Now, I took the trouble to get some of the—I don't know what to call it. One will have to be an expert to tell what they call this, mortar or lime or cement.

Mr. SPROULE. Sand.

Mr. BRODER. No, filling.

Mr. HYMAN. Might I ask the hon. gentleman where he procured the sample he has in his hand?

Mr. BRODER. I went up in the inside of the building—and this is no matter of curiosity, it is a matter of public concern what our buildings are being built with; I went on to the roof, and got this sample out of the wall at the top of the fallen part of the tower. There is no bond whatever in it. I will take the liberty of sending the sample over to the hon. gentleman, because if he has not seen it before, he should see it now. I understand that the upper part of that wall was built during frosty weather, and apparently there is no bond whatever in the material which is supposed to hold the wall together. Some people say that the trouble is that there are no iron girders or bond timbers. Bond timbers are not for the purpose of holding a wall together; they are for the purpose of bearing other timbers to which lathing is nailed. Under the specifications under which this building was constructed, what happened? When the frost came out of this so-called mortar, it softened and the building tumbled down. Its fall may be prophetic, because I believe it was called the Laurier

tower. We have to come to the conclusion that the government's feet are not of brass, but of clay, because the whole thing is falling down. This is a matter of considerable concern to the other side of the House, surely. I do not think that the contractor could depart from the specifications ; but if that is the kind of work the public is getting all over this country from the large expenditure of money by the Department of Public Works, it is a subject in which the public should take a very live interest. I suppose no one will admit that more fully than the hon. gentleman himself. I am quite aware that the tramping of soldiers or even the running of a dog over a bridge is sometimes dangerous, even to a strong bridge ; but there was no tramping to cause this building to fall down. Six men went on the roof to put on the copper, and down she came. There was no wind, no storm ; it was a departmental failure, that was the trouble. I was looking at that building the other day, and with what little architectural knowledge I have, I said that the tower did not improve the building architecturally at all. The building would look quite as well without that tower. I was not aware that events would come to my assistance so soon to remove it. It is down now, and I would suggest that it be left down, because in my opinion the architectural effect is better without it. That question may be submitted to the experts ; if so, you will have my opinion without any cost. Now, what kind of mortar was used in that building—sand and lime, or sand and cement ? Can the hon. gentleman tell me ?

Mr. HYMAN. I do not want to prejudge the report of the architect ; I do not feel myself competent to do so. The hon. gentleman seems to think that he is competent to discuss the matter, and to say where the blame should lie. I confess that I am not. I want to have the examination of experts in order to place the blame on the proper shoulders.

Mr. BRODER. I think the specifications called for mortar and sand or sand and cement. That is surely a question the hon. gentleman can answer.

Mr. HYMAN. I certainly cannot answer the question at the moment. In addition to the investigation, I intend to have the mortar analysed.

Mr. BRODER. If the building was constructed according to the specifications, and if that ingredient which I have sent over to the hon. gentleman is according to the specifications, it is no wonder the building fell, because there is no bond whatever in the mortar, and there is nothing to fasten the brick to the centre wall. These are matters which do not require the knowledge of an expert ; a man's eyes are enough to show him what the trouble is. Any man who knows anything about cement knows that you cannot successfully construct a strong building with cement which freezes after it is used. It was wrong to allow the building to be proceeded with in frosty weather. I am aware that buildings are constructed successfully in winter with what is called hot mortar ; but if cement was used for the construction of this building during severe frosty weather, then I think the people who had charge of the undertaking certainly were not looking after the interests of the country as officials under the control of the Minister of Public Works should.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton). Mr. Speaker, having had considerable experience in building bridges and cement walls, I had the curiosity to investigate the building to which this accident has happened, and I quite agree with my hon. friend from Dundas (Mr. Broder) that it is a very good indication that the present government is dying at the top.

An hon. MEMBER. We have heard that before.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I have here a specimen of some of the filling that was placed in the walls of that building, and instead of it being sand or gravel, properly mixed with cement, and properly bonded, I find that large sections of the ceiling are merely filled with cinders. I have specimens of the cinders used as filling, and I do not see how it is possible for any man to expect to put up a tower to the height that was expected to go and believe it could possibly remain standing with such binding as was found in that centre wall.

Not only should we draw the attention of the government to this matter, but I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to two of the constructions carried on by this government upon Lake Huron. At the little town of St. Jo, the Minister of Public Works some years ago agreed to construct a pier. As a matter of fact there is really no town in that district, although there is a locality known by that name. He, however, went into that district and agreed to construct this pier and expended many thousand dollars on it. But I have yet to learn that the first boat has called there, and within the last year that pier has been washed away by the waters of Lake Huron. If the minister will go along that lake, he will find parts of the pier scattered along its shores down towards Sarnia. That is merely a sample of the work done by this government. It was built simply on top of the sand in the bottom of the lake and the waves came and washed it out of existence. I want also to call the attention of the hon. minister to the fact that at Grand Bend, in spite of the warnings of a number of people who called his attention to the flimsy way in which that breakwater was being constructed, a breakwater was built with a sand foundation, and

the result has been that it is being undermined and is gradually going to pieces. That pier construction cost $20,000. I can hardly believe that the minister can be cognizant of the manner in which his officials are carrying on the work of his department, and I wish to impress upon him the necessity of his taking more pains to see that the inspectors and the other officials on public works should be more careful and competent men. As regards the work at Grand Bend, if the minister will investigate it, he will find that it was simply set on top of the sand and then the department started dredging within a very few feet of the pier. How could it be possible for any man to go into a contract such as that and expect the pier to remain in the position in which it was built?

I sincerely hope that this tower accident will be a lesson to the minister to be more careful in the erection of public works throughout the country.

Mr. PETER ELSON (East Middlesex). Government buildings, above all others, should be safe and free from endangering the lives of persons passing by or frequenting them. Only a short time ago I had occasion to walk past this building and I have reason to be very thankful that the accident did not happen just then. I am not a builder myself nor an architect, but I have seen a great deal of building done, I have seen a great deal of stone work and cement work done, and when the accident happened to that tower, I naturally went and examined the ruins. What surprised me was that that building, constructed as it had been, stood as long as it did. I do not know what the specifications called for, but I would judge that no cement had been used. Nor were there any tie stones. I could see no long stones reaching from one side to the other. The different parts were simply built up on each other with nothing to tie the wall together. I earnestly trust that the government will take a lesson by this accident and look more carefully into the future in the erection of government buildings.

Mr. H. S. CLEMENTS (West Kent). As I took the occasion of accompanying my hon. friend from Dundas (Mr. Broder) to the top of the Laurier tower in order to gather some of the cement which had been used in that tower, I might take this opportunity of giving my experience. I felt that in justice to the case, we should get the cement from the top where the break occurred. I have had considerable experience in cement, and one would naturally suppose that in a construction of this kind the specifications must surely have called for cement. But after examining the top of the tower with my hon. friend from Dundas (Mr. Broder), there appeared to be nothing there but sand, and what surprised me was that the tower should have stood as long as it did. While this accident must be unfortunate for the contractor—as I understand from the Minister of Public Works that the government have a guarantee—it has been a fortunate thing for the country that the Laurier tower fell as it did, because it has brought to the attention of this House the fact that there must certainly be a great deal of laxity on the part of the officials of the department. If there are other public works being erected in the same manner, this casualty should induce the minister to take active steps to have the defects remedied, and I trust he will probe this matter to the bottom and see that those who are to blame are dismissed from the department at once.

Mr. T. CHISHOLM (East Huron). This is one of the occasions when one who has practical experience in building, ought not to hesitate in giving his views to the House. I notice that generally our time is taken up by the lawyers and no doubt there is reason in that since we are most of the time engaged in passing laws. But on this occasion, I think I should give my opinion. I am a practical builder. I not only laid out a village and named it, but during my long life I have built as many houses as would make a good sized village. And, more than that; I have been my own architect most of the time, and have drawn my own specifications. So, Mr. Speaker, I feel that I have had some experience in these matters. I went over to see the ruins of this fallen tower, and I was astonished, astounded, at what I saw. I do wish the farmers of Huron could come down here and see that ruin. It would be the greatest political lecture they ever had in their lives. Why, there is not a farmer in my riding that would take such a job off a contractor's hands if he were putting up a cow-house. I could not help thinking, when I was looking over this building, about the stories I have heard years ago, about the Langevin block. And I thought that the facts in that case and in this showed the difference in the parties. Let any hon. gentleman go down and examine the Langevin block. Why, they used to talk about the Langevin block scandal. But that is a building, Mr. Speaker, founded upon a rock, handsome, solid, reliable, yes and reasonable in price too. On the other hand here is a building put up by this government which cannot even bear its own weight. The attempt of these hon. gentlemen to emulate their predecessors in building reminds me of the story in the old reader when I was at school. A certain bird decked himself out in the feathers of a more beautiful member of this tribe, and so adorned, strutted about thinking he was—quite a bird. The Liberals used to be called Reformers. But the name was not good enough for them. And not satisfied with stealing our policy, they have stolen our good name as well—or at least half of it—for we are proud to be known as Liberal-Conservatives. These hon. gentle-

men seem most anxious to justify the name in one way if they cannot do it in any other. At least, they seem to be very liberal to contractors. But the borrowed feathers have fallen away, and the real bird in all its ugliness stands exposed.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT (Muskoka). Mr. Speaker, I presume that in putting up public buildings we have more than one object in view. We are constructing public buildings in the cities and larger towns from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and sometimes when made necessary by political exigencies we build them in the small villages as well. I suppose that the primary object in erecting these buildings is that they may be used by the department of the public service for which they are designed. But, I suppose we have another object as well. We are supposed to put buildings each of which will be an object lesson to the community in which it is placed, an example not only of architectural beauty but of everything that is worthy to be followed and emulated in the proper construction of a building. I believe that these public buildings cost us from fifty to one hundred per cent more than similar buildings would cost private individuals. Expending so much money, I think we naturally expect to have first-class buildings, buildings which the people can depend upon and whose principles of construction they can safely follow. I have been over to examine the fallen building which is now under discussion, and I must say that I never saw a more discreditable job anywhere. I take a little interest in the public buildings in the different localities in which I may happen to be. I would not refer to the subject on this occasion were it not for the strong belief I have that there is a general tendency among builders in this country to slight their work. I speak not merely of the buildings constructed under this government but other large buildings as well. I believe it is high time that the attention of the people should be called to this tendency. I have seen more than one hollow wall,—a wall with two faces, and with the space between them filled with dirt or anything that the builder could get hold off. The attention of the public should be sharply called to the necessity of having these buildings properly constructed. If the falling of this building—and, like other hon. members I am most thankful that the crash was not accompanied by loss of life—shall draw attention not only of the government but of the people of this Dominion to the necessity of watching this work very carefully, the loss will not be without its compensations.

Mr. WM. JACKSON (West Elgin). I regret that it has become my duty as a member of this parliament to express an opinion with reference to the condition of things which has just been brought to light by this accident to the west block. If you look back fifty or a hundred years, you will find that our large buildings were constructed exclusively of stone. That is true of all the old buildings in this city. This was a method of building in the early part of the nineteenth century. But in the last decade of that century a new system was inaugurated, and, I believe, that under this system we are entering upon a system of construction that will be just as strong and a good deal less costly. I refer to cement construction. There is no doubt in my mind that, if the plans and specifications of the addition to the West block had been carried out, the result would have been a building that would have met all emergencies. There seems to be no doubt whatever that one of the ingredients that was supposed to enter into the construction of that building, was not there—the cement—and that is the reason why the building fell. We take pride in repeating the saying that the twentieth century is to be the century of Canada as the nineteenth century was the century of the United States. In the development which is now taking place and which gives us hope that that prophecy will be fulfilled, there is one industry which has been established and which is a most important element in the progress of the country, I refer to the cement industry. But what is the government doing by permitting such work as was done on this West block? They are making a condition of things which will inevitably cause ill-informed people to say that this disaster is proof that cement is not fit for such work. This cannot but be detrimental to the great industry that we have begun.

Let me give the House a little of our experience in the county of Elgin from which I come. The department of Public Works is one of the most important departments of the government. In the county of Elgin we call it our department of Public Improvements. We go on and improve our public buildings and our public utilities as the county just as much as we improve the buildings that we own as individuals. We made a fresh start in this work twelve or fifteen years ago. At a certain stage of our experience we thought that part of our public work was not being done as it ought to be. We stopped all public building in the county and had the work carefully inspected. But, before actually carrying on the inspection, we sought the very best experts that we could find in the province of Ontario, and invited them to come into our county, that we might get their opinion as to what cement and stone mixed together would do for us, and to pass on the condition of the work that had been done by contractors in our county.

We went further than that, and asked them to examine every piece of work that had been done in the county of Elgin for the last ten years. We said : We are start-

ing on something of which we scarcely know what the end will be ; let us find out whether this new way of doing things in stone and sand and cement is equal to the old. If it is not going to be permanent we will do away with it. We brought those experts into the county, they went over the ground and told us that if we went on and did the work as it should be done it was better than the old way of doing things. We found out—and I tell the Minister of Public Works that I think he will find out that the same cause that we had to butt up against existed here—that our inspectors were men not qualified to do the work, they were appointed by some county councillors or commissioners because they were friends of those men, not for any ability they had to do the work. We changed that and got men as inspectors regardless of the influence of any county councillors, men who understood the work, and in Elgin to-day you will find that cement has taken the place of stone, not in our public buildings but in all our large private concerns, manufactories, and even in private dwellings. This is a small thing over here, but it is one of the little things that together make this Dominion what it is to-day. The work that is going on over there is going on in every constituency in the Dominion of Canada. There are 500 works of the same kind under construction or about to be constructed with the same ingredients that should have been in that tower, but whose absence has been the cause of the collapse. We are here the highest municipal body in the Dominion. We are looked to here to do things on that high level that smaller municipalities may look to us and say : The federal authorities have done so and so and we will take pattern by them.

Some good should come out of this I hope, from the very defects that are there. I ask the Minister of Public Works to see and I ask this whole parliament to assist him in seeing, that there are no defects in the 500 or 1,000 different works in Canada to-day. Some of the speakers have referred to this work being done in the winter. If the inclemency of the weather prevented the proper carrying out of the work why was it gone on with ? I do not believe that the cold weather was the cause of that trouble. In Elgin we have done municipal work of that kind in winter and some of the largest railway corporations in Canada or the United States have been constructing cement works of the same kind in the dead of winter and they are not crumbling to pieces as this has done. I hope and believe that the Minister of Public Works, that parliament, will make a thorough investigation of this trouble. If the part that has fallen down is bad I say it is possible that the whole of that work is not what it should be and a thorough investigation should be made of it. That investigation should be extended to each and every part of the Dominion of Canada so that we may ascertain if the conditions existing here exist in all the works of that kind that are carried on in Canada. In the little village in which I live in Elgin, a contract has been let for over $100,000 worth of work on which the same material is used that should have been used in the building of this tower, and in the doing of that work there should be more care as to the carrying out of that work than there has been in this tower. I believe that if the specifications and plans had been carried out, that work would not have been in the shape it is to-day.

Mr. M. AVERY (Frontenac). I think we have heard a good many remarks that will be of benefit to the people of this country, especially where we have public works ; and I hope that the government, if they still intend to have in this beautiful building a structure called the Laurier Tower, should have a better tower than they started out with.

Mr. BUREAU. Will the hon. gentleman inform us when and where this tower was christened the 'Laurier Tower'.

Mr. FOWLER. No wonder you are ashamed of it.

Mr. AVERY. It is the newspaper press. It is not to the credit of the government to allow the use of such material as has gone into that building. Any person accustomed to buildings would not allow such cheap building to be put up on his own place. It is a good thing it fell down when it did for had it fallen later it might have killed many people. I think the building should be well investigated from end to end and it is my opinion that the whole addition will have to be torn down and rebuilt before it is safe. I believe the Minister of Public Works should have his men examine that portion still standing and if it is found to be made of the same material that we found in this tower it is time the whole thing should come down. We have heard a good deal about the Langevin Block and its cost to the country. If it cost this country a great deal they have something to be proud of. It has stood there for many years and will stand for many years to come. It is not like this structure that has fallen down before it was finished. I do not believe that the proper amount of cement or sand was used in this building. There should be a thorough examination from end to end, and it should be seen that binding stones are used. I never saw a building erected in that style without binding stones and the men who erected it could not have understood their business. In the rebuilding binding stones and proper cement should be insisted upon. We have plenty of cement in Canada and that building has cost enough to have it used. You can get better stone

in the fields than is used in the inside of that wall; the stone is not cut and is not properly placed. I hope the minister will look into this and see that the men who have had charge of that work will be severely punished for the bad work they have done, which has cost the country so much money.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). It is sometimes said and properly said that it requires great catastrophes to remedy certain evils that from time to time creep up in a country, the destruction of human life by a railway train or by a steamboat, the burning or falling of a building, or the destruction of life in a mine. But, in any of these cases, it generally results in a searching inquiry in proportion to the damage which has been done. Fortunately for the people connected with this building, through the intervention of Providence, there was no loss of human life. It might easily have been otherwise, because I saw, within half an hour of the time the building fell, men engaged putting on the roof of the building. It was by the intervention of Providence that they were saved. But, if it results in directing public attention in a more acute way to what is being done and in remedying other evils that appear to be creeping into this country in connection with the expenditure of public money this calamity will not be entirely a loss. There are times, I believe, in the life of people when, because of a peculiar lethargy growing upon them, you cannot arouse them to a realization of the importance of what is going on. They seem to be almost indifferent, you cannot direct their attention to such things, and it is only when great catastrophies occur that you do succeed in doing so. While this has not been a great catastrophe, it is surrounded by peculiar circumstances which will, I think, attract the attention of the public to it. One of the most important features is that we have in progress the erection of a public building right here at the seat of government where the people's representatives are congregated and where above all other things it might be expected that the greatest amount of care and precaution would be taken to give the work the semblance at least of what is right before the eyes of members of parliament. When we find that it is carried on by the Department of Public Works in such a way that there is no security to life or property and that there is no proper oversight given for the expenditure of public money. A public building is put up in such a way that it is neither safe nor durable, that is not the equivalent of the money spent upon it, and if such is the case right here at the seat of government what may be taking place in other portions of the country where public works are not under the eye nor before the attention of the representatives of the people? We may reasonably conclude that these abuses have prevailed to a much greater extent at a distance from the capital than have been found to exist in connection with this building here. It has been attended with danger—serious danger—and while fortunately there has been no loss of life in connection with it there has been loss of property. It is said that it will cost $20,000 or $25,000 to replace that building. While this is a large loss of money it is not so much as compared with the loss of human life and this accident might have resulted in the loss of a very large number of human lives. It naturally directs our attention to a few things in connection with it. What has been the cause of this? We have employed experts to draw up plans and specifications and we are bound to assume that these architects are professional men who understand their business. The government is responsible and the minister at the head of the department is responsible for it whether it is bad or good, whether it will reflect credit upon the government and the department or discredit, and if the hon. minister was doing his duty we are bound to believe that he employed professional men, men of expert ability to draw up suitable plans and specifications for a building that would be strong, durable and valuable to the country in the future. But, it is the very reverse. Who is at fault? Is it the architect? It is not for me to say whether it is the architect or not, but it is the duty of the government to employ proper architects and if they have failed in the discharge of their duty they must be held responsible to the country for that failure. There is no doubt of that whatever and I say that the hon. Minister of Public Works will be held responsible whether he likes it or whether he dislikes it for the accident that took place there. Who was the clerk of the works, because there must have been a clerk of the works? We have sometimes had occasion to complain in this House that parties have been employed by the government to perform certain important duties and that they have not been selected with regard to their qualifications to discharge these functions. A few years ago we found that a tailor from Toronto was one of the men who was carrying on important dredging work. He was not an expert in that line, yet he was doing that work and making money out of it. What conclusion did the country come to? Either that the work was being slighted or that there was something wrong in connection with it. We complained that he was not the proper man to be entrusted with that work, that having regard to his previous experience and training he could not be considered to be an expert in it. The reply given to us was that this was a man who could be relied upon to do that work properly, that his intelligence, knowledge and experience justified the action of the government in selecting him as

an expert to go on and do that work. We had, in another case, a painter selected from Toronto and although his previous life had been devoted to the painting line he was regarded as an equally valuable expert to be entrusted with different public works. We had in another case a journalist who had a very small country press and who was selected by the government to undertake the important work of building harbours and breakwaters. Yet, the government defended this and said that it was not only not wrong but that no injustice had been done the country. When we brought these things to the attention of the government and of the country we were constantly met with the statement: We are responsible, look at the results of our labours. There are the edifices that have been raised the material and workmanship in them are first class and we challenge anything to the contrary. So, it would have been said of this building if it were standing to-day and had not fallen down. The same answer would have been given to us if we had raised the question in this House or if we had said that the building was not properly constructed, that it was not as durable an edifice as it would have been if it had been carried out under the direction of a proper architect, a proper Minister of Public Works, a proper inspector and a proper clerk of works. Then again it raises too the question: What are the duties of these men? A few years ago we had an important inquiry by one of the committees of this House in regard to what took place during the construction of the Soo canal. What was brought out in that investigation? It was that the government inspector, from day to day, had inspected and tested every barrel of cement that went into these works to know that the quality of the material was as good as could be desired, that he had inspected the mortar that was made for the construction of these works to ascertain whether it was mortar made from the combination of pure sand and fresh lime which would form a bond of union between the stones. It was brought out that from day to day an examination took place on the part of experts and it did convince me at least that proper precautions were taken. Now, were the same precautions taken in the erection of this building? Will the hon. Minister of Public Works say they were? Will he convince this House and the country that the men who were appointed to do that work and to look after it were men of ability or men possessed of the right knowledge? I have here in my hand a portion of the material taken right out of that wall. I submitted it to an examination under the glass first to ascertain if it were composed of sand and cement because if it were composed of sand and cement and the cement were tested from day to day to see that it was of the proper quality the result must be a splendid bond of union and a durable structure, but in so far as I can ascertain there is not a trace of cement in it. The sand must be good and sharp sand, the specifications usually say, and the lime fresh and of good quality and the next question that suggests itself to my mind is this: Was the sand and lime mixed in proper proportions because it is only in that way that you can have a durable bond? I examined this also under the glass and what do I find? I venture to say there is not one grain of lime in it for 6,000 grains of sand. It is practically all sand and nearly all dry sand. Where could be the clerk of these works, where could be the inspector whose duty it was to see that nothing but proper material was used there and to see that it was used in proper proportions in the construction of the building? Who were they? Were they men possessing the proper judgment and knowledge?

This sample we have here is simply sand; there is scarcely a trace of lime in it even when you put it under the glass. I tested it to ascertain how much lime there was in it, and in a large portion of it there is no lime; it does not give the reaction which would be given by lime; the indications are that it was put in largely for filling. Now, in view of this, there must either have been a skimping of the work for the purpose of making a large profit or else there was carelessness or indifference or worse on the part of the government employees who were looking after that work. And if such a thing can take place under our eyes in a building which was constructed during the session of parliament, are we not to infer that worse is going on in parts of the country remote from our observation. There is no doubt whatever that by the same parity of reasoning we must come to the conclusion that many of these public works are being slighted. It is said by some that these contracts are given to men who must provide a rake off for some one—I am not insinuating that is so—and that consequently the contractors are obliged to make more than the ordinary profits. If that be the case then the sooner this sort of thing is stopped the better. I am free to say that I hardly think the Minister of Public Works is a man who would lend himself to anything of the kind, but there is the undeniable fact that this tower fell down. If the Minister of Public Works had competent officers under him this accident would not have taken place; it could only have occurred through ignorance or carelessness on the part of the men in charge. I have had some experience in building for the last 25 or 30 years, and I say deliberately that no builder in this country would pretend to build a hog pen out of the material that was put into that tower. It is said that the friends of the present Prime Minister were desirous of immortalizing his name by

building a great tower pointing towards Heaven as a permanent monument to his career and therefore they named it the Laurier Tower. But there has been a sorrowful and untimely tumble; I was going to say that I hope it is not an omen of the downfall of the government in a short time. If we can believe one-half of what we hear we must come to the conclusion that the fall of the tower is an omen of the early fall of the government, for the party in power seems to be crumbling away at the top, and the material out of which it is composed, just like the mortar in the west block Tower, has not the proper bond. In a sense it is a good thing for the country that this happened, because it may have the effect of drawing the attention of the people of Canada to the extent to which the present system of contracting for public works is carried on, and the squandering of public money in all directions. I believe the people of Canada will hold the Minister of Public Works responsible for that catastrophe, in that he appointed officials who were either entirely incompetent or entirely ignorant of the duties they were supposed to discharge.

Mr. R. BLAIN (Peel). The question has been fairly discussed from this side of the House and it is left for us to assume from the silence of the government that they have no defence for this bad management of the Public Works Department. It has been shown in this discussion that right at the door of the Public Works Department and under the eyes of the minister the grossest carelessness prevails. For a number of years the opposition in this House has been pointing out to the government that there has been extravagance and carelessness in the Public Works Department in respect to the expenditure of money on public buildings. We have also complained that the government has adopted the policy—a policy which I do not think would be approved by the people of Canada—of expending large sums of money by days' work rather than by contract and by tender. If the government are going to spend money by days' work rather than by contract—of course the expenditure by days' work does not apply in this case—then it is of the greatest importance that the minister should insure that those who have the supervision of that expenditure should be men of experience and men of probity. In the past the government and the ministers have had little regard as to qualifications of the men whom they appointed as clerks of works. Let me draw the attention of the Minister of Public Works to his own language during the last session of parliament. Hansard page 1057. In Committee of Supply on the item for an expenditure of $35,000 on the Woodstock Armoury and Gun Shed, the following discussion took place:

Mr. FOWLER. Have you a clerk of works in charge?

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. How long has he been in charge and what salary is he receiving?

Mr. HYMAN. $3 a day, the usual price.

Mr. FOWLER. How long has he been in charge?

Mr. HYMAN. Since February the first.

Mr. FOWLER. Of this present month.

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. What was his former occupation?

Mr. HYMAN. I have no knowledge of his former occupation.

Mr. SPROULE. Hear, hear.

Mr. BLAIN. In this case the Minister of Public Works appointed a clerk of works to supervise a building that cost the people of Canada $35,000, and when he is asked what are the qualifications of this clerk for such a position he expresses absolute indifference as to whether his appointee had any qualifications or not.

Mr. CARVELL. Would the hon. gentleman kindly read a little further on?

Mr. BLAIN. With the greatest of pleasure.

Mr. CARVELL. Read the whole of it and see whether or not this man had any qualifications.

Mr. BLAIN. I will gratify my hon. friend's curiosity. I quote further:

Mr. FOWLER. It is of importance that the department should know his former occupation.

Mr. HYMAN. It may be.

There we have it from the Minister of Public Works that he was utterly indifferent as to whether this officer was qualified for the work or not.

Mr. CARVELL. If my hon. friend will read a little further he will find it reported in 'Hansard' that this clerk of works had 30 or 40 years experience as a builder and is one of the most practical men in Canada.

Mr. BLAIN. I will allow my hon. friend (Mr. Carvell) to deal with that; that is not my point of discussion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Read it.

Mr. BLAIN. My point is that the Minister of Public Works did not know whether this man was qualified or not, and I quote the minister's own statement to prove it. My hon. friend may be right; I am not dealing with that point at all. I am dealing with the expression of the Minister of Public Works, who said practically that it was a matter of indifference altogether to the department and to himself——

Mr. HYMAN. I did not say anything of the kind.

Mr. BLAIN. Let me repeat it:

Mr. FOWLER. What was his former occupation?

Mr. HYMAN. I have no knowledge of his former occupation?

Mr. FOWLER. It is important that the department should know his former occupation.

Mr. HYMAN. It may be.

And now my hon. friend rather tries to smooth it over as he has been smoothing over some of the important details of the work which we have under discussion at the present moment. The opposition from year to year during the past few years has been drawing the attention of the Minister of Public Works and of his predecessors to the fact that the men who have been engaged by the government at considerable salaries to look after the large expenditures of public money that have been going on throughout the country have been in many cases men without any practical experience whatever. May I stop for a moment to ask the hon. Minister of Public Works whether it is the policy of his department that men appointed as clerks of works shall be men of practical experience ?

Mr. HYMAN. I have very much pleasure in answering the hon. gentleman that it is the policy of the department. The greatest care is always exercised to ascertain what experience they have had before they are employed.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask the minister if he has carried out that policy with respect to public buildings and other public works throughout the country since he has had charge of the department ?

Mr. HYMAN. Since I have had charge of the department I have always endeavoured to carry it out.

Mr. BLAIN. Then, we have the statement from the Minister of Public Works, if I understand him correctly, that it is the policy of his department that in the future as in the past men of practical experience shall take charge of the expenditure of money in connection with public works.

If that is the policy, I will venture to produce in the House at no distant date several cases of public works under the control of my hon. friend in connection with which men without any practical experience whatever have been employed as clerks of works. It may be that the man employed in the case under discussion had some practical experience ; but the point is that when the matter was brought to the attention of the Minister of Public Works as in the special case referred to, he passed it over by saying practically that it was a matter of indifference on the part of the government whether the man was a clerk or a tailor or a carpenter or what he was. Now, I have only this to say in conclusion, that I think more care should be exercised on the part of the Minister of Public Works. I do not wish to criticise too closely or to condemn in too strong language ; but I do say that the government should see to it that the specifications for public works are more carefully drawn, and that when contracts are let practical men should be employed to look after them, in order that the people of this country shall have proper results from the large expenditures which are being made, particularly as the policy of the government seems to be that a considerable amount of this money shall be expended without any contract whatever.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton, N.B.). Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to enter into this discussion, because it seems to be something which the hon. gentlemen of the opposition are having all to themselves, and from which they are receiving considerable satisfaction ; and had it not been for the matter which was referred to by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, I would not have trespassed on the time of the House. I do not think my hon. friend has discussed this matter with his usual fairness. It is true, he read from Hansard a statement of the Minister of Public Works, in answer to a question of Mr. Fowler as to the former occupation of the clerk of works at Woodstock, which the minister answered by saying that he had no knowledge of his former occupation. I do not think that it would be reasonable to expect the Minister of Public Works to carry in his mind the former occupations of the clerks of works employed all over Canada.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the hon. gentleman be good enough to read the paragraphs following that answer of the minister ?

Mr. CARVELL. I will read everything the hon. gentleman wishes. But because the Minister of Public Works cannot tell off-hand the occupation of every gentleman who happened to have charge of public works all over Canada, it does not follow that the officers of his department have not the knowledge, or have placed people in charge of these works who have not the requisite qualifications. My hon. friend is trying to draw the inference, that because the minister could not tell the former occupation of this clerk of works, therefore the man had no previous experience, and that this appointment was only a sample of what was going on all over the country. Now, I will read what took place. The discussion arose on account of something the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler) had stated; and I might say here that that hon. gentleman has had a hobby on which he has run one election and will I presume run another if he ever gets a chance, that is, that a certain man appointed a clerk of works on a small building at Sussex had once in his life time been a tailor. But the hon. member for King's has not told us that the work was not properly constructed. It has been there for several years, and, so far as we can see, it is all right.

Mr. BLAIN. Will you wait till it falls down ?

Mr. CARVELL. Well, it has not fallen down yet, and it has been there three or four years. I am going to read, as my hon. friend wishes me to do so, every word that

was uttered in that discussion, and I will then ask the House to say whether the hon. gentleman has been fair in reading a part of the discussion and not the whole of it. I will read what followed the portion read by my hon. friend :

Mr. FOWLER. It is of importance that the department should know his former occupation.

Mr. HYMAN. It may be.

Mr. FOWLER. Not only may be but is. There was an instance in the town of Sussex where I reside, the principle town in King's, part of my constituency. The clerk of works in charge of an important work was a tailor by occupation and was in active work as a tailor. He had no previous knowledge of building and was not a mechanic except with his needle, and yet he was put in charge of the construction of that building as clerk of works. He was paid $3, or I think it was $3.50 a day. This man must be a mechanic because he is only getting $3 a day whereas the other, on account of his superior qualifications as a tailor got $3.50. The contract price for the building was $4,300, but this clerk of works, who was a tailor, drew $1,900 as clerk of works.

Mr. HYMAN. I am not disputing the hon. gentleman, I have no knowledge of it.

Mr. FOWLER. He will find if he refers to the accounts that they will bear out the statement.

Mr. HYMAN. He must have been a good tailor.

Mr. FOWLER. He knew how to make a bill, which they say is a requisite of a good tailor.

Mr. FOSTER. He evidently found his goose.

Mr. FOWLER. Evidently there was lots of cabbage. It seems that the department forgot he was employed and he kept on drawing his pay all the time. The building occupied four months in construction but he was kept on for a year and a half. I hope the same mistake will not be made in this case, and that is why I asked the minister what this person was. I would like the minister to find out from his officers.

Mr. HYMAN. I suppose the hon. member from the constituency can give the information.

Mr. CARVELL. I think I can give some information to the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler). I can tell him that the clerk is Mr. Drysdale, who has been a contractor for probably twenty-five or thirty years, and who, some fifteen or twenty years ago had charge of the building of the record building in Woodstock. . He has been engaged in work of this kind all his lifetime.

That is the portion which the hon. gentleman would not read and which is an answer to the whole question.

An hon. MEMBER. That is another building.

Mr. CARVELL. It is not, it is the Woodstock Armoury, the building which my hon. friend was discussing when he brought up the question. With his knowledge of that, and he must have had knowledge of it—or if he had not the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler) had—he should have read the whole thing and should not have made the statement that the Minister of Public Works appointed a man a year ago to take charge of a work at Woodstock without knowing anything of his qualifications, for the evidence is in Hansard that he had all the qualifications necessary.

Mr. BLAIN. Did what he read refer to one or two buildings ?

Mr. CARVELL. The discussion, so far as the hon. member for King's (Mr. Fowler) is concerned, referred to the construction of the armoury at Sussex in New Brunswick. The other referred to the construction of the armoury in the town of Woodstock.

Mr. BLAIN. Entirely two different things.

Mr. CARVELL. But the armoury at Woodstock was the building about which the discussion of the inspector took place. It was the appointment of an inspector in the armoury of Woodstock about which the charge was made that the Minister of Public Works had no knowledge of his qualifications.

Mr. BLAIN. He said he had none.

Mr. G. W. FOWLER (King's N.B.). I had no intention of taking part in this debate but as my hon. friend from Carleton, N.B., (Mr. Carvell) has seen fit to refer to me and to say that I have already run one election on the appointment of a clerk of works in my constituency and he supposed I would run another if I got the chance, I want to say to him that in the late election I had the honour of having against me as an opponent the strongest man that could be produced in that constituency on the Liberal side. I had for my opponent the ex-Attorney General of the province, who for sixteen years had represented the constituency of King's in the New Brunswick legislature, who had held several positions in the cabinet of that province, and had never met defeat. And I suppose it was on account of the rascally work done by the government in connection with the building of this armoury at Sussex and the appointment of that very clerk of works that I was able to defeat that hon. gentleman in the county by a majority of 300 votes or double that given me in the previous election. And since the appointment of the clerk of works proved such a specific in that case, I shall be very happy to use it in the next election. But I shall be able to supplement that appointment with a number of other cases since then. I shall be able to point to the Laurier Tower, that magnificent monument which was to have been erected to this wonderful statesman who had a dream and made a nation in a night. I hope that the nation he created in a night was not one established on such unstable foundations as the Laurier Tower. Why the very materials of which the mortar was composed that should have bound together that building are typical of

the condition of that party to-day. There is no bond of union to keep those materials together. It was a case of every one for himself—typical of the condition of that party.

An hon. MEMBER. How about your own ?

Mr. FOWLER. It is bound together strong, firm and staple. Let us take up the question which the hon. member for Carleton, N. B., (Mr. Carvell) brought up. He says that the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain) was unfair in not reading the whole discussion which took place regarding the appointment of a clerk of works for the armoury at Woodstock. I say that the point which my hon. friend from Peel was making did not require that he should read the whole of that discussion. He did not make the point as to whether this clerk of works was a competent man or not, but the point he made was that the Minister of Public Works had said it was a matter of perfect indifference to him whether that man was competent or not.

Mr. HYMAN. I am sure the hon. gentleman does not want to put words in my mouth which do not appear in Hansard. I made no such statement as that it was a matter of indifference to me. I simply said that I had no knowledge at the time. That cannot be construed into the statement that the hon. gentleman attributes to me.

Mr. FOWLER. I do not want to be unfair to my hon. friend. Therefore notwithstanding this discussion has already been quoted once or twice, I shall quote it again, since the hon. gentleman does not seem to have grasped the gist of it. The question was, referring to the clerk of works, how long has he been in charge. Mr. Hyman replied : Since the 1st of February.

Mr. FOWLER. Of this month ?
Mr. HYMAN. Yes.
Mr. FOWLER. What was his former occupation ?
Mr. HYMAN. I have no knowledge of his former occupation.
Mr. FOWLER. It is important that the department should know his former occupation.

Here is the answer which the Minister of Public Works made to that. He did not say it was important, he did not agree with that statement of fact which certainly should appeal to every reasonable man in this House or out of it. No, he said :

It may be of importance or it may not .

Here is a man entrusted with the supervision of an important public work, and we are told by the minister that it only may be of importance that that man, appointed for the purpose of seeing that the contractor does not skimp his work but does his duty by the people and performs the contract he is paid to execute—yet the minister tells us only that it may be of importance. With that answer in Hansard by the minster, my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) was absolutely justified in saying that to the minister it was a matter of complete indifference whether the man was qualified or not. Yet this armoury is not the only public work which has been erected in my constituency. The government have built a large rifle range there, and the clerk of the works employed was not a man who had experience in the building way in any shape or form. He was a legal gentleman and the secretary of the Liberal association in the county. That gentleman was appointed to supervise the carrying out of a contract covering an expenditure of $10,000 to $12,000. He was a legal gentleman who used to go up on his way to lunch and take a look at the construction. That is the way the business is being done all around. It appears that it is not necessary for a man to know anything about buildings to be an inspector. I say the minister has treated this House with scant courtesy. Yesterday this matter was brought up, and he should have had here to-day the information we require. He ought to have known that we would have questioned him. I give him credit for more astuteness than not to have known it would be brought up. Here, under the very eyes of the representatives of the people, a construction topples down, not in a gale of wind but on a calm spring day in the bright sunshine. Why, we would be doing less than our duty if we did not discuss this matter fully.

And yet, the hon. minister is not able to tell us who was the clerk of works in this case ? The question was asked yesterday, and surely the hon. minister could have found out this fact in the course of twenty-four hours. What has he been doing ? Have the calls upon him socially been so great that he could not attend to the affairs of his department ? Had he been attending to his department, he could surely have brought here the specifications of this building, in anticipation of what he would be asked to-day. Yet, he comes here with absolutely nothing to tell us. And what is his excuse ? He says : Oh, I am going to have an investigation into this matter some day, and I do not want the case prejudiced by bringing the facts before the House until I have had my official investigation. It may be like the investigation that the Minister of Railways (Mr. Emmerson) had recently into the alleged stamp-stealing at Moncton. He sent down an officer from the department, as I am informed, to investigate the case. This officer went down and interviewed the man who was accused. The accused told him it was all a lie, that he had never stolen a stamp. So, the officer came back and reported that there was nothing in it. I suppose that is the kind of investigation that we shall have into this

falling of the Laurier tower. One would think that the Prime Minister would be sufficiently interested in this piece of architecture which was named after him to insist upon a thorough investigation of this affair. The Minister of Public Works should have come here with the specifications of the building and with the name of the clerk of works, so that we, the representatives of the people, might know how the matter stands. Does the minister suppose that this is a matter that creates no interest in the country ? Does he think that the people have become so dull, so used to the delinquencies of this government that even the falling of a tower makes no noise in their ears ? I can assure hon. gentlemen opposite that the people are beginning to take an interest in the repeated delinquencies of this government. Of course, these hon. gentlemen may say : We do not care a fig for the people. When the elections come on we will get a majority, no matter how, and will come back here and run the country just the same. I say that the Minister of Public Works has been derelict in his duty and I am surprised that he should treat the House with such scant courtesy. It is rumoured that this clerk of works, whoever he may be, was appointed on the recommendation of the members for the city. I see one of the members for Ottawa present, and I would like to ask him if he can give us the name of the clerk of works of this building ?

Mr. ROBERT STEWART (Ottawa). If the hon. member (Mr. Fowler) is referring to me, I may say that I have been given to understand that the inspector in this case was appointed by the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite, and also that the contractor is, or was, a friend of these hon. gentlemen. I know nothing about the matter myself.

Mr. FOWLER. That is a magnificent answer to be given by the honourable junior—or senior, I do not know which—member for Ottawa. Why, if it had not been for some renegades throughout the country who turned from supporting us to supporting hon. gentlemen opposite, they would not fill the seats that they now occupy. Sixty per cent of the contractors who supported the Conservative government when in power are supporting hon. gentlemen opposite now, and supporting them with far greater force. And why ? Because the plums fall thicker ; because there are greater rake-offs ; because there is more money in it. If this gentleman was once, as a contractor, supporting the Conservative government is that a reason—

Mr. BUREAU. He is a Tory now.

Mr. FOWLER. How does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bureau) know ? If rumour speaks true, the hon. gentleman was once a Tory himself. Now, my hon. friend the junior—or senior—member for Ottawa city says that the inspector of works, as he calls him, was also a friend of our side. I asked him for the name, but he has not given it. I understood that this officer is a man named Canty—probably a very canty person, who changed his politics as soon as the government changed. I can only say that it would certainly be a great departure from the rule so closely followed by hon. gentlemen opposite if they appointed a Conservative to be inspector of works here in Ottawa. If rumour speaks true, this gentleman receives $5 a day and pays no attention whatever to the building. I do not know whether this is so or not. I hope the investigation that the hon. minister speaks of will probe to the bottom of these matters and find out why this clerk of works allowed a public building to be constructed in this rascally manner. I do not care who the contractor is or what his politics may be. What does it matter ? We are here to look after the interests of the people ; and if a man has slighted his work in so important a case as this, the fact that he is a Conservative or that he is a Liberal ought not to count in his favour. But I can well understand why hon. gentlemen opposite speak as the hon. member from Ottawa city has done. He in effect, says : You must keep your mouths closed because, by speaking you may hurt a Tory. All I can say is, if a Tory is a scoundrel, let him take his punishment. We are here to look after the interests of the people, and that should be our first consideration, our last consideration, our only consideration. We are not here to hide the faults or weakness or guilt of a man because at one time, or even now, he is counted a Tory or is counted a Liberal. I, for one, do not propose to take that stand. I do not think it is my duty to do so; and I trust the hon. Minister of Public Works, if he holds this investigation, will not hold it behind closed doors, but will hold it in public, where the press will be represented and where the general public can hear what is said. Let us have this matter probed to the very bottom, so that we may know who is responsible for the fall of the Laurier Tower—that fall which is an omen of the fall, soon to come to pass, of the political party headed by the right hon. gentleman after whom this tower was named.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). At a convention in the United States, one of the delegates, Patrick Flannigan, by name, made a speech that appealed to the feelings of all present. It was a short speech, but it was enough. Mr. Flannigan said : ' What are we here for if not for the spoils ? ' That seems to be about the position of the Liberal party from one end of the Dominion to the other. I am not surprised that a man engaged as an inspector of works should be

on the look out for graft, when he considers the two members who represent the city in this House. We all remember the celebrated Gilbert dredging claim. The hon. senior member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) stood in his place and said : I am conducting the claim of the Gilbert Brothers in the Department of Railways and Canals; I am going to get a fee for what I do ; I am looking for other cases in any of the departments, and I will take all that comes my way. And ministers applauded that sentiment to the echo. That hon. gentleman has not given up prosecuting claims of contractors, and something more will be heard of one of these claims before the session is much older. And the hon. junior member for Ottawa (Mr. Stewart) was very flippant about this matter. He said that this inspector of works had been in the employ of the department for years. But his name is not on the permanent list. I challenge the hon. gentleman to find it there. The hon. gentleman knows, and the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman) knows, in fact everybody at all conversant with the matter knows, that this man Canty is not only an inspector of this work locally, but also is inspector of the museum building that is now under construction. I ask the hon. minister if that is not correct.

Mr. HYMAN. I understand that Mr. Canty, the gentleman mentioned, is inspector of the museum building. But Mr. Taylor is the gentleman in the department who is responsible for the inspection of the building now under consideration, and Mr. Canty is only called in at certain times.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. minister knows that it is common report throughout the town that Mr. Canty was on this work too. Before we depart from names, may I ask the initials of Mr. Fuller who is to be called in to act in this matter ?

Mr. HYMAN. I do not remember his initials.

Mr. BENNETT. I may tell the minister that I have looked over the Toronto directory and what do I find? I find that there is a gentleman named Fuller in Toronto, an architect—at least he is not classed as an architect—but he is the assistant engineer of the Public Works Department of Canada. That is the independent gentleman, I assume, who is to come down here and he is a near relative of a prominent official in the Public Works Department. Why, Sir, this great Liberal party that goes from end to end of the province is all in accord with the sentiment of Mr. Flannigan. I am glad the Postmaster General has come in, because he heard the sentiment applauded to the echo. A convention was held in North York and Mr. Fleury, whose name appears in the public accounts for thousands of dollars, who freely declared that it was to the benefit of the party to be out for one thing and one thing only, that is material benefits. What do material benefits mean? They mean exactly what has been seen in this public work to-day; it means that a man contracts for a certain work; it means that by the connivance of either an architect who makes blundering, ill-advised and stupid specifications, or an inspector who is a party to probable fraud, he is going to get the best advantage of the contract. That is what it means and to-day while this debate has gone on not a gentleman on that side has had the temerity to stand up and say that he has gone to that building and picked up a handful of the alleged cement and that it does not bear up to the samples that have been shown here this afternoon. There is the member for Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith) looking up in such a pitiful way, the hon. gentleman who is always shedding crocodile tears for the workingman. To-day he is dumb as an oyster, although his fellow-workmen were exposed owing to the collapse of this building. Behind him whom do I see? That contractor of contractors, the member for Thunder Bay and Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) who could tell us all about the material; who could tell us not only what was to be found in the earth above but also in the waters under the earth, because he is doing dredging by thousands and ten of thousands of dollars worth for this government. I can go further, to the junior member for Ottawa (Mr. Stewart). Could not the junior member for Ottawa tell us what there is beneath and what there is above the water ? Is he not dredging for this government, too?

Mr. STEWART. No he is not.

Mr. BENNETT. I will tell you what he is doing. It is true that he is not, but there is a company called the Dominion Dredge Company in which one of his sons has blossomed out as a large shareholder. Will the hon. gentleman dispute that? Sir, this is the way the Independence of Parliament Act is shelved and this is the way hon. gentlemen are trying to avoid it. A gentleman sat in this chamber who was the owner with others of a dredge. He transferred his stock to the name of another person to cast off suspicion. The gentleman is dead now, but the stock has gone back to the name of his wife. Look at the whole list of hon. gentlemen on that side who are interested in dredges to-day. All that is required with this government is to get a contract and you can easily make your money out of it. We have a case in point. Here is a contractor and it is not to be believed that the architect of the department ever provided that there should be sand between this brick and the stone wall. I challenge the minister to say that is in the specifications. It cannot be found there and never will be found, but the contractor has a way apparently by which he can throw in sand

instead of cement. The member for Centre York (Mr. Campbell) has tendered low for the flour for the penitentiaries. I wonder what kind of flour he will supply? Will there not be an awful lot of objection made to the quality if it is a little inferior, an awful lot? Why, Sir, graft? It is graft all through. There is the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson), I hope I have wakened him up. What is he doing? Going into a petty joint stock company in New Brunswick, unloading its oil on the people of Canada, and that, too, by telegram, regardless of expense, to Mr. Pottinger, to rush the orders for this company.

Is it any wonder that the ordinary man who is given a little petty position in this country when he sees the two members for Ottawa, the senior member pressing claims and getting that business merely because he is a member of parliament, the junior member with his son in a dredging company, and the Minister of Railways starting a little Johnny business for his company. Is it any wonder that every man in town thinks there is something in it and should be for him, and with one accord say with Mr. Flannigan: 'What is there in it, if there is not the spoils?'

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

VANCOUVER AND LULU ISLAND RAILWAY COMPANY.

On the order:

House in committee on Bill (No. 29) respecting the Vanocuver and Lulu Island Railway Company.—Mr. Macpherson.

Mr. CAMPBELL moved:

That the order of the House for the House again in committee on Bill (No. 29), an Act respecting the Vancouver and Lulu Island Railway Company be discharged and the Bill be referred back to the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines for further consideration.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Campbell) explain the reason for this?

Mr. CAMPBELL. The reason is that the Bill grants an extension of time for the building of the main line as well as certain branches and this railway company has also power, by getting the consent of the Governor in Council, to build branches not exceeding 30 miles in length. This power was granted some five years ago. The committee amended the Bill, but when it came to the House the other night the House thought the powers granted the company were too large, that the time for building these branches authorized by the Governor in Council should be limited to two and five years and it was thought better to refer it back to the Railway Committee in order that this amendment might be made.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not understand why the hon. gentleman says that the House came to the conclusion that the powers granted were too large. I think I have been in the House every time this matter has come up. The other night, when this matter came up in committee, it was pointed out that the form in which the Bill had been reported to this House was not exactly correct for this reason: The section as it originally existed provided for an extension of time as to the main line and branches. It transpired in the Railway Committee that in addition to having power to build the main line and defined branches the Bill also provided for the building of indefinite lines not exceeding thirty miles in length in any one case upon the order of the Governor in Council. I took occasion to point out to the committee of this House the other evening that the striking out of the words 'and branches' which appeared in the section as it was originally framed was not correct nor according to the intention of the committee and for that reason the committee was asked to rise and report progress. There was no decision, as I understand, by the House, and I think the hon. gentleman will admit when I call his attention to it that there has been no decision of the House, that it was not advisable to grant this extension of time. The House has not considered it in any way and it is hardly fair for the hon. gentleman to make that statement. I hope he will not persist in it now that his attention has been called to it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The Bill as originally brought in provided for an extension of the time for the completion of the main line and the branches which it had been authorized to construct for five years. Now, under the original Bill, power was granted to this company by getting the authority of the Governor in Council to build branches not more than thirty miles in length. The committee thought it was wise to amend this clause by providing that the branches should be commenced within two years and completed within five years from the time of the passage of the order in council. Some gentlemen in the House contended that that was wrong that that amendment should not have been made because the life of the Act was extended for five years but that if we adopted this clause providing that the branches should be commenced within two years and completed within five from the passing of the order in council the order in council might not be granted for ten years from now and so the time would be unduly extended. It evidently was the intention of the committee that it should be made plain that the two years and the five years should be within the extension of time granted in re-

gard to the main charter. The hon. gentleman for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) is quite right when he says that the House did not come to that decision, but the Minister and some others thought it would be the better course to refer it back to the committee and have it amended in that way.

Mr. LENNOX. With the explanation that the hon. gentleman has just made I quite agree. What arose was that when we came to consider in the committee another Bill of a similar character the other day it was thought that it was not wise to leave it indefinite but that we should limit the time for the making of the order in council. So, I have no objection to the Bill being referred back.

Motion agreed to.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 46) respecting the St, Clair and Erie Ship Canal Company.—Mr. Tisdale.

Bill (No. 31) respecting the White Horse and Alsek Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

QUEBEC MIDLAND RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 23) to incorporate the Quebec Midland Railway Company.—Mr. Bureau.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the length of this road ?

Mr. BUREAU. About eighty-five miles.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does it connect with any other railway ?

Mr. BUREAU. It connects with the projected line of the Grand Trunk Pacific and then runs north to Lake Mattagami.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

NAKUSP AND SLOCAN RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 32) respecting the Nakusp and Slocan Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What section of this Bill is repealed ?

Mr. CAMPBELL. The time for the extension of the railway.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You repeal the time limit and fix another time limit.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes; and the words 'and works' are stricken out because we did not know what the works included and it was thought it should be confined to the railway itself.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 61) to incorporate the Grand Trunk Pacific Telegraph Company.—Mr. McCarthy (Simcoe).

Bill (No. 69) respecting certain patents of Henry Edmunds.—Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 70) respecting the British Canadian Loan and Investment Company, Limited.—Mr. McCarthy (Simcoe).

Bill (No. 71) to incorporate the Calgary and Fernie Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 72) to incorporate the Quebec, Montreal and Southern Railway Company. —Mr. Demers.

Bill (No. 73) respecting the Boundary, Kamloops and Cariboo Central Railway Company.—Mr. Ross (Yale-Cariboo).

Bill (No. 75), to incorporate the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company.—Mr. Crawford.

Bill (No. 76) respecting Revillon Brothers, Limited.—Mr. McCool.

Bill (No. 77) respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—Mr. McCarthy (Calgary).

Bill (No. 78) respecting the Great Northwest Central Railway Company.—Mr. Roche (Marquette).

Bill (No. 79) respecting certain Patents of Chester Burnell Duryea.—Mr. Belcourt.

Bill (No. 80) respecting the Pacific Northern and Omenica Railway Company—Mr. McCarthy (Simcoe).

Bill (No. 81) respecting the Bell Telephone Company of Canada.—Mr. Bureau.

SUPPLY— WEST BLOCK— COLLAPSE OF NEW TOWER.

House resumed consideration of the motion to go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (E. Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, the other afternoon the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Greenway) in addressing the House, prefaced his remarks with this text: The land for the settler; and I think, from the way that the discussion went on this afternoon, a very proper text would be: Graft for the grafter. In the remarks that I made before dinner, I brought out certain facts, not with a view of causing hon. gentlemen opposite to feel annoyed that they had not been feeding in rich pastures like some of their more favoured brothers, but that I might stir in the minds of some of the better members—and I am sure that a majority of the members are such—a feeling of dissatisfaction and disgust at this pillaging of the public chest, and a feeling that as members of parliament we have a public trust and that we should endeavour to rise above petty speculations. The debate has thus far done some good, because the Minister of Public Works

announced that a gentleman named Fuller would be entrusted with the work—

Mr. HYMAN. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to say that I made a mistake in the name. It was not Mr. Fuller; I meant to say Mr. Curry. It was a slip of the tongue.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is exactly as I understood the minister, he spoke with inadvertence.

Mr. BENNETT. Of course, I accept the minister's statement, and that disposes of the matter at once. Mr. Curry is a gentleman highly spoken of in the city of Toronto as an architect, and the public will respect any finding he may make.

Mr. HYMAN. I may say also that I have thought it well to ask Mr. Hutchison, of Montreal, to act with Mr. Curry.

Mr. BENNETT. This afternoon I adverted to the fact that one minister did not think it below his position to traffic at the public chest, protected by the law which permits a member of parliament to deal with the country under cover of a joint stock company. When I picked out the Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. H. R. Emmerson), I did it not only to hold him up as an example, but with the hope that before the evening passed some of the other ministers would rise to their feet and declare that in future they would have nothing to do with joint stock companies. It cannot be expected that members of parliament will not participate in what is going when they see Ministers of the Crown doing so. We see more than one minister feasting at the public crib. Take the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Sidney Fisher) who I regret to see is not in his place to-night. It is a notorious fact that this gentleman for many years was a large stockholder in the Montreal 'Herald,' and what did he do in order that that newspaper might receive public patronage? He confessed before the Public Accounts Committee that he had surrendered his stock in the Montreal 'Herald' Company to his brother, and, when pressed, he admitted under oath that he had done so without any consideration. This year the Montreal 'Herald' is drawing nearly $31,000 of public money, and is any man insane enough to believe that the Minister of Agriculture having handed over to his brother the large block of stock which he held in that company, does not enjoy to-day the advantage of every dollar that accrues to that stock? Let us go a little further. There is the Minister of Inland Revenue (Hon. Mr. Templeman) who also, as I am informed and believe, is a large stockholder and practically the owner of a newspaper in Victoria, B.C., which is deriving large sums of money from the public treasury. I need not go into cases of members of parliament who at all times are practically trafficking in their positions. How they contrive to do it we know not, but we do know that from time to time cases occur in which members of parliament receive substantial advantages from the government and in return are giving their support to the government in every contingency. Take the case of the hon. member for Stanstead (Mr. Lovell) who had erected on his property a dock worth $75,000, but of no public benefit to the country as a whole, and which so enhanced the value of that hon. gentleman's property that he was able to dispose of it at a very large advance. Take the case of the hon. member for N. Simcoe (Mr. Leighton McCarthy), whose firm's name figured in the public accounts a year or two ago for $3,000 or $4,000; and when the case came before the Public Accounts Committee, the public were informed that while it was true that the money had come into the office, the firm had carefully set it aside, and he did not participate in it. Well, that can easily be arranged. Children at school may give to one more cake, and to another more apple. Perhaps the hon. gentleman did not participate in that money but the general income of the firm was augmented by what they got from the government. This government has been bred up to this principle of graft; it is in the air. As I showed this afternoon, at a convention at which the Postmaster General was chosen, the speeches rang with graft. Let me read the words used by one of the speakers on that occasion:

> We have got into the habit of being represented by a minister. It is not a bad habit, but rather a good habit, so far as material advantage to the people of North York are concerned. It is a question of material benefits.

I think the Postmaster General will bear me out that that was cheered to the echo; and if you will peruse the public accounts of this country you will find that the gentleman who gave utterance to these grafter sentiments is a gentleman whose name figures in the public accounts for thousands of dollars—a gentleman for whom the former Postmaster General did what? Why, he gave him a contract, without any competition, for the construction of the thousands of letter boxes that one sees from Vancouver to Quebec. The Postmaster General will not deny it, and I trust, for the sake of his reputation, he will see that there is no more gigantic grafting to be done in that department and that in future the contracts for these letter boxes will not be given without public competition and tender. The Postmaster General was present on that occasion.

Mr. AYLESWORTH. I beg to correct the hon. gentleman, I was not.

Mr. BENNETT. I stand corrected, but with the sound ringing in his ears and know-

ing that the keynote of that convention was, what did he say when he met them ? He said : Let us show what can be done by the stalwarts of North York when they are out for their rights. I will show you what were the rights of the stalwarts of North York. The rights are these—that Mr. Fleury was to have, at his own price, the manufacturing of all the letter boxes in this country and that other men in that riding were to have the repairing of all the mail bags in the country. And further, whenever boots were required for the letter carriers, no matter in what city, they must be purchased in the riding of North York. If a letter carrier in St. John, New Brunswick, had his boots worn out, he should get another pair, not in that city, but in North York. We know lately that there has been great speculating throughout the country as to who would be the lucky contractors for sections on the Grand Trunk Pacific. What do we find ? We find that when the time was drawing nigh for giving contracts, the stalwarts of North York were out for their rights and that a gigantic company was formed to tender for the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific. Needless to say that Mr. Fleury, encouraged by the Postmaster General, was out for his rights, but he was hardly able to tackle such a proposition as the building of hundreds of miles of railway. But the pipes had to be laid and Mr. Fleury and Mr. Tudhope, the member for East Simcoe in the local House, who has promised to be the federal candidate at the next election in East Simcoe, were brought into the field. These gentlemen, in connection with Mr. Gauthier and Mr. Laliberté, from Montreal, looked out for some capitalists with whom they could plunge into this speculation. I have here a formidable list but shall not endeavour to read the names, they are so unpronounceable. And these gentlemen who were brought into the scheme were no ordinary men. They were counts and dukes and viscounts—gentlemen of most exalted position. And rumour hath it that even the King of Belgium was in this contract company.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Who was the solicitor ?

Mr. BENNETT. That does not appear. There was a formidable organization of wealthy capitalists, including the King of Belgium, and these gentlemen from North York, urged on by the stalwart words of the Postmaster General, were the moving spirits in this company with a million dollars capital. But rumour has it that the Belgian gentlemen got scent of the company they were in and did not tender. Perhaps however the Postmaster General may yet be able to assure the King of the Belgians and the other distinguished gentlemen that the company into which they were about to embark were good men and true. But there is one thing certain, and that is that Mr. Fleury's friends must have been rather surprised when he saw his name paraded in the 'Canada Gazette,' in conjunction with these counts and viscounts, in a contract company with a capital of a million dollars. Well, things have not all gone by on the Grand Trunk Pacific. There is a chance yet. There are still some contracts to be let, and these gentlemen may yet be able to profit by the advice of the Postmaster General. Where are we to-day on the Grand Trunk Pacific matter ? It was supposed by innocent and confiding people that the lowest tenderers would get the contract but what do we find ? We find that Mr. Parent—the gentleman who was assailed by the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Grant) for not being what he should be on that commission—we find Mr. Parent and another gentleman holding out for the highest tenderer and the two other commissioners holding out for a lower tenderer. The public know how these commissioners stand, but they will never know, until the cabinet leaks, how it will stand on the question. The whole business is permeated by a desire for greed and graft and by the conviction that if you can only exert sufficient political influence you will get benefits and advantages that should not accrue if matters were properly conducted.

I was referring before dinner to the question of dredging in this country, and I say now that the most colossal swindle going on against the people is the expenditure on dredging. I say that advisedly and deliberately. There are dredging companies to-day in Ontario which have thrown around them the protecting arm of this government and the Minister of Public Works. The hon. minister is to-day endeavouring to give certain favoured friends all the dredging available in this country and not throw it open to the world wide competition. Who compose these companies ? The minister knows it. He knows that in some there are judges and members of parliament. He knows that this afternoon the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) silently acquiesced in this.

Mr. CONMEE. I wish to correct my hon. friend. On several occasions both this session and last session he has made reference to me in connection with dredging. I do not think it is in the interest of this House or the people that members should malign each other across the floor. I can say as many disagreeable and offensive things of my opponents as the hon. gentleman can of me. Has he any knowledge of my business ? He knows absolutely nothing about it. He has no evidence at all. If he has, he should produce it. If I have violated the rules of this House or the independence of parliament, there is machinery in this House to put such things right, and until my hon. friend is prepared to take that posi-

tion it will be just as well for him to drop my name in that connection. I am here entirely within my rights. I do not owe my election to any person or party for that matter. Certainly not the hon. gentleman's party. I am here in spite of them. I am not here at the bidding of any company or corporation. No man, no corporation, no organization has ever contributed anything to put me into this House. I am not going to bandy words with the hon. gentleman now. But I am willing to go this far—I warn the hon. gentleman that it is just as well for him to keep within reasonable bounds.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. member for Thunder Bay and Rainy river (Mr. Conmee) is a veritable Rip Van Winkle. These charges that he was interested in the Great Lakes Dredging Company went through the press a year ago, and he never opened his mouth or penned a word to repudiate them. But I am pleased to hear the hon. gentleman rise in his place, and I am pleased to hear the notice he has given to this government. He has notified them that he is ready to get under the tree that has the most apples. He is ready to sound a pæan of independence. Evidently he thinks the government is going, and he is getting ready to jump to the other side. It is charming to hear the hon. gentleman preach political morality. Nobody ever contributed to his expense, he says. Why, has not the province of Ontario contributed heavily to that end ? But I will do the hon. gentleman the justice to say that he is always generous. He did not mind putting up a thousand dollars to protest Gamey when he knew about it. The hon. gentleman is well known in Ontario politics. I am surprised that to-night he should have broken that reserve which has characterized him in the past, that reserve which has always been an evidence of his wisdom. He has not denied, even now, that he is interested in this company. And I am going to give him a chance now to say that he is not.

Mr. CONMEE. I wish to say that when he merely flings insinuations and suspicions across the floor the hon. gentleman puts himself on a level below that upon which a member of this House should stand. The hon. gentleman has the choice of his own standards ; so far as I am concerned he is at perfect liberty to measure himself by any standard he pleases. But I feel reasonably assured that his constituents did not send him here merely to spread slander. What account is he going to give to his riding when he goes home ? What can he tell them to assure them that he has done anything in their interest or in the interest of the country ? He has made many unwarranted assertions ; he has expressed many suspicions. I thought I was quite moderate with the hon. gentleman. I wish to say to him now that if he wants to be the scavenger of his party, he can find work to do among those in front of him. I do not want to be drawn into a discussion here to-night.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. CONMEE. Hon. gentlemen opposite need not be alarmed or amused. I know their history. They may have forgotten it, but I have not forgotten it, nor has this country forgotten it. If hon. gentlemen opposite will have no discussion except such as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) seems to favour, they can have all they want of it. But, for my part I protest against it. I say we are not here for any such purpose. I have already said to my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) that if he thinks I am here upon any wrong footing, if he thinks I am interested directly or indirectly, in anything that I should not be interested in, it is his duty to go at that matter in a businesslike way. It is his place to make his charge and give his evidence. But the fact is he knows nothing ; he cannot produce any evidence now, or at any future time.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Conmee) has my sympathy. The province of Ontario once afforded him rich pasture, but it affords it no longer. That jocund laugh of his which used to echo about the legislative assembly building is a thing of the past. He passes and repasses there, but nothing is heard from him but groans and lamentations. Will the hon. gentleman deny now that the Great Lakes Dredging Company, before he became a member of it——

Mr. CONMEE. I have no interest in or anything to do with the Great Lakes Dredging Company.

Mr. BENNETT. I have got the hon. gentleman (Mr. Conmee) just where I wanted him. Now, Charles Bowman and James Conmee, two members of the local legislature of the province of Ontario, were interested in several dredges. The hon. gentleman will hardly deny that. The hon. gentleman saw the way things were going at Toronto ; he could read the handwriting on the wall. So he succeeded in coming here to Ottawa. I am not sure whether his election was held before or after the general elections. But, be that as it may, he came here. At once it was seen that it would not do for Messrs. Conmee & Bowman to engage in government dredging contracts under the circumstances, and so an incorporated company was formed. The hon. gentleman says I speak harshly about him. Why I have paid him compliments. I have said he is the shrewdest gentleman on that side of the House. I am willing to say that he is one of the most artful dodgers every known ; that his smile is the sweetest of all smiles ; and, that, up to to-night, his discretion has been beyond praise. But he has broken out to-night, and in do-

ing so he has made a mistake. From this day I shall be obliged, when commending the hon. gentleman, to refrain from my customary praise of his discretion. There is a company such as I have named ; and the hon. gentleman will hardly deny that Mr. Bowman is a member of that company; and he will hardly deny that a gentleman whom he trusts very much holds a large block of stock in the company, that gentleman being Mr. Whelan, his son-in-law. There is the whole thing. We have heard of his satanic majesty being chased around a bush—but he was overtaken at last. Not that I would suggest that the hon. gentleman is the personification of the name that I have just mentioned. But there is the whole story of the Conmee Dredging Company. And, if any one imagines that the hon. gentleman, as he trudges back and forth to the Public Works Department, is not concerned in dredging contracts, all I can say is that——

Mr. CONMEE. I rise to a point of order. I have made a statement to the House. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) made a reference to me which I contradicted. I have made my statement here in my place and on my responsibility as a member of this House. I think that the hon. gentleman should withdraw his statement. I have no connection with Charles Bowman in dredging. My hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) is fishing, and he is welcome to fish. I do not want to say nasty things though, I could do it if I wished to. If after being corrected, the hon. gentleman does not feel it his duty to withdraw the statements he made—which statements were false, for which statements there is no foundation ; for which statements he can give no facts, for which statements he has no basis of knowledge, then I leave the hon. gentleman to the judgment of the House.

Mr. BENNETT. If the hon. gentleman wishes me to withdraw the statement that Mr. Whelan is a stockholder in that company——

Mr. CONMEE. I do not intend to permit the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) to quibble with me. He may as well understand that now. I can talk as long as he can——

Mr. SPEAKER. In view of the denial of the hon. member (Mr. Conmee), it is the duty of the hon. member (Mr. Bennett) who has the floor to withdraw his statement.

Mr. BENNETT. Once again I state that I believe that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Conmee) has not one dollar's worth of stock in the company standing in his own name.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is not enough. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Conmee) has stated that he is not directly or indirectly——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. That was my understanding of the hon. gentleman's statement. If that is so, I consider that any previous reference to that should be withdrawn.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I must say that I did not hear the hon. gentleman use the word 'indirectly.'

Mr. SPROULE. He said that he had no connection with Mr. Bowman in dredging.

Mr. SPEAKER. He said he had no connection directly or indirectly with anything that would trench upon his position as a member of this House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is a question of law.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is a question of fact. The hon. gentleman who had the floor ought to withdraw the statement.

Mr. BENNETT. I did not make the statement that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Conmee) is a stockholder in the company.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is merely playing upon words. The sugestion was the hon. gentleman had some improper connection with dredging contracts. That suggestion has been denied, and now it should be withdrawn.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, we will have to pass from this political dredging concern to another one.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. That suggestion should be withdrawn.

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

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) asks: What is the impropriety of the suggestion? If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Conmee) has an interest in a dredging contract and is a member of this House that is an improper position for him to be in and the suggestion that he is in that position is an improper suggestion.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am referring—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am referring to an incorporated company, I was referring to an incorporated company—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I was referring to an incorporated company.

Mr. SPEAKER. The whole tenor as I gather it—

Mr. FOWLER. Now you are quibbling.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order, please. The hon. member (Mr. Fowler) has no right to reflect on the statement of the Chair while he is making it. The whole tenor and suggestion of the statement of the member who had the floor (Mr. Bennett) was that there was something improper in the connection of a member of this House (Mr. Conmee)) with this dredging company in association with a government contract. That was the whole tenor and suggestion that was expressly and explicitly denied. I think that denial should be accepted and any such suggestion withdrawn.

Mr. BENNETT. I have frankly said I accept the denial of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Conmee) that he is not a stockholder.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is again conveying the same suggestion. The suggestion was made that there was something improper in the association of this hon. member (Mr. Conmee) with the company and a contract of the government. The ruling is in the meantime, whether rightly or wrongly is a question for the House to decide, that the suggestion should be withdrawn.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But the hon. gentleman—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Hon. gentlemen will not get any further by calling out 'order.' They may as well resign their souls to that idea.

An hon. MEMBER. Address the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Bennett) says that he accepts the statement of the hon. member who rose to interrupt him (Mr. Conmee). It seems to me, from an experience of ten years in this House, that I have never heard more than that required of an hon. gentleman in this House.

Mr. CONMEE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) did not put it just as the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) has said. His words were these, that he accepted the statement that there was no stock standing in my name. Now my denial is this, that I am not in any sense, directly or indirectly, violating the rules of this House and I have not had any interest in this case that the hon. gentleman has named.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. There is another quibble.

Mr. CONMEE. I cannot make any plainer statement, and I think I am entitled to a straight apology, without any hedging about it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order, withdraw.

Mr. FOWLER.

Mr. SPEAKER. Meantime my ruling is that the statement should be withdrawn.

Mr. INGRAM. I would like to ask for information. Does the hon. gentleman say that he has no stock—

Mr. SPEAKER. Order; let us not get away from the question. Meantime we are just dealing with one question. The suggestion was made that there was something improper in the association of the member (Mr. Conmee) with these contracts and with this company. That statement has not been withdrawn. I think it should be withdrawn.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is always withdrawn, in my experience, by the gentleman stating that he accepts the statement made by the hon. gentleman who makes the denial. I do not know how you can do differently. Further than that I may be permitted to say, with all due respect to yourself, Mr. Speaker, that the statement of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Conmee) seems to me to differ in a very important particular from your honour's understanding of it.

Mr. McINTYRE. I rise to a point of order. Is it in order for these hon. gentlemen to discuss your decision? Have they not the alternative of appealing to the House and is not that the only alternative ?

Mr. SPEAKER. That is my ruling. I will have to abide by the judgment of the House as to whether I put a proper interpretation on the statement made by the member who had the floor (Mr. Bennett) in reference to the member who objected to that statement (Mr. Conmee). My ruling is that the statement was made, as 'Hansard' will show, I think, that there was some improper connection with this company and as to contracts with the government by the member who is charged with it, and that that has not been withdrawn and that it should be withdrawn.

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON. My understanding is, I am speaking subject to correction, that when Mr. Speaker has given his ruling it must be accepted; it can be appealed against, but that is the only course that can be pursued.

Mr. INGRAM. I again ask for information; did the hon. gentleman say—

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. INGRAM. I am in order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Meantime I have ruled, and that ruling is not debatable. It is appealable afterwards to the House, but meantime it is not debatable.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understand it has been accepted.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, Mr. Speaker, I accept the hon. gentleman's statement as he has made it.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is satisfactory.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is what he did long ago.

Mr. SPEAKER. No, I do not desire to be drawn into a discussion, but I do not apprehend that that is not the statement that was accepted before.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not desire to get into any altercation with you Mr. Speaker, but I rose because I had the impression that the hon. member (Mr. Bennett) had accepted that statement.

Mr. BENNETT. Now any gentleman who is at all conversant with dredging operations on the great lakes during the past ten years has seen exactly what has happened. As soon as the change of government was brought about certain practical men who were in the business were at once placed on the defensive. They were told in plain black and white, in effect, that there was no earthly chance of their participating in any dredging contracts. What was the result? Companies in which Liberals predominated took up these dredges and started in on this dredging business and the result has been to exclude Conservatives altogether from the work. And the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman) did what last year for the benefit of the firm of Conmee & Whalen, or the Great Lakes Company—

Mr. CONMEE. I again rise to a point of order. I will not allow this gentleman to use my name in that connection.

Mr. BENNETT. I mean Bowman & Whalen.

Mr. CONMEE. I ask again that he should withdraw that statement. I do not intend to stand here any longer and permit my honoured friend to use that language towards me. I ask him to be a gentleman and drop it.

An hon. MEMBER. Nonsense.

Mr. BENNETT. And at once steps were taken which would virtually give Bowman & Whalen or the Great Lakes Company a complete monoply of the hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of dredging to be executed in the harbours of Port Arthur and Fort William. That firm had a number of dredges at these two ports and the Minister of Public Works so framed an advertisement that only dredges which were in there and frozen up could possibly tender for the work.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. The ice was in the harbours.

Mr. BENNETT. The minister cannot deny that. And when it was debated here, time and again, we forced and drove the minister from his position and even then that favoured firm were in such a position that they got the monoply of the dredging, and what is the minister doing to-day? Why, Sir, he is telling these gentlemen who own dredges in Ontario and who are all Liberals, and I challenge any one Conservative concern to be named, one.

Mr. TELFORD. I beg to correct the hon. gentleman. Mr. Green, of Owen Sound, is a Conservative and always has been.

Mr. CONMEE. I can tell my hon. friend of another, Mr. Boone, who is dredging extensively, perhaps most in Ontario.

Mr. J. T. SCHELL. And I would mention Mr. M. P. Davis.

Mr. BRODEUR. I might quote Mr. E. A. D. Morgan, who ran as a Conservative candidate in Richelieu.

Mr. CONMEE. I might tell the hon. gentleman of another, Mr. Poupore, who was a Conservative member of this House.

Mr. BUREAU. I would mention Mr. Randolph Macdonald, who is a Tory.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, we, who have been here for the last twelve or fifteen years can largely appreciate the very high tone of this House to-day. It is sublime! Here is the greatest assembly in Canada! It would be a great sight if the King could come and see this assembly and the way it is conducted.

Some Hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. BENNETT. I was referring to Conservatives in Ontario and anybody who mistakes Mr. Boone for a Conservative is very much mistaken. Mr. Boone's activity in behalf of the present hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) in the last election resulted in that hon. gentleman carrying the seat by twenty of a majority. As to Mr. Green we have not heard of him before, but, there is a great big concern in Owen Sound—the well known A. G. McKay Company. What has the hon. Minister of Public Works done? He has practically said to his favoured friends in Ontario: I care not who the man is; I care not what his politics are, you are my political friends and you are to have a monopoly of the dredging in Ontario. You can go and select one point at which you wish to dredge and make a corner of it. An advertisement appears in to-day's 'Globe' calling for tenders for dredging at Penetanguishene, Meaford, Fesserton, Goderich, Point Edward, Port Stanley, Port Burwell, Rondeau, River Thames, Owen Sound, Nigger Island Channel and Trenton. It is stipulated that only dredges which are registered in Canada at the time of the filing of tenders can be employed. Is not that a lovely arrangement that these gentlemen are to participate in? Let us take one of the dredging companies in the riding of East

Simcoe. Mr. Bowman had an old dredge up there. Mr. Bowman disposed of it and who did he dispose of it to ? He disposed of it to a company called the Penetanguishene Dredging Company. The minister knows who compose that company. A defeated candidate for this House, Dr. Spohn is the president of it. The minister knows that as well as I know it.

An hon. MEMBER. A defeated Liberal candidate ?

Mr. BENNETT. Yes, Dr. Spohn the Superintendent of the Asylum there. One of his partners is Mr. Gendron and then the Department of Public Works has this dredging concern looked after on their behalf by Mr. Gendron's brother. Mr. Gendron looked after this dredge on behalf of the Dominion government when it was owned by Mr. Bowman. And, it was a wonderful dredge. It would run for four, five, six or sometimes seven hours and then it would have the inevitable breaks due to its age and infirmity, but since the new firm got in the dredge works twelve hours a day. You have to remember that it is paid by the hour.

Mr. HYMAN. Does the hon. gentleman make the statement that it is paid by the hour ?

Mr. BENNETT. Certainly.

Mr. HYMAN. The hon. gentleman's statement is entirely apart from the facts.

Mr. BENNETT. I will challenge the hon. minister to send up now to the public accounts committee because if he does so he will find by the public accounts for this dredge that it is paid by the hour.

Mr. HYMAN. I thought the hon. gentleman made the statement that the dredge is now working by the hour.

Mr. BENNETT. Is not that clever of the hon. Minister of Public Works ? The hon. gentleman is a statesman of the statesman's size. Talk about western Ontario having a giant in the cabinet ! Yes, they have a giant with very small teeth. I did not say that the dredge is working now. It was working last year. Yes, these are wonderful times for the grafter and the grafter is to be found everywhere. What is the result of public opinion on the grafter and what the grafter is doing ? We had the other day brought before this House the case of a blind man named Molloy who unfortunately lost his sight in the South Africa war. If you go up to the railway committee what will you see to-day ? You will find two magnificent canvasses spread on the wall. The first one is a representation of the Colonial Conference of 1894, and in that picture, although Sir John Thompson was the great big man on that occasion, he is dwarfed into insignificance, he is placed in the rear and foremost positions are given to the Premier and Sir Richard Cartwright. Why, Sir, they are life size. We may talk about poetical license but this is painting license and yet after all I think the artist probably did well to remember that these gentlemen in 1894 had very long faces indeed. When you go along a little further. What do you see? You see an important statesman of the present—the hon. the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher). That hon. gentleman was not only not in the cabinet but he did not even have a seat in the House at that time and he should not appear in the picture at all, but the artist was struck with the idea which prevails everywhere in Canada and he said : If I want to sell these pictures there is only one way to sell them and that is to make these hon. gentlemen conspicuous in the picture. What is the accompanying picture ? Alongside of it there are the gallant sons of Canada marching side by side up to the vessels many of them not knowing whether they will ever come back or not and passing the inspection of the Prime Minister and other ministers. When the case of Trooper Molloy is brought before the House we find that thousands and millions of dollars can be spent in every conceivable way but that there is not a dollar to be spent in paying a poor pittance or an allowance to a man who lost his sight in the defence of his country. How is this being regarded in Canada ? I do not ask you to accept any poor words of my own but I will give you the words quoted the other night by a Liberal in the province of Ontario who time and again has stood on Liberal platforms and who by his eloquence and by his force has won votes for the Liberal cause, one whose name will live as the author of that grand old song 'The Maple Leaf For Ever' when the government's memory is dead for ever. What does Alexander Muir say ? Mr. Muir says :

> It was a shame, a bitter, burning shame, that men who had served their country as did Trooper Mulloy and your comrade, Sergeant John Wilkinson, here, should be told by the government of their country, as Mulloy was told when he made application to that government, 'You fought for England; let England pay. It was not our fight.'
>
> Now that man sits in darkness to remember a bitter injustice at the hands of his country for whom he had done so much.
>
> I tell you it was Canada's fight, and it was well fought by Canadian boys. The boys that went under the Canadian flag, and they honoured it wherever they carried it.
>
> The voice of the government is not the voice of the people when it says 'It is not our fight; let England pay.'

This unfortunate blind man may go from one end of this country to the other having charity doled out to him, having little kindness shown to him by good hearted citizens of Canada, but this government has to give so much graft to the grafters that it cannot give him a dollar. This government started a good deal like the tower that we have heard of to-day on very shifting sand. It

did not start on a high moral plane. After the elections were over in 1896 the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) who had played a great part in that campaign was without a seat and there was not in the Nova Scotia contingent a man who would say : Mr. Fielding, you may have my seat—until what happened ? Until overtures were made, the result of which were that an hon. gentleman got a judgeship, and the hon. Minister of Finance got his seat. Mr. Forbes held a seat in this House, he traded that seat for a judgeship and the Minister of Finance came here. The Hon. Mr. Blair who next came into the cabinet came in under what circumstances ? Although he had been in the forefront of the fight there was not a member from the province of New Brunswick who would give up his seat until a gentleman named King was approached. A seat in the Senate was given that gentleman and Mr. Blair came into this House. Mr. Tarte had been defeated in Beauharnois county. He too wanted a seat. A gentleman who was at that time a member of this House had a senatorship doled out to him. Last but not least when the Postmaster General (Mr. Aylesworth) wanted a seat in this House he could not get one in west Durham, the fates were against him, a gentleman was given a judgeship and a vacancy was created there. When the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) wanted to come into this House no seat could be found for him. Of all the good men who come from the province of British Columbia not one would give up his seat until what happened? —until the hon. member who surrendered his seat got a senatorship, and Mr. Riley was transferred to the other House.

From one end of the country to the other the pernicious policy of the government has diseased the 'body politic.' So diseased are the members of this House with this graft at the public crib, that the Minister of Justice has told the House that the public men of this country are so tainted politically that it is absolutely necessary to pass a law that will debar members from having a seat in this House if they practice their nefarious practices. Such a law as that is unknown in England, but the Minister of Justice thinks it necessary here, and I hope it will pass. Let me point out the position of affairs in England to-day in this respect. During the South African war two members of the House of Commons negotiated for the sale of some vessels to the British government and when that became known they were forced to resign their seats. That would be considered a very mild offence indeed in this country. The people of Canada look upon the huge expenditure that has been going on in this country for the past ten years with the greatest possible disfavour. As is pointed out by Mr. Muir, a veteran in Liberalism, this government has no longer the confidence of the country. In the great province of Ontario, the province above all others which the Prime Minister would like to have a following from, the government is in such disrepute that the public press to-day says that certain gentlemen must leave the cabinet in order that it may be strengthened by others. I have my own opinion of the timber that is coming as to whether it will strengthen it or not. After ten years rule of these gentlemen opposite, public life in Canada has been dragged down so low that the Minister of Justice says that parliament must rise in its might and pass salutary legislation to preclude members of parliament from selling their services to corporations or others who may desire them; and every one knows that the legislation is not intended for the opposition members for it is not they who have a pull with the ministers. I am glad there is going to be an inquiry into the western tower business. It is not the falling of the tower that is agitating the government now, it is the fact that there has been such a disclosure, and because they know that from one end of Canada to the other the people view with distrust and suspicion the expenditures made by the government, and believe that the falling of the tower is but a sample of what has been going on for the past ten years.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin). It is not my intention to prejudice the cause of the accident that occurred in the west block. We were told yesterday by the Minister of Public Works that:

> The contractor is Mr. George Goodwin ; the plans and specifications are exactly in accordance with those used in the construction of the other towers and buildings, and the general work all through. The materials specified are exactly the same as those specified for the other portions of the building.

I take it for granted that statement is correct, and I shall wait until the documents are before the House before expressing an opinion on the cause of the accident. I have been here several years and I know the contractor, Mr. George Goodwin, is a highly respectable and reputable contractor. I have nothing to say against that gentleman nor have I anything to say against contractors generally, because I know we have in Canada a large number of perfectly honourable contractors who are prepared to do their work according to plans and specifications. But, Sir, I am impelled to rise on this occasion to discuss the public works in my constituency because of the statement made in the Liberal organ published in the city of St. Thomas; a newspaper which is the most prominent liberal organ in my county. A gentleman living in a town where some public works are being constructed wrote to the Conservative paper finding fault with the way in which the work was being carried out, and in attack-

ing that correspondent the Liberal organ has this to say :

> The strongest point which has been scored against the 'Times' is its admission that the work has been bungled and that public money has been wasted, while its champion, Mr. A. B. Ingram, the people's representative, remains as mum as an oyster regarding the whole affair for the simple reason that his government is not in power. If that is the feeling of the Conservative members of parliament it would be better for them were they to remain at home and not be drawing the people's money for sitting with their thumbs in their mouths when there is much to be said in the interest of the electors.

Now, I challenge the Prime Minister and I challenge the Minister of Public Works to say that I have remained as mum as an oyster in this House. Is that my record when the estimates are before the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Oh, no.

Mr. INGRAM. The right hon. gentleman merely shakes his head but that is not recorded in 'Hansard,' and I want the right hon. gentleman to say that that is not correct.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is not correct.

Mr. INGRAM. The Prime Minister assents to my proposition but he merely shakes his head and that shake cannot be put down in 'Hansard.'

Mr. SAM HUGHES. The right hon. gentleman said 'yes.'

Mr. INGRAM. Well, if there is any doubt about my remaining too silent it will be necessary for me to make greater efforts in the future than I have in the past.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Dispense.

Mr. INGRAM. I beg the Prime Minister's pardon. I did not hear him say as I wished him. I think I can safely say that the Minister of Public Works would have been very glad on many occasions had I remained as mum as an oyster. But let us see as to the condition of the public works in my county. I find in this paper a letter from the Liberal candidate who opposed me last election admitting the bungling of the public works in my constituency, and I also find the resident engineer of public works admitting that they are bungled. It is not necessary for me a Conservative member to find fault with these public works, because I can prove the fact out of the mouths of the Liberal candidate on the one hand and the resident engineer of public works on the other. I have been accused by this Liberal paper of remaining as mum as an oyster; but I am perfectly willing to bide my time until the Minister of Public works brings down the returns I have asked for, calling for all the correspondence and documents in connection with Port Burwell Harbour, Port Bruce Harbour, and Port Stanley Harbour. When these are brought down, I shall carefully go over them and analyse them and compare them with the correspondence that has gone on from time to time in my county between the Liberal candidate on the one hand and the resident engineer of public works on the other hand. Let me state some of the accusations which they make. The Liberal candidate states that the cribs were left in the channel, obstructing navigation all last summer. The defeated candidate says that is true, and that they were a menace to navigation. Another statement is that the timber used was of an inferior quality, although the highest price was paid for it, that the channel is too wide, will fill up, and will require dredging from time to time, and that the sheet piling on the west side should be cribwork. This is admitted by the foreman, Mr. Cookson, who had charge of the work. Then, I find Mr. Teall, the resident engineer, saying this :

> Again I challenge anybody, I do not care who he may be, to show before competent judges many defects in the works that were constructed under my supervision, or any that could have been reasonably avoided with one exception of about 130 feet on the west side where I acted under specific instructions.

Thereby properly holding the department responsible for that portion of the work as not being proper work. Another point to which I wish to draw the attention of the government with respect to Mr. Teall, the resident engineer, is this. He was accused by certain members of the Liberal party of not having been loyal and true to that party. Mr. Teall was drawing $120 a month of salary as a resident engineer of these works, and when accused of not having taken an active part in the last election, he said over his own signature :

> I feel I can safely pass all the attempted slurs on my political faith, as it is too well known that I never cast other than a Liberal vote in my life, and that not only did I do all in my power to elect Mr. Hepburn last election, but also enlisted all my friends to that end.

I have heard the right hon. learder of the government and other ministers say in this House on various occasions that whenever a civil servant of this government chooses to engage in practical politics, either on the platform or in the canvass, he shall no longer hold a position as a civil servant under this government. This gentleman not only took the platform, but as he says over his own signature, did everything in his power to secure the election of the Liberal candidate. There is no hearsay in this matter, because this statement is made by the gentleman himself over his own signature. This is the system under which the public works in my county are conducted. To-day every political heeler who has any influence or is of any use to the Liberal party is at work on Port Burwell harbour, Port Bruce

harbour, or Port Stanley harbour. These men do not profess to know anything about the construction of harbour works. Mr. Ford is a farmer, who does not know anything about it; Mr. McCrimmon is another farmer employed in that work; and Mr. Smale, who is not good for anything except as a political heeler, is also employed there, and it is a disgrace to have him employed on this work. In the last election the Minister of Public Works gave his candidate a document, or if not, his candidate misrepresented him by saying that he had a letter, which stated that so much money would be expended on a certain harbour. I make this statement in the presence of the right hon. leader of the government and of the Minister of Public Works, and I think it most remarkable that a minister of the Crown would tell a candidate that he could have $5,000 expended on a harbour, and give him a letter to that effect. I am glad to know, from the way the Minister of Public Works shakes his head, that that statement is not true, and I would prefer to take his statement to that of the Liberal candidate. However, that statement was made, and it was by reason of that statement that my opponent endeavoured to secure popular support in East Elgin. I am laying these facts before the House to-night because I am compelled to do so by reason of the statements made by the Liberal organ in my constituency.

Mr. F. R. LALOR (Haldimand and Monck) Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to take any part in this debate; but as one of the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House referred to a well known dredge owner as being a Conservative, and as I know the gentleman referred to, I propose to speak of him; but will do so a little later on. First, I want to pay my respects to that famous tower known as the Laurier tower, which yesterday crumbled and fell to pieces.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The late Laurier tower.

Mr. LALOR. Well, it was not very late in falling, because it fell pretty early in its construction. I examined that structure, and I must say that of all the buildings I have ever seen put up, whether by a government or by a private individual, it is about the worst. The building is stone on the outside, in the centre it is filled with mud or sand or something of that kind, and there is nothing to hold it together. Apparently there was no lime used in the mortar and no Portland cement, or if there was, there was so little that it was of no use whatever. The result is that the building is to-day lying a wreck and ruin, an object lesson to every member of this House, and to everybody else who may happen to visit Ottawa. Fortunately, the event has taken place right under the eyes of the members of this House, and it is an illustration of the work being done by the Minister of Public Works. The minister tells us that he proposes to have an investigation by a new architect, who will examine the work and tell him why the building has fallen down. I think, Mr. Speaker, that is not necessary. It needs no architect to tell us why this building is a ruin to-day, because every one who examines it can see that proper material was not used in the work, and that the structure was not properly built. It is all very well to say that the superintendent in charge is to blame or that the architect is to blame. I understand that the architect is a very responsible gentleman, probably a very good man in his profession. I think the one responsible for this structure and the work upon it is the man in charge of that department, the Minister of Public Works himself. He is the gentleman to whom the country is paying a very large salary in order that he may superintend and look after works of that kind. This is a work right under his eye, at the very door of his department, which he passes a dozen times a day; and if he were a practical man, he would not need any architect or superintendent to tell him that the work was not being properly done. I suppose this is a sample of the work being done all over this country under the charge of this department.

If a contractor will put up a building of that kind right here on Parliament Hill, where all the members can see it, where the minister himself looks at it daily as he passes, what will not contractors do in Halifax or the west where the minister is unable to look after the work and see how it is progressing.

The whole thing shows the want of proper management on the part of the department, and the contractors realize they are working for a government which does not look after them and consequently do not care how the work is done so long as they can draw their pay. Probably another reason why these contractors are negligent is because there are too many charges made upon them at election time, too many rake offs. I would like to ask the minister if this building was done by public tender.

Mr. HYMAN. Yes.

Mr. LALOR. Then that is all the more reason why it should have been done up to the specifications provided in the contract. Evidently the contractor did not live up to these specifications. But what I wanted to refer to chiefly is a piece of work done in my own constituency of Haldimand and Monck, which was not done by public tender and which did not require to be done at all. At the town of Dunnville in which I live, the Department of Public Works un-

dertook to dredge the Grand river. Why they did so no one could understand, but the then member for that county, Col. Thompson, urged the government to do it. Last session I tried to get information regarding it, but was unable to do so, for in the Department of Public Works there seems to be little or no record concerning this work or explaining how Mr. Boone—a gentleman who, some one opposite has said, is a Conservative—obtained this contract. If Mr. Boone is a Conservative, I am glad we have not more of his kind, for although he is a very nice gentleman, he is a very strong supporter of this government. The only record in the Public Works Department is that in June, 1903, Mr. Boone wrote a letter to the Minister of Public Works reminding him of a certain conversation he had about the dredging of that river. He was ordered by the Minister of Public Works to bring his dredge down to Dunnville and begin work. The dredge was then on the Welland canal, and the pay mentioned was $8 per hour. One would naturally suppose that since the dredge had been ordered to go to Dunnville to do the work, it would have gone there. There was a letter authorizing Mr. Boone to bring his dredge to Dunnville and a reply from him accepting the offer, but we have nothing else in the record until September of that year when we find a letter from Mr. Boone in which he says he is now ready to bring the dredge to Dunnville and the price will be $12 per hour. It came to Dunnville and worked in the Grand river nearly two summers twelve hours a day at $12 an hour, thus drawing $144 per day for doing work absolutely useless and unnecessary and not worth a dollar to the people of that county or the country. That charge I made on every platform in the county. Col. Thompson was the man who caused the work to be done, and I made that one of the issues of the contest, and the good sense and judgment of the electors of the part of the county where the work was done condemned it, and the result was Mr. Thompson was defeated. Nothing contributed more to his defeat than that very dredging, which was absolutely useless and unnecessary. The dredge was working in the Grand river below the bridge. The farmers from the neighbouring townships have to cross this bridge and they could see the dredge working. Sometimes it was at work and sometimes it was standing idle, but all the time it was drawing $144 a day and every day it was making votes for me. The people knew that the whole thing was a farce and that there must have been something behind the work or it would never have been undertaken. Col. Thompson had had the county gerrymandered so as to make it nice and safe for him. He come to Ottawa a young man, full of ambition, clever and bright, but unfortunately down here he became contaminated and induced the Minister of Public Works to do works that were useless and the people condemned this as they should. This dredge worked in the Grand river until early in the month of December each year although, as every one knows, long before that, the days are so dark that the dredge could not work. Besides the river was full of ice, yet still the public accounts show that the dredge drew $144 per day until early in the month of December. Either the Minister of Public Works, or some one in his behalf, has told us that the men placed in charge of these public works were always competent. I know from my experience that such is not the case. I know that the gentleman who was the inspector of this particular dredging was a painter by trade from Sarnia. I notice another interesting item in the public accounts in connection with this dredging. The government gave $1,553 for towing the dredge from Sarnia to Dunnville. That is a most ridiculous charge. I am told by men who own tugs and who know what they are talking about,—and Liberals too—that they would have done the same work for one-fifth the money charged by these people, and according to the public accounts, paid to them.

This is a sample of the work done by the Public Works Department in my own county. I know whereof I speak, for I saw the work and I know that the dredging done there was useless and wasteful. And if, as the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) said, the dredging all over the Dominion is the same, we can easily understand why the expenditure of the government amounts to such an enormous sum and why so many favourites of the government are in the dredging business. We in Ontario know something of these dredging contracts. Through the public press we know something of the contracts for dredging that are given out at the Soo and other places. I agree with the hon. member for East Simcoe that there is not a department of the government in which there is a greater swindle, or in which the government is more shamlessly robbed than by the men who do dredging work in the province of Ontario. The hon. member for East Simcoe has told us of many of the gentlemen on the other side who are interested directly or indirectly in the rake-offs for these contracts and services. We heard the other night about one of the land agents of this government, who is now a member of this House who has a brother-in-law another member of this House who was a member of the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, which company got 250,000 acres of land in the Northwest for $1 an acre and sold it inside of two years for $8 and $9 an acre, clearing $2,000,000. So, when I hear of the many other members on that side who are interested in the rake-offs, it reminds me of the story of a coloured gentle-

man in the south. This man was arrested for stealing hams and was brought before judge and jury for trial. When the evidence was brought forward there could not be the slightest doubt about his guilt. The judge charged directly against him. Nevertheless the jury returned a verdict of 'not guilty.' The lawyer who defended him and who had felt quite sure that he would be convicted, asked him after his acquittal, how it could possibly been brought about. 'Why', said the man 'every one of de jury had one of them hams. I presume that is the reason gentlemen on the other side who have so faithfully supported this government—so many of them have some of the hams.

Mr. CONMEE. Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to discuss this question, and I would not discuss it now were it not for some of the remarks that have fallen from certain hon. gentlemen on the other side. I believe, and I think that hon. members on this side generally believe, that fair criticism is no less the privilege than the duty of an opposition. We do not shrink from fair criticism. Nor am I prepared to say that a great many of the remarks made by hon. gentlemen opposite this afternoon were of a character to be found fault with on this score. But many remarks were made and persisted in that were not only unfair, but had no basis of truth, and ought not to have been made in a legislative body when so little attempt was made to show that there was anything in the facts of the case to support or justify them. An unfortunate thing has occurred. A tower, part of a building, has collapsed during construction. This is not the only case of the kind that has occurred; we read of such cases every day. But, on the basis of this one fact, hon. gentlemen opposite have built up a theory that the government is bad. Not content with condemning this one department their imagination has carried them into other departments and into the general administration of the affairs of the country under this administration. Surely, Sir, all this is entirely unwarranted. There is no good purpose to be served by taking that course. It is not a dignified or statesmanlike course. It does not require very much ability or tact or skill for any hon. member to rise in his place and throw across the floor all sorts of wild statements. Why, I could slander the greatest man living, if I chose to turn my attention to slander, but I do not believe in that kind of thing. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) has attracted quite unnecessary attention. He has seen fit to make some very wild statements in this House. If this were the first offence of this hon. gentleman I would let it pass. But this is not the first or even the second time that the hon. gentleman has been guilty of the same thing. Therefore, I do not think it necessary to let it pass. The hon. gentleman should look to his own record and to the record of the party that he supports. Is his own record so clear that he can afford to asperse his fellow-members in this House? Or, is the hon. gentleman smarting under the exposure that was made last night in that, while he was talking of 'graft' on the part of the supporters of the government, a letter was produced written by himself to a former government of which he was a supporter asking for 'graft'. If I used the term that the hon. gentleman himself used, he and his friends can hardly find fault with me. I have already stated that I do not think that that kind of discussion tends to promote the public interest. The hon. gentleman found fault with the government for not putting a certain island up for sale by auction which had been valued at over $9,000. A sum at which an inspector who had been over the property estimated its value. But he himself wrote a letter asking for the island on 'easy terms,' without competition. The hon. gentleman says the island is worth $15,000; it must have been worth more at that time. Yet he asks for it on these easy terms, by private arrangement.

Mr. BUREAU. What terms?

Mr. CONMEE. 'Easy terms.' We understand what that means. I have already stated that there was probably not a member on the other side of the House who ought to be less prone to indulge in reflecting upon his fellow-members than the hon. member for East Simcoe. No member, I assume, will shrink from the discussion of his public record or of any public act. For one, I do not ask any favours from any gentleman in that regard. But I would like to remind the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) that his own record is not quite clear in relation to these matters. Now, I have in my hand a clipping from a newspaper. Extracts from newspapers are frequently read in this House and perhaps I will be permitted to read one. This article is headed:

Midland slander case.

W. H. Bennett, M.P., will have to pay W. H. Wilson $100 and costs.

Mr. PATERSON. For what?

Mr. CONMEE. I will read it for the hon. gentleman.

Of the sixteen cases on the docket at the spring assizes last week only six were tried, and court concluded on Friday afternoon.

The most interesting case was the slander case of Wilson vs. Bennett. D. S. Storey, of Midland, and J. MacKay, of Toronto, acted for the plaintiff, H. Lennox and A. E. H. Creswicke for the defendant.

The plaintiff is a Midland livery-man, and the defendant is the Dominion member of parliament for East Simcoe. At the municipal nominations held in Midland in December, 1904, the defendant having been nominated for an office

availed himself of the opportunity to talk. In his statement of claim the plaintiff alleged that the defendant maliciously libelled the plaintiff in these words : 'I know you, Wilson, I have bought your vote before, and I can buy it again.'

Mr. Bennett, in defence, endeavoured to show that Wilson had changed his political faith from time to time according to the patronage given him at election times. He claimed that the words complained of meant only that the plaintiff had on previous occasions been successfully satisfied——

Successfully satisfied, that is he was acting on easy terms, that is cheap and quietly.

—and quieted, and there was no intention to impute the commission of a criminal offence. Six witnesses were examined on each side, and after lengthy addresses by the counsel the case was given to the jury, who returned a verdict for $100. Costs go with the verdict.

I am not going to impute altogether the worst motives to my hon. friend. This is a newspaper clipping and the facts are strong enough. The fact is that six good men and true were in the witness box on each side and the jury convicted my honoured friend of slandering a neighbour or a fellow citizen. Now that is not a good record to give him the privilege in this House of using the language he generally uses towards members on this side. I do not wish to pursue this case too far.

Mr. BENNETT. Go ahead.

Mr CONMEE. But I want to say that I have been more than twenty years in public life. There is not a Conservative newspaper in my riding that has attacked me against which I have not had a verdict for libel. They have all slandered me, and I have never failed to compel them to retract when I brought them into court.

The hon. gentleman made some references to myself, and that is why, perhaps, I am somewhat personal in my reply. Not satisfied with my statements which I think were ample and particular, the hon. gentleman made references to my record in Ontario and in the Ontario House. If my hon. friend wants to delve into that record, he is perfectly welcome to do so and I am perfectly willing to stand by it. I have nothing to regret, I have nothing to be ashamed of in that regard, either there or in this House where I am only a new member. My hon. friend went far afield, went far outside the question before the House and delved into the general record of the Liberal party. He told us about making room for members going into the cabinet, the resignation of this member and that member and a cabinet minister taking his constituency. Why, Sir, his own party is full of that record. If it is a bad example, if it is an abuse, Sir, that abuse was committed by hon. gentlemen opposite for many years when they were in power. I could name member after member of former Conservative governments who came into this House, who took the place of resigned members who found homes for themselves in the Senate or in some other comfortable position. I am not arguing that two wrongs make a right. If the record of the Conservative party is bad, if it has been corrupt, if it has been decayed and falling from the head to use the expression we heard this afternoon, why Sir, that is a misfortune of the Conservative party. My hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) has been a life long supporter of that party; he supported it in all its corruption; in its McGreevy scandal, in the Langevin block scandal, in the Curran bridge scandal, in a great many other scandals which I could name if I choose, who supported it in all those years, was its mouth piece on the platform, not only in his own constituency, but also in other constituencies. If this man is to lecture us on high morals and political virtue, I might ask him to look just in front of him. It was said here this afternoon that the government is crumbling from the top. Sir, I think the record of this government is such that it has held this country fairly well. The late elections are evidence that it still holds the country. Their candidates in the west, on the Pacific; in the east, on the Atlantic; in the middle, in Ontario; have all come back to this House with large majorities. Wherever there is an appeal to the people the Liberal party is sustained. Why ? Because of their record, because of the administration of this government being progressive, and notwithstanding the sneers and slanders of hon. gentlemen I am prepared to say that I believe it to be clean and honest administration of public affairs.

Mr. CAMPBELL. In the election yesterday the Tory lost his deposit.

Mr. CONMEE. My hon. friend (Mr. Campbell) reminds me that in an election only yesterday the opposition candidate lost his deposit. I might point out to the hon. gentleman that there was a time when the government of this country was rotten at its head, when it was rotten in the centre, when the general body of the Conservative party was unsound. We know the position that party was in, we have the words of one of the hon. gentlemen now leading the opposition that there was an old fool at the head of it, or words to that effect. My hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) supported that sort of thing, what is their position to-day ? Do they expect the people of this country to withdraw their confidence from the government which conducts the public affairs of Canada at the present time and change over to a party that would have a cabinet of whom, Sir, the majority would be made up of the very men who were hurled from power by an indignant people in 1896?

I do not believe that that sort of discussion on the part of our friends is good dis-

cussion. I do not believe that they are going to enhance their reputation in the country by drawing into the discussion of a simple matter that sort of debate. I only refer to it because of the reference that was made to myself in the discussion which these hon. gentlemen have seen fit to introduce on this question. But, the record of the Conservative party is not such that they need glory in it. I am not prepared to say that every hon. member opposite is responsible for the wrongs of the past or that he should be held responsible for them, but I mean to say that hon. gentlemen opposite, when they are discussing such a question as this, have no right to impute motives to hon. gentlemen in this House. They have no right to make charges of corruption, wrong-doing, and mal-administration, as has been done this afternoon, unless they are prepared to back them up. I would not rise in my place, if I were a member on that side of the House, if I could not get something better to carry my party forward than a resort to that sort of slander. If these things exist, if there is this corruption, that hon. gentlemen have been speaking about, then it is their duty to unearth it. That is what the Liberals did previous to 1896. They brought their opponents before the committees of this House, partisan committees as they were. I have heard our opponents say on the platform: What is the use of bringing them before the committees? They are partisan committees. Well, the Liberals had to face partisan committees and they proved corruption up to the hilt against many hon. members on the other side of the House, they drove some ministers out of public life; nay more, they drove some of them into the prisons of this country. Therefore, their record is not one that hon. gentlemen opposite should glory in, and I have only to say to hon. gentlemen opposite that if they do not like this mode of discussion, if it is not agreeable or palatable to them, I will ask them not to make the untruthful and slanderous mis-statements that they have cast over to this side of the House on more than one occasion.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria). Mr. Speaker, when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Conmee) arose and spoke of fair criticism, of the undignified course of my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), and of the course pursued by members of the opposition as not being a statesmanlike course, we all expected that afer his long experience in the pure atmosphere of the city of Toronto—the school from which he has graduated with such distinguished honours—we would have had an exhibition of dignity, statesmanship and high tone in debate. But, what has his speech been? vilification and political blackguardism,—if I may be allowed to use the term,—perhaps I had better not use the term—from start to finish. We have heard the definition of diplomacy given as personal intrigue, influence and unscrupulousness. Our hon. friend has had an experience. Ontario controls the timber and the pulp of that magnificent area upon the shores of lake Nepigon, and it has been corralled through the engineering and diplomacy of that distinguished member who has just taken his seat.

Mr. BENNETT. And Captain Sullivan.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. And Captain Sullivan. The fish industries of lake Nepigon, the most magnificent in Ontario, are held in the breeches pocket of the distinguished gentleman who has just taken his seat.

Mr. BENNETT. With Captain Sullivan.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. And the vast quantities of tie timber along the line of the Canadian Northern Railway from Port Arthur to the west was controlled (that was the word used), held in the trousers pockets of that distinguished gentleman.

Mr. CONMEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I never had any timber between Port Arthur and Rainy river. I never owned a foot of timber of any kind or description there.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Would the hon. gentleman please repeat that ?

Mr. CONMEE. I say that I never owned, by lease or otherwise, a single acre of timber between Port Arthur and Winnipeg, or Fort Francis. I just want to tell the hon. gentleman that he is entirely mistaken when he says that I control the Nepigon pulp concessions or even the Nepigon Fish Company. These are matters that I had a perfect right to be interested in if I wished to do so, but I do not control them, and I want to tell the hon. gentleman that he is entirely mistaken. If he has any information of his own knowledge, I am willing to listen to it, or if he has a statement, or will produce a statement in writing from any respectable person who will sign his name to it, I am willing to listen, but I will ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw the statement which was made in reference to the ownership of timber, because I never owned a foot of timber along the line of the Canadian Northern.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. My statement was that the hon. gentleman controlled the timber and I reiterate that statement here.

Mr. CONMEE. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Let the hon. gentleman take his seat until I am through. When I am finished, the hon. gentleman can get up and bluff the House if he has a mind to.

Mr. CONMEE. I rise to a point of order. I say that the statement of the hon. gentle-

man is false and untrue and I ask him to withdraw it.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Conmee has said that the assertion in reference to him is incorrect.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I have not finished my sentence.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Conmee) has stated that the statement made by the hon. member (Mr. Sam-Hughes) is incorrect. That statement was made. He says it is incorrect and it should be withdrawn.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. But, Mr. Speaker, I have made no statement regarding the timber along that line of road.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member must not persist in stating that he made no statement. The rule is that if he does make a statement which is denied, it must be withdrawn.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I was interrupted before the sentence was finished.

Mr. SPEAKER. It must be withdrawn. We might as well make up our minds to it.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Well, I accept the hon. gentleman's statement. Now, I shall proceed. I make the statement that hon. gentleman controlled this——

Mr. CONMEE. I want to correct the hon. gentleman.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) has a right to complete his statement before the hon. gentleman (Mr. Conmee) denies it.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES——that the hon. gentleman controlled the tie timber and other timber within a certain distance along the line of the Canadian Northern Railwoy from Port Arthur west—he and friends of his—at one time.

Mr. CONMEE. The hon. gentleman is entirely mistaken. I do not suppose that he would make that statement if some one had not told him that it was true. There is no justification for it at all. I never owned, by lease or in any other shape or form, a single acre of timber along the line of that railway from one end of it to the other, at any time and I do not to-day. Nor, do I control it if the hon. gentleman wants to use the word 'control.' Now, I ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw that statement. I will not say that I appeal to him in this House. That hon. gentleman (Mr. Sam. Hughes) and the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) indulged a good deal last year in that sort of thing and I endured it. I did not take up the time of the House in regard to it, because I thought these gentlemen would become better informed and that they would drop that sort of thing. I would ask the hon. gentleman to be good enough to take that statement back.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I am speaking from personal knowledge.

Mr. SPEAKER. The rule of the House is that when an hon. member makes a statement and another hon. member denies that, the member making the statement should withdraw it. That is what is necessary to be done in this case.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. If you will allow me——

Mr. SPEAKER. You must withdraw.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. But wait.

Mr. SPEAKER. No, the rule is that it must be withdrawn.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, when a member makes a statement——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The rule of the House is plain, that if one member makes a statement in reference to another member and that member states that it is not true, the first member should withdraw it and accept the denial.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of course there is the qualification that it is within the personal knowledge of both members.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand the rule——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will you allow me for just one moment; I have the floor. If the hon. member for Victoria should state that he met the hon. member for Rainy River in the corridor five minutes ago, and the hon. member for Rainy River should declare that statement to be incorrect, I know of no rule of the House which compels one or the other to withdraw what is a matter of personal knowledge to both. If this were a matter within the personal knowledge exclusively of the hon. member for Rainy River he has a perfect right of course to have his statement accepted, but when it is a matter within the personal knowledge of both hon. gentlemen, that is a different thing.

Mr. SPEAKER. As I understand the rule; when a statement is made by one hon. member in reference to another hon. member and the other hon. member denies its accuracy, the rule is that the first hon. member must withdraw. That is my ruling at present.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I bow to your ruling Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. And withdraw the statement.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I accept the hon. gentleman's statement. I say now Mr. Speaker, that I know of my own personal knowledge that what I have stated here is true.

Mr. SPEAKER. I call the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that he is simply repeating the offence ; the hon. gentleman must withdraw.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. If Mr. Speaker wishes me to accept the hon. gentleman's statement I do so and I point out this, Mr. Speaker, that when I stand before this House and make a statement of my own personal knowledge, it has been held by Speakers who were possibly—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The remedy, if any, which the hon. member has is to appeal from the ruling.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. May I not quote an authority in reference to the ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am not prepared to enter into a discussion with the hon. member. My ruling is that he must withdraw the statement and he must not reiterate it, for that would simply be repeating the offence.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Conmee) will not deny—perhaps he will, though, for he is in the humor to deny everything to-night. He is rising and I shall not say whether equivocally or otherwise, but he is constantly making denials here. He will possibly not deny having 10 per cent of a rake off on the construction of the Algoma Central Railway.

Mr. CONMEE. Yes I deny that, and I ask my hon. friend to withdraw it. I never had any rake off of 10 per cent on the Algoma Central Railway.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CONMEE. I never got any contract on the Algoma Central Railway by political influence of any kind ; I never had any contract there that I did not get under fair competition. I met that question in another chamber and I met it just as I meet it here now. I ask my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes) to withdraw it. Now, I want to say to my hon. friend that it is not my fault that we are drawn into this sort of thing.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I have the floor. I am not going to permit him——

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Conmee) to say that the statement made by the gentleman who had the floor is not true. The rule is that it should be withdrawn.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I asked a question, I made no statement. Perhaps he will deny that he ever was interested in the Port Arthur dredging——

Mr. CONMEE. Allow me to say——

Mr. PATERSON. Do'nt answer ; he is not making a statement.

Mr. CONMEE. Well let him go ahead and make his statement.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Will he deny he was interested in the Port Arthur dredging ? Will he deny that owing to the action taken by this House last session there was a saving to the country on that dredging——

Mr. CONMEE. Certainly I deny that statement.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. He is in a denying humour to-night.

Mr. CONMEE. I certainly deny it to-night and any other time.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Perhaps he will deny that he ever knew Cap. Sullivan.

Mr. CONMEE. No I wont, and I have this to say that I believe Cap. Sullivan is more of a gentleman than the hon. member.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. CONMEE. That is my opinion and I know them both very well.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I expected that sort of language. Birds of a feather flock together, and undoubtedly he would have a very high opinion of the ingenuity of the gentleman who had steered so many of these timber limits ; characters and types of mind very similar——

An hon. MEMBER. He put up $1,000.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Why, yes, did'nt this distinguished gentleman put up $1,000 once to run as a government candidate and then when he was conveniently left at home it was found he had never resigned his position in the Legislature. He was obliging enough to contest the election of Mr. Gamey, I dare say at the instigation and inspiration of this man Cap. Sullivan. He is the gentleman who will get up and lecture the House on dignity and all that sort of thing, and then with the most convenient memory in the world deny the accuracy of statements that can be proven if an opportunity is given to prove them. Well Sir, we were discussing I believe something in connection with—Oh, yes, I was forgetting ; he referred to a certain letter written by the hon. member for East Simcoe. (Mr. Bennett) and he tried to make it appear that the letter which my hon. friend sent to the department some years ago in relation to the Christian island pasturage was something crooked. Here is what Mr. Bennett says in that letter :

There is an island called the Giant's Tomb some fifteen miles from here of considerable size which is in the group belonging to the Christian Indian islands but upon which no indians reside, and I have been asked by some parties to learn upon what terms a lease of the island could be acquired for purpose of raising sheep in large numbers.

Is there anything wrong in asking upon what terms——

Mr. JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). What were the terms.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Public tender.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. By public tender or private lease ; Mr. Bennett was leaving that to the discretion of the Minister of the Interior. It was a lease for pasturage for sheep on parts of the island that are not timbered. My hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) demanded then as he demands to-day that the timber should be put up at public auction and that the pasturage should be let to these gentlemen for the sheep. I dare say that is a small transaction in the minds of these gentlemen who are in a habit of getting a rake off, of the $50,000, the $250,000, and the $3,500,000. I dare say this little sheep lease seems small to the gentlemen beyond there who had feathered their nests out of the public treasury of this country, who came into the parliament of Canada poor men and who now have stock in the Lake of the Woods Milling Company, and stock in every large institution in the country registered in their names, and the public are curious to know how they got it. There is nothing whatever in the letter of Mr. Bennett that can be considered in any way improper.

Mr. CONMEE. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) permit me a word or two ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. If the hon. gentleman has a question to ask me I shall be delighted.

Mr. CONMEE. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to represent me as saying of Mr. Bennett that there was any crooked act in his letter? I merely pointed out to Mr. Bennett that while he was contending last evening that this island should be put up for competition, he himself asked, not for the part of it on which there was any timber but for the whole island and upon easy terms without tender. If he preaches a doctrine he should live up to that doctrine.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. We are giving the hon. member for Rainy River all the privileges he can have for he has made twenty or thirty different speeches to-night and in each one of them he has exhibited himself in a worse light than in the previous one. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Conmee) made one unfortunate allusion to the practice of the Tories in dealing with members of the House of Commons who were found guilty of improper connection with contracts. What did the Tory party when in power do ? The Tory party engaged the foremost Liberal lawyer in the Dominion of Canada. Mr. Osler, to try to fasten the charges on these men and the Tory party sent them to penitentiary. If the present Liberal government followed that example of the Tory government, I wonder how many seats would be vacant on the other side of the House to-night? If that practice were followed by the Liberal government and these gentlemen were put on fair trial before the juries of this country how many seats would be vacated and how many cells would be filled? If the practice of the Conservative party, not to whitewash such men, not to promote men to agencies in London, Liverpool and elsewhere when convicted of crime; if the Liberal party imitated the policy of the Conservative party in that respect previous to 1896, they would find themselves very seriously handicapped to-day. Now I shall not enter into details. There are a great many matters I could take up in connection with the Public Works Department, and in connection with the Department of Railways and Canals more than in connection with the Public Works Department because my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works fortunately or unfortunately has not been able to give us much opportunity as yet. But on another occasion, when the House is in Committee of Supply, I purpose taking up some time in discussing some matters concerning the expenditure of public money, and I shall then be able to show, I hope conclusively, that the best interests of the country have not been looked after in the conduct of these matters. I would not have spoken to-night had it not been for the unjust attack which the hon. gentleman opposite made on the hon. member for East Simcoe.

Mr. JACQUES BUREAU (Three Rivers and St. Maurice). Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to take part in this discussion, which started this afternoon with the promise of being a business discussion. For a time we had a sort of experience meeting. Men who dealt in sand, cinders or mortar gave their ideas one after the other and sent samples to my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works. Most of the members who have spoken seemed to have had some experience in building, and wanted to show the House that they knew something of that subject. But there was something hidden and undiscoverable behind it all. The monster showed its head slightly before dinner, and after dinner it continued to show more and more of itself. If I rise now to speak, Mr. Speaker, it is because of the statements made by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Sam Hughes). When I heard that hon. member say that vilification and political blackguardism was at an end, I thought he was going to talk business, but the vilification and political blackguardism continued, and, if I am not mistaken, it became parliamentary blackguardism. When I see a man who poses as one of those fiery soldiers of King

Edward VII., who went to South Africa and captured Cronje, and who refuses to bow to your decision, Mr. Speaker, I think it is high time to put a limit to these discussions. What has the hon. gentleman being doing? Refusing to respect the dignity of the House and continuing to vilify and abuse the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) in spite of that hon. members's denials. The hon. gentleman says, 'I know of my own knowledge,' and then he asks the hon. member for East Simcoe, 'What is it?' We have eyes to see and ears to hear, and I think this is most unbecoming conduct. If the hon. member for Victoria has any axe to grind with the hon. member for Rainy River, that is a question for him; but when he gets up in this House and makes such ungentlemanly statements as he has made to-night—when he says that if we were to take all the grafters, all the robbers and all the thieves on the government side of the House, the penitentiary would be full, and there would be many vacant seats here, I take exception, Sir. When the hon. gentleman gets up and poses as the embodiment of virtue, morality, good manners and refinement, and says, 'Mr. Speaker, when we had scoundrels in the Tory party we put them in jail,' he forgot the balance of the story, just as he forgot the balance of the letter of the hon. member for East Simcoe. He forgot that the Tory party took these scoundrels out of the penitentiary and elected them for Quebec West with the brand still on their foreheads. I listened also to my hon. friend from King's (Mr. Fowler) who said: 'Because the contractor is a Tory you may think we are going to drop our attacks, but we are going to punish the Tories.' In the discussion this afternoon it was contended by one gentleman who claims to have had some experience in building, that great government works or buildings ought to be done by day's work. Well, Sir, what do we hear every day from these hon. gentlemen? They say there ought not to be a single work done except by tender and contract, and they attack the government if the least little work is done without tender. Because Mr. Goodwin appears to be a Tory, because the cement put in was no good, because the tower, which they have chosen to baptize the Laurier tower, came down, it gives their hearts a little satisfaction to see something to which they affix the name of Laurier come down—because the man himself goes up all the time—they say that Mr. Goodwin should be held responsible and the work should be done by the day. Talking about experience in public works, I have the honour to represent a riding which was represented formerly by a Minister of Public Works, Sir Hector Langevin, who, like my hon. friend from Victoria, whose leader he was at the time, was a model of all the virtues. I have nothing to say about that; but let me give you an instance of how in those days public works were carried on. They erected in the city of Three Rivers a post office that was two storeys high. An election came on in which Sir Hector Langevin was the Tory candidate. In those days the electors of Three Rivers would not elect any other but a Tory. They have opened their eyes since. In those days they used to say that Three Rivers was a very expensive riding. It has been reformed in that respect, because it is now very cheap. The government built another storey under the post office; it took six months to do the work, and it cost $35,000. I was told—whether it was true or not I do not know—that it cost Sir Hector Langevin $32,000 to be elected. So you can see how much was left to pay for cement and sand. Let me give you another instance. Our hon. friends opposite like to talk about the dredging in the St. Lawrence river. In front of the city of Three Rivers there is a shoal, making two channels in the river, one running north and the other running south. In the middle of that shoal was a big boulder. Just before another election Sir Hector Langevin, the Minister of Public Works in a Tory administration, and like the others a model of economy and virtue, got this boulder pulled out of the river at a cost of $15,000.

Mr. SPROULE. That is not half as bad as plugging a hole in the Yukon at a cost of $50,000.

Mr. BUREAU. My hon. friend is talking about a matter that I know nothing about. I am talking about Three Rivers. They put the boulder on the dock and many people came from a distance to look at it, and to say what a great man Sir Hector Langevin was to perform such a feat. They did not have to spend any money in removing it, because in the spring the ice saved them the necessity. The ice rolled it into the channel of the river and it cost the government $27,000 to pull it out again. These are the only two public works which the government did in the city of Three Rivers which for eighteen years faithfully elected the Minister of Public Works and the result can be seen to-day. There is a sand shoal forming around the remnant of that boulder and we have the most miserable post office in the Dominion.

Mr. SPROULE. What has the government been doing in the last ten years?

Mr. BUREAU. I have been at them to build a post office, but the Postmaster General was so economical and was so desirous of having a surplus, that he would not build it. In Three Rivers. we have changed our mode of conducting elections. We no longer run them on the erection of public buildings or taking boulders out of the river, and consequently I do not

have as much assistance as my Tory friends would have were they still in power. I have heard my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) say a corporation had been formed, consisting of counts and viscounts, with the object of getting a Grand Trunk Pacific contract. Well, I may be misinformed, but I have heard of some such corporation and was told, if political colours are to count, that it was formed at the instance and through the labours of a very prominent Tory lawyer of Montreal, and that it was through the influence of those counts and viscounts that the King of Belgium became interested in the company. Or if he was not interested, they used his name to give it a little more prestige and weight. My hon. friend exclaimed what a grand thing it would be and how it would redound to the honour of the House of Commons if our King, whom we are inviting to Canada, should walk into this House just at the moment when he was speaking. No doubt my hon. friend thought His Majesty would be impressed, but I should hope that the King would be spared any such spectacle as we have witnessed to-day. The King is supposed to believe that the loyal opposition discuss questions of public interest and do not come to parliament to vent petty grievances and personal feelings against their colleagues. I must say that if this debate is remarkable for anything, it is remarkable for lack of dignity. When I heard the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) exclaim how low members on the ministerial side must have fallen when the Minister of Justice has to bring forward a measure making members of parliament belonging to the legal profession liable to a penalty of $2,000 and two years imprisonment for practising before the departments—

Mr. BENNETT. Hear, hear.

Mr. BUREAU. My hon. friend says 'hear, hear,' but dealings in the departments are not the only things that influence members in this House. If, like the hon. gentleman, I were inclined to believe everything that is dishonourable and disreputable, I would lend a willing ear to those people who come to me and say: Why, Bureau, do you not get into the swim? Why do you not do like so and so and a thousand or two acres of land from the Canadian Pacific Railway for backing their Bills in the House of Commons?

Mr. BENNETT. Does the hon. gentleman say that I ever got an acre of land from the Canadian Pacific Railway? If he makes that statement or any insinuation of that kind, I tell him that it is a deliberate falsehood, and I will tell the same to any other man who makes it. Any land I got from the Canadian Pacific Railway, I got in the open market and paid for it and got it in my own name.

Mr. BUREAU.

Mr. BUREAU. I did not make the statement, but I knew my hon. friend would assume that it applied to him. I said that I would not listen to such statements, that I refused to believe them. But that is not the way with hon. gentlemen opposite. Give them the slightest pretense for crediting something that reflects on their opponents, and they will jump at it. They take every thing for granted. It seems to me the great ambition of some of these hon. gentlemen, especially the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Bennett), who outside the House is a genial, sociable man whom I always like to meet—it seems to me their only aim in life is to try and lower the level of their fellow members when they come inside this chamber. I do not think that that is the kind of thing which ought to be encouraged. I cannot understand hon. members shaking hands with their colleagues when they meet them outside the House and making all sorts of charges against them inside. The statement that this measure to which I have referred has been brought forward on account of the corruption on this side is, I believe absolutely unfounded. There is a very true saying that out of the fulness of the heart the mouth speaketh; and if we are to judge of what is in the heart of the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) by the number of times he made use of the expressions 'grafting' and 'grafters,' I should conclude that there is very little room in his heart for anything else. I wish I had the command of language possessed by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) so that I might give adequate expression to my sentiments in this connection. As I have said already, the falling down of this tower is a very regrettable incident, but whatever the cause may be we shall know it. The hon. Minister of Public Works has made a statement, and I do not think anybody can ask any more. He has acted as a wise man would. He has called for the best architects and engineers obtainable to examine and make a report. But the hon. member of Dundas (Mr. Broder) thought he would take advantage of a little flying trip he had made to the top of the wall to start this debate, and I want to register my protest against the manner in which hon. gentlemen opposite have conducted it. Whatever may be the feelings which hon. members show to each other outside the House, they should continue to exhibit inside it. We have been sent here to discuss public questions, and there is not one of us so perfect that he can afford to throw stones against the other. If there are members who hold their seats illegally, there are, as has been said by the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee), ways and means of bringing them before a committee and forcing them to vacate their seats. If there are members who do not deserve to have seats in this House,

let us take the proper means to get them out. But if we were to believe half what is said, there would not be two members on opposite sides who would give each other the hand. This, it seems to me, is most unfair, and unjust. Whatever our political convictions may be, it is our bounden duty to defend them and whatever may happen we shall take sides. I have no desire to lecture to-night, but time and again I have listened to speeches which ought not to have been in the mouths of those who made them and I cannot refrain from making my protest. It is all very well to indulge in witticisms across the floor which we all appreciate, but when it comes to making charges and insinuations which would lead one to conclude that one half the members of this House ought to be behind the bars in the penitentiary, I say it is about time that hon. gentlemen, who indulge in these wild attacks, should pause a little and think before they speak.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara). I wish to make a little protest here to-night but perhaps not exactly of the same kind as my good friend—one of the best friends I have on the other side—who has just sat down (Mr. Bureau) has made, because unfortunately we look at these things more or less from a somewhat political bias and different standpoints, and I have not the slightest expectation of convincing him that the lecture he has just given us should not be applied to this side of the House and not to his also. If, however, he will take time between this and Monday to reflect over what he has said, he might possibly conclude that it would do some good if he were to speak privately to his friends and the Minister of Justice concerning the measure that hon. minister has brought down, before charging us with doing something inimical or discreditable or disloyal to the King when we appeal for a higher state of public moralty.

If an hon. gentleman on this side cannot be allowed, representing his constituency and trying to do justice to the whole Dominion, to protest against that which is condemned by public opinion, there is but little use in our coming here. My hon. friend cries 'halt' to such a discussion; but I would say 'halt' to the opposition to the discussion. I say that opposition to such discussion should cease, though the discussion went on from now until Christmas, until we had made it clear that things shall not be done or allowed by the government which are contrary to the public interest and which tend to make our people ashamed of their country. The cry 'halt' should be directed to those who would try to stop this discussion till the House is clean. I do not know whether my hon. friend from Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) is going to call me to order when I say that we should seek to win for this parliament greater respect than is now paid it by the people of this country. I am not going to say the hon. member is wrong, if he says that there have been thieves, rascals, scoundrels in the Conservative party. I suppose that every man who is in the penitentiary, every man who ought to be in the penitentiary, is either a Grit or a Tory, and I cannot honestly say that all of them are Grits. But, if the general statement is made by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House that things are not what they ought to be in public life in Canada, is it a sufficient reply to say that some of those who have done wrong have been Tories? What does it matter what the politics of this man or that man may be in such a case? What does it matter though the government of Sir John Macdonald did or did not do things that were amiss. We are elected here to try to attend to the affairs of the country between the last election and the next election. We are here to try to help Canada, to purify the public life of Canada, to make this a creditable nation among the nations of the earth. If a man rises on this side of the House and says that he thinks that the government should take means to prevent the government supporters from doing things that are now done in fact, I do not think it is a sufficient answer to say that unless you can prove that the thing is illegal you cannot prove that it is wrong, and that a wrong thing in our public life is to not to be made illegal simply because it has not been illegal hitherto. The hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) was arguing that the government should not allow people to be interested in contracts with the government who are on this floor or who belong to families that are represented on this floor. Of course, the thing is not illegal, but the suggestion is that it should be made illegal. To say that this must not be considered is to say, in effect, that we do not want our law made better; we do not want that to be made illegal which is not illegal to-day; in other words, the laws are not to be amended in the interests of the people. I do not think that hon. gentlemen opposite, particularly my hon. friend from Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) means that. So, I think that it would have been better for him to consult, between now and Monday, some hon. gentleman on the other side and see how far they are going to assist in this direction. For instance they might support the Minister of Justice in the Bill he has introduced to prevent certain things being done which are done quite legally to-day, so that public life may be improved and people may have more respect for those who come to this House. I think we ought to be free, in this House, to take an example and argue a general principle from it. I think that if a tower falls down in course of construction by the Public Works Department, we

have a right to take it as an example, and, arguing reasonably from it, conclude what may or may not be wrong in the administration of the government. Otherwise what are we here for if we have no right to discuss things relating to the public interest? Are we to be prevented from this fair discussion by being called cowards or being told that we ought to be more gentlemanly? There is such a thing as being too gentlemanly. I am not elected here to be a gentleman solely. I hope the people of Lincoln think I am an ordinarily well behaved man enough. But they did not elect me as the quintessence of gentlemanliness exactly. They sent me to watch public affairs and to try to help on the time when things will be done properly, and to resist them, so far as they are done improperly. I am perfectly willing to be called ungentlemanly if I believe that the argument that I present to the House is in the interests of the people and is within the rules of the House. I am content that hon. gentlemen on that side should say that I am not gentlemanly, so long as I can feel that I am doing my duty to my constituents. I am willing, on these terms, to be lectured by hon. gentlemen opposite. And, so long as we feel that we are doing our duty, I do not think we should bother our heads about whether they think us gentlemanly or not. I would like to be considered a gentleman here, if I can keep that reputation and also promote the interests of my constituents and use what influence I can command to have things done in a way that will be creditable to them and to the country. The hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) said that we ought to discuss here questions of interests. He suggested that if the King had come here and heard the discussion this afternoon he would not have formed a high opinion of this House. We are not anxious to have these discussions. But, if things are wrong, we are anxious to have them put right. Surely the hon. gentleman does not want things to go on in a wrong way simply because they have been going that way. If not, then he must be willing to discuss them with a view to finding out whether they are wrong or not. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) is surely trying to do the right thing by parliament and by the people. He has introduced a Bill the effect of which is to declare that members of parliament shall not take special remuneration for getting arrangements made with the government which they may be supporting. I cordially agree with that. It may be that when the Conservatives were in power this step was not taken. But, am I therefore debarred from voting for this Bill of the Minister of Justice? Yet is not that the effect of what the hon. member for Three Rivers says? Because I supported the government of Sir John Macdonald and that government did not introduce this measure or apply this remedy to the conditions of that time, therefore I am to vote against the minister's Bill, though I think it a good one—I ask the hon. member (Mr. Bureau) if that is what he would have me do. The hon. gentleman wants us to talk seriously. I ask him seriously and conscientiously if that is what he wants me to do. I expect to remain as good a Tory as ever, and I will vote for the Bill of the Minister of Justice if I think it right. And that is what my people expect of me. They do not expect me to be frightened into voting against such a Bill because I am a Tory and because the Tory government, when in power, did not propose such a Bill. It may be there was not the same occasion for it. We have had Ministers of Justice representing this side who were honourable men: we have had Ministers of Justice representing the other side who were honourable men. Is it not fair to assume that, if no previous Minister of Justice introduced this Bill, one reason was that there was no necessity for it? Is that an unfair statement to make or a wrong conclusion to draw?

It may be assumed that one Minister of Justice is as competent and as anxious to serve the people as another. The fair inference would be that when the Conservative party were in power, no Minister of Justice thought it was necessary to introduce such legislation and the natural inference would be that there was not so much of that kind of thing going on. No one sugegsted it should be done. Here we have the leader of the opposition stating before parliament met, that he was going to to advocate that this should be done, and the Minister of Justice, agreeing that the leader of the opposition is right. They are both trying to purify politics in this country. We find the Minister of Justice bringing as a government measure into the House, the measure which the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) advocated shortly before the House opened. If the hon. member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) is going to vote against the Bill because the leader of the opposition advocated it, and if I am to vote against it because the Minister of Justice introduced it, what are we going to do in the effort to discharge our duty? I suppose if I vote I will be told I voted for it, because the leader of the opposition advocated it. If it is a good measure, I am prepared to vote for it, but I say to the member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau) if he votes for it because the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) introduced it, he is also voting for the measure which the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) advocated before the Minister of Justice introduced it. After all, is it not our duty to try and assist each other to bring about such conditions in Canada as ought to exist. I

can understand an hon. gentleman saying: some things said here, but we must not be so thin skinned, so afraid of discussion. I can understand an hon. gentleman saying: I do not like the Minister of Justice introducing this Bill; it is a reflection on us, a reflection on lawyers on this side, a suggestion that we are taking money to get arrangements through the department and to get Bills passed through the House, advocating them in committee, &c. Now, there is an evil or the Minister of Justice would not propose to remove it. The Minister of Justice sometimes, might not apply a remdey because he might not see an evil that existed, but it has never been suggested that the Minister of Justice is trying to apply a remedy to an evil which nobody saw. We often have evils for which we can not find remedies, but when the Minister of Justice advocates the making of certain things illegal and penal, surely we must assume that an impression exists which the Minister of Justice thinks must be dealt with and with which he proposes to deal. I ask hon. gentlemen if they think we are entirely to blame for supposing that things are wrong. Here is a tower not finished, a building with walls that are supposed to be brand new, which collapses. I do not know that the rest of that building is any better than the tower, but I will be inclined to think the walls are all alike. I would not like to see any Canadian fellow citizen go into that building, unless it was quite certain that it is safe. If I had any influence with any one to be employed in that building, I would say to keep out until there is a full report on it. If the tower had lasted a little longer there might have been 150 civil servants there and other people to do business with them. We fear from this accident that things are not as they ought to be in the Public Works Department, and do hon. gentlemen think we are not going to say what we ought to say for fear of being called ungentlemanly? They are applying the wrong dose to us, if they think that is going to prevent us, and I ask them again to come to the conclusion that there is something wrong in regard to the way business is being done by the department. Evidently advantage is being taken by people who know how to get advantages, such as members of parliament in some way secure because the Minister of Justice recognizes that something is wrong when he introduces the Bill. We will assist to make this thing right. We will have our fights on party questions, but do not, for Heaven's sake, make a party question of the morals of this country. Let us all agree to try to make people behave themselves in public life. We may dispute about other things and will take our knocks from each other and take them in good part, but do not let us have any personal trouble if we can help it, over a matter like that. If I have any influence with hon. gentlemen opposite, and I am on the best of terms with all of them and particularly with the member for Three Rivers (Mr. Bureau), and I think he knows I mean what I say, I ask them now to reflect between now and next week whether we should not join hand in hand on this matter, and make every effort to bring about a satisfactory condition. I shall not trespass on the time of the House, but I felt compelled to say this to try and bring back the debate to where I thought it should be and away from the low plane to which I think hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House did more than we did to bring it down.

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

Mr. INGRAM. Before we proceed, I would like to ask the minister if he has taken any steps towards laying the ordinances of the Yukon council on the table.

Mr. OLIVER. I have the pleasure of informing the House that on March 23 of this year, the premier laid before the House a copy of the ordinances passed by the Yukon council in the year 1905.

Immigration—salaries of agents and employees in Canada, Great Britain and foreign countries, $150,000.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I observe there is an increase of $12,800 for the year.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, that is correct.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Could the hon. minister just as conveniently take up any other item? One hon. gentleman who is interested very much in this item has been called away to-day suddenly. I think there will be a good deal of discussion and perhaps we could take some other item that would not call for so much discussion and accomplish something.

Mr. OLIVER. I thought that possibly there might be a number of questions that would be asked in regard to this vote that would give me an opportunity of bringing any information that may be required at a later date. We might take a preliminary canter to-night upon this and after that we could take up the vote of the Interior Department for a few minutes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. We can go on with it for a while in the meantime.

Mr. SPROULE. We will have a little inconvenience in discussing this item to-night seeing that we are dealing with the same subject in the Committee of Agriculture, and we have been unable to get all the information we desire to have before this question is discussed. In the absence of that information I would like to ask the minister if he could give us the names and the salaries of the various agents who are employed in Canada, Great Britain and foreign countries?

Mr. INGRAM. I would ask the hon. minister when he gives the names of agents in Ontario to specify the points at which they are located.

Mr. OLIVER. The list is as follows :

List of immigration officials whose salaries are to be charged to the vote for immigration salaries :

135.—Canada.

Name and rank.	Salary per annum.
F. W. Annand, agent, Halifax	$1,400 00
W. L. Barnstead, clerk, Halifax	900 00
H. D. Blackader, clerk, Halifax	600 00
Wm. Ross, clerk, Halifax	547 50
Jos. Bernstein, interpreter, Halifax	730 00
Mrs. M. Cullen, matron, Halifax	600 00
A. Bayley, night watch, Halifax	547 50
Chas. Magnus, night watch, Halifax	456 25
Thos. Yeoman, night watch, Halifax	547 50
W. Evans, chief guard, Halifax	638 75
Jas. Fitzgerald, guard, Halifax	547 50
W. Sheppard, guard, Halifax	547 50
John Marga, guard, Halifax	547 50
Dr. A. C. Hawkins, medical officer, Halifax	1,000 00
Dr. H. L. Dickey, superintendent detention hospital, Halifax	1,200 00
J. V. Lantalum, agent, St. John	1,400 00
J. P. Lunney, clerk, St. John	900 00
Mrs. A. P. Reed, matron, St. John	600 00
T. H. Ritchie, guard, St. John	456 25
A. Stirling, guard, St. John	456 25
Dr. W. L. Ellis, medical officer and superintendent Detention Hospital, St. John	1,600 00
P. Doyle, agent, Quebec	1,400 00
L. Stein, clerk, Quebec	1,400 00
J. P. Stafford, clerk, Quebec	912 50
S. Morisset, clerk, Quebec	638 75
E. Valin, chief guardian, Quebec	700 00
Geo. Martel, guardian, Quebec	547 50
E. Galarneau, guardian, Quebec	547 50
P. Charest, guardian, Quebec	547 50
Jas. Fitzgerald, guardian, Quebec	547 50
Jean Rochette, guardian, Quebec	547 50
E. Drouin, messenger, Quebec	600 00
W. Anderson, interpreter, Quebec	800 00
Mrs. E. Corneil, matron, Quebec	600 00
Mrs. M. C. du Tremblay, assistant matron, Quebec	420 00
Geo. Hayden, engineer, Quebec	800 00
Jos. Huck, assistant engineer, Quebec	600 00
Dr. J. Howe, medical officer, Quebec	1,000 00
Dr. A. Potvin, medical officer, Quebec	1,000 00
Dr. E. Nadeau, assistant superintendent Detention Hospital, Quebec	1,200 00
N. Poulin, guardian, Point Lévis	638 75
John Hoolahan, agent, Montreal	1,200 00
Jos. Daigle, clerk, Montreal	1,000 00
A. Regimbal, messenger, Montreal	800 00
John Kuhlman, interpreter, Montreal	600 00
Dr. A. D. Stewart, medical officer and superintendent Detention Hospital, Montreal	1,600 00
Dr. P. H. Bryce, medical superintendent, Ottawa	2,200 00
Dr. G. W. Elliott, medical officer, Ottawa	2,400 00
W. D. Scott, superintendent, Ottawa	2,800 00
E. B. Robertson, assistant superintendent, Ottawa	1,500 00
G. B. Smart, inspector, Ottawa	1,600 00
R. W. Hillyard, assistant inspector, Ottawa	1,200 00
Robt. Fraser, statistician, Ottawa	$1,200 00
M. A. Cook, clerk, Ottawa	1,080 00
F. C. Blair, clerk, Ottawa	900 00
W. Thompson, clerk, Ottawa	900 00
A. E. Eccleston, clerk, Ottawa	800 00
D. W. Johnston, clerk, Ottawa	800 00
J. H. Stanford, clerk, Ottawa	900 00
A. J. Havey, clerk, Ottawa	550 00
Miss N. O'Reilly, clerk, Ottawa	550 00
Mrs. S. M. Geddes, clerk, Ottawa	550 00
Miss E. Hackett, clerk, Ottawa	550 00
Miss Jeanie Lang, clerk, Ottawa	550 00
Miss Maud Martin, clerk, Ottawa	550 00
Miss B. Bedard, clerk, Ottawa	550 00
Miss E. Kavanagh, clerk, Ottawa	500 00
J. S. Fraser, editor and compiler, Ottawa	1,200 00
J. O. Cowan, shipping clerk, Ottawa	720 00
James Back, assistant shipping clerk, Ottawa	660 00
J. Obed Smith, commissioner, Winnipeg	3,000 00
A. Moffat, accountant, Winnipeg	1,800 00
Chas. G. Bernier, clerk, Winnipeg	1,500 00
M. Jerome, clerk, Winnipeg	1,200 00
Thos. Gelley, clerk, Winnipeg	1,500 00
C. F. Beaudry, clerk, Winnipeg	1,000 00
Jos. Polson, clerk, Winnipeg	1,200 00
Miss K. Duff, clerk, Winnipeg	840 00
A. Hallonquist, clerk, Winnipeg	1,200 00
W. J. Kennedy, clerk, Winnipeg	1,200 00
D. W. McIvor, clerk, Winnipeg	1,000 00
Robt. Adamson, clerk, Winnipeg	1,500 00
C. A. Boxer, clerk, Winnipeg	1,000 00
Jas. Campbell, clerk, Winnipeg	900 00
Miss H. Williams, clerk, Winnipeg	600 00
Miss F. Messent, clerk, Winnipeg	600 00
E. J. Lloyd, clerk, Winnipeg	780 00
C. J. Pasmore, clerk, Winnipeg	780 00
P. Harvey, interpreter, Winnipeg	1,200 00
Leon Roy, interpreter, Winnipeg	1,200 00
Cyril Genik, interpreter, Winnipeg	1,200 00
J. Wolff, interpreter, Winnipeg	1,200 00
Paul Wood, interpreter, Winnipeg	1,200 00
Rev. F. Woodcutter, interpreter, Winnipeg	1,000 00
D. Morrison, caretaker, Winnipeg	800 00
H. C. Read, caretaker, Winnipeg	456 25
P. M. Morin, watchman, Winnipeg	730 00
Thos. Stanbury, watchman, Winnipeg	730 00
T. J. and Elizabeth Saunders, caretaker and matron, Winnipeg	1,200 00
Dr. S. C. Corbett, medical officer, Winnipeg	2,400 00
Jos. Young, agent, &c., Winnipeg	1,500 00
S. Gray, travelling agent, Winnipeg	1,200 00
D. W. Agnew, travelling agent, Winnipeg	1,000 00
T. J. Connell, clerk, Emerson	900 00
F. Bockus, caretaker, Brandon	600 00
H. Harley, agent, Swan River	900 00
S. Cohen, interpreter, Dauphin	600 00
John McKinnon, caretaker, &c., Dauphin	900 00
J. A. Potvin, agent on trains, North Portal	900 00
J. Dietz, agent on trains, North Bay to Winnipeg	900 00
A. M. Lenglet, caretaker, &c., Duck Lake	360 00
Thos. Bennett, clerk, Strathcona	720 00
M. McIntyre, assistant clerk, Strathcona	720 00
J. Portas, caretaker, Strathcona	300 00
C. W. Sutter, agent, Edmonton	1,600 00
P. Wagner, assistant agent, Edmonton	300 00
P. Mohr, interpreter, Edmonton	600 00

Name and rank.	Salary per annum.
C. Mair, travelling agent, Lethbridge..	$1,000 00
A. E. Humphries, land guide, Lethbridge	600 00
Jas. Winn, caretaker, Calgary..	900 00
S. S. Simpson, agent, Battleford..	900 00
W. Braun, agent, Saskatoon..	1,200 00
Sam. Foster, caretaker, Yorkton..	720 00
L. B. Cochran, agent, Medicine Hat..	900 00
W. Plaxton, land guide, Prince Albert	600 00
J. M. McGovern, agent on trains, Port Arthur..	1,200 00
J. T. Whalen, land guide, Warren.. ..	300 00
H. Zimmer, agent, Regina..	900 00
C. W. Speers, general colonization agent, Winnipeg..	2,000 00
Thos. Cory, inspector, Gladstone.. ..	1,200 00
P. M. Bredt, inspector foreign colonies, &c., Regina..	1,500 00
Dr. R. E. McKechnie, superintendent, Detention Hospital, Vancouver.. ..	1,000 00
Dr. A. S. Monro, medical officer, Vancouver..	1,500 00
Thos. Elliott, clerk, Vancouver..	900 00
Dr. G. L. Milne, medical inspector and superintendent Detention Hospital, Victoria..	2,500 00
Jas. Paterson, clerk, Victoria..	900 00

The following have been appointed for a period of six months in connection with the distribution of farm labourers coming from England :

Geo. L. Stewart, King post office, Ontario, for North York.

R. J. Crothers, Northport, Ontario, for Prince Edward county.

Robert Holmes, Clinton, Ontario, for West Huron.

W. M. Baker, Woodstock, Ontario, for North Oxford.

L. Burnett, Greenbank, Ontario, for South Ontario.

E. W. Brewster, Compton, Quebec, for Eastern Townships.

The remuneration of each of the above officers is $100 per month with actual travelling expenses.

Mr. INGRAM. Who is this Mr. Holmes who is mentioned at Clinton.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Robert Holmes.

Mr. INGRAM. Is that the ex-member ?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot tell you at the moment.

Mr. BARKER. It is the same name.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, it is the gentleman who was formerly member of parliament.

Mr. INGRAM. Are there any Ontario government immigrant agents at these places in Ontario which you have mentioned.

Mr. OLIVER. Not to my knowledge, but of course I am not absolutely certain as to that.

Mr. INGRAM. If the Ontario government has an agent at Clinton for example, then the duties of the officer of each government would conflict.

Mr. OLIVER. I have no information as to what the Ontario government may be doing but to the best of my knowledge the Ontario government has no immigration officials of any kind at these places.

Mr. INGRAM. It is within my personal knowledge that they have. and I know that it is a subject of complaint with the Ontario government that the Dominion officials interfere with their agents in this work. It is a matter which the minister should inquire into.

Mr. OLIVER. Would the hon. member name the place where the officials of the two governments conflict ?

Mr. INGRAM. I want to find out the names of the places from the minister, but I will give the hon. gentleman privately my information on that point and ask him to make inquiry.

Mr. OLIVER. This work has been undertaken at the very strong request of members representing agricultural constituencies in Ontario and we were led to believe that the Ontario government was not doing any work of that kind anywhere in Ontario outside of Toronto. My hon. friend will remember that during the debate last year the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn) made somewhat lengthy remarks on the necessity of such work as this being carried on and he evidenced the good work that was being done by a Mr. Crothers, in his county and suggested that this government should take up Mr. Crothers and forward him in his work, and parallel that work elsewhere. I thought the suggestion was a good one, and Mr. Crothers is one of the gentleman who has been placed in a position by the immigration department to cary out that idea.

Mr. INGRAM. I have no doubt that what the minister says is quite correct as applied to that time, but the Ontario government has taken certain steps to do that kind of work and there is an objection to the Dominion agent and the provincial agent acting at the same point. There is considerable territory to cover in Ontario and it would be much better to distribute the work and not have two agents in the same place.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the minister give us the names of the other agents ?

Mr. OLIVER. I have given the names of all the agents in Canada. I will give those in the United States and in Europe.

United States and promoting immigration from United States.

Name and rank.	Salary per annum.
W. J. White, inspector and press agent, Ottawa..	$2,600 00
M. V. McInnes, agent, Detroit..	1,800 00
O. Tessier, agent, Detroit..	1,200 00
F. S. Longworth, clerk, Detroit.. ..	900 00
Miss E. Hastings, clerk, Detroit..	540 00

Name and rank.	Salary per annum.
C. A. Laurier, agent, Marquette.. ..	$1,500 00
E. T. Holmes, agent, St. Paul..	1,800 00
Miss M. Dass, clerk, St. Paul..	780 00
Mrs. G. A. Sandberg, clerk, St. Paul..	720 00
Chas. Pilling, agent, Grand Forks, North Dakota..	1,500 00
C. O. Swanson, agent, Western States	1,500 00
T. O. Currie, agent, Milwaukee..	1,200 00
F. J. Lange, agent, Milwaukee..	1,200 00
J. M. MacLachlan, agent, Watertown, South Dakota..	1,200 00
Jas. Grieve, agent, Spokane..	1,800 00
J. S. Crawford, agent, Kansas City.. ..	1,500 00
W. H. Rogers, agent, Indianapolis.. ..	1,500 00
G. A. Hall, agent, Indianapolis..	1,200 00
W. V. Bennett, agent, Omaha..	1,500 00
H. M. Williams, agent, Toledo..	1,200 00
C. J. Broughton, agent, Chicago..	1,500 00
Benj. Davies, agent, Great Falls, Montana..	1,500 00
Alex. Ayotte, agent, Great Falls, Montana	900 00
Thos. Hetherington, agent, Roxbury, Massachusetts..	1,200 0
Romuald Laurier, agent, Roxbury, Massachusetts..	1,000 00
J. C. Duncan, agent, Indianapolis.. ..	1,200 00
Thos. Duncan, agent, Syracuse..	1,800 00
D. Gauthier, agent, Laurentides..	1,000 00
Rev. M. Blais, repatriation agent.. ..	720 00
Rev. H. L. Vachon, repatriation agent..	600 00
Rev. O. Corbeil, repatriation agent.. ..	600 00
Great Britain and Ireland.	
W. T. R. Preston, commissioner, London..	$3,000 0
C. A. Allen, clerk, London..	1,000 00
E. G. Everett, clerk, London..	632 64
Miss F. E. Gardner, clerk, London.. ..	632 64
Miss E. Godden, clerk, London..	445 04
Miss B. Lock, clerk, London..	411 24
A. F. Jury, agent, Liverpool..	2,000 00
J. C. Hardy, clerk, Liverpool..	1,200 00
E. Macleod, clerk, Liverpool..	700 80
S. Salingar, clerk, Liverpool..	449 95
G. H. Mitchell, agent, Birmingham..	1,400 00
J. B. Walker, agent, Glasgow..	1,800 00
Miss Stevenson, clerk, Glasgow..	278 40
J. Edgar, travelling agent, Scotland..	1,825 00
F. O. Chapman, agent, motor car.. ..	1,200 00
W. Webb, assistant agent, motor car..	442 80
H. M. Murray, agent, Wales..	1,500 00
J. Webster, agent, Dublin..	1,800 00
Miss N. Hensbey, clerk, Dublin..	253 08
E. O'Kelly, agent, Belfast..	2,000 00
Continent.	
P. Wiallard, commissioner, Paris.. ..	$2,500 00
P. Foursin, agent, South of France.. ..	1,000 00
D. T. de Coeli, agent, Belgium..	1,200 00

Mr. BARR. What is the total number of agents all told ? Are these agents employed the whole time ?

Mr. OLIVER. All those whose names I have read except the seven who are employed in the distribution of farm labourers in Ontario, are employed by the year. The seven in Ontario are employed only for six months.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask what are the duties of those employed in the province of Ontario ? I understand there was a good deal of complaining by the farmers of Ontario that they had not sufficient labourers on their farms, and this seems to be a very worthy departure on the part of the minister. What are the duties, for instance, of Mr. Robert Holmes, ex-M.P., who has been appointed for work of this kind, and has he and the other gentlemen brought in a report of what they have been doing in the past year ?

Mr. OLIVER. The duties of these men have only commenced. They are to secure information as to the requirements of the farmers in the vicinity where they reside—to get lists of the farmers requiring help, the character of the help they require, the wages they are able to pay, and whether they want married or single men. That information is dealt with by our agents at the ports of landing, and as far as possible efforts are made to direct to those different distributing agents such immigrants as the agents at the ports of landing may think it is advisable or possible to send. Of course, this is only an experiment so far. We have only begun it, and I cannot give any very definite statement as to the results.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the date of their appointment ?

Mr. OLIVER. These gentlemen were to begin their duties on the 1st of March.

Mr. BARR. How long are they expected to remain at their posts ?

Mr. OLIVER. They are engaged for six months during the immigration season.

Mr. BLAIN. I suppose uniform instructions are given to them in writing ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, their instructions are given in writing.

Mr. BLAIN. Will the minister at some future time lay on the table a copy of the instructions ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. Do these men devote their time exclusively for the six months to this work ?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know that they do, or that they do not. As a matter of fact, we are not certain yet that we are going to be able to supply the demands that are being sent in by these gentlemen sufficiently to keep them properly employed. So far as I have heard, the only complaint against them is of possibly being somewhat too active in their efforts to secure immigrants.

Mr. BLAIN. Is the territory for each of the seven gentlemen in the province of Ontario defined and laid out ?

Mr. OLIVER. The territory, I think, is not exactly defined. The appointments are made with a view to each agent being re-

sident at a central point in an agricultural district where there is a considerable demand for agricultural labour, and anything that he can do to accommodate any person requiring such labour it is of course his duty to do.

Mr. BARR. Looking at the number of immigrants that came into the province of Ontario last year, I should think the work of seven men in distributing that number would be very small. Unless their territory is divided, would there not be overlapping? It seems to me that in order to make it effectual, it would be absolutely necessary to divide out their territories in order that they might accomplish their work properly and not overlap each other.

Mr. OLIVER. I think that the points at which these parties are located are so far apart that there is no possibility of their work overlapping. Especially when it is considered that the demands for labour are so great that we have not been able to supply them. I have had several persistent requests for the appointment of such agents at other points, but so far we have not been able to accede to these requests on account of the condition of our appropriation.

Mr. HERRON. Does the minister say there are two agencies at Great Falls, Montana? Strange that there should be two agents with the same duties in the one city.

Mr. OLIVER. One of them is the resident and the other the travelling agent.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you pay your American agents by commission or salary?

Mr. OLIVER. There are two classes There are the salaried agents who receive no commission and the sub-agents who are paid a commission.

Mr. SPROULE. Could the minister give the names and the amounts paid these sub-agents?

Mr. OLIVER. I can give the total amount paid, which is $5,860.75 during the year 1904-5. The names and the amount paid to each I shall furnish later. With regard to the question of the possibility of overlapping of the work of distributing agents in Ontario and the possibility of their work conflicting with that of the agents of the Ontario government, I notice in the Toronto News of April 5, the following article :

I am strongly of opinion, observed Mr. F. G. Macdiarmid, that the government should establish other distributing points besides Toronto. In the west officials should be stationed at St. Thomas, Chatham, London, Woodstock, Stratford and Brantford. In this way the farmers in these localities could look the arrivals over and have the opportunity of making their own selections. As it is the fellows near by and close to Toronto have the advantage of first choice over the others. The application system does not alleviate this injustice to any extent. You can see in this rush that it is practically impossible for the officer in charge to fill his applications first. As a matter of fact those on the spot get first choice and the outsider gets what is left.

That is the case as has been stated to me by a number of representatives from agricultural constituencies in regard to the situation in Ontario. It was because of that we have attempted the experiment now in progress.

Mr. INGRAM. Mr. Macdiarmid may not be aware of what the Ontario Minister of Agriculture is doing in that direction. There is no reply from the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. OLIVER. The final part of the article is this :

Mr. Macdiarmid expressed his intention of directing the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to the advisability of creating other distributing agencies throughout the province for the next few weeks.

Mr. INGRAM. That may have been done at other points. I do not know what the Minister of Agriculture would say on that point. With regard to the statement made by the hon. minister, he does not say that the Ontario men whom he has appointed are to devote all their time to the work or not. They are to receive $100 a month and have a certain extent of territory to work in. I suppose they would be entitled to railway fares and other expenses in travelling. With respect to the agents distributed in Canada, you have in Halifax 15, St. Johns 6 and Quebec 19. And you have in Montreal about 5. What are the 15 in Halifax employed at and the 19 in Quebec?

Mr. OLIVER. Their duties are to receive the immigrants when they land from the vessel, see that they pass the customs and medical inspection, see that they are started for their destination and that they are cared for. Of course, it is advisable that if 1,500 or 1,000 or 500 immigrants land from a single ship at any of these ocean ports they should not be detained an hour longer than absolutely necessary. Even if this necessitates the appointment of a comparatively large staff in order to facilitate the movements of the immigrants from the ship through the ocean port and on to their destination. I am sure the country will not grudge the money for the staff—a large staff apparently, but not large in reality considering the necessity for quick despatch in the movement of immigrants.

Mr. INGRAM. At which of the ports, Halifax, St. John, Quebec or Montreal do the large number of immigrants arrive ?

Mr. OLIVER. I believe the larger number landed in Quebec—61,000 last year.

Mr. INGRAM. And at the other ports, about what proportion ?

Mr. OLIVER. About 12,000 landed at St. John, and about 25,000 at Halifax. I have not the figures for Montreal.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Do these officers, whom the minister has appointed, consider it their duty to travel in the train with the immigrants to see to it, that sharpers do not take advantage of them ? I ask this, because of what I have learned of the experience of the English colonists who came out here. These people were skinned from the time they landed, until they were settled.

Mr. OLIVER. Every immigration train has a man on it. Of course, there are many people on the train and it is hard to keep track of them all. But the effort is made to take care of the immigrants from the time they land until they reach Winnipeg.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the advantage to the farmers of having an agent stationed at Clinton, over having an agent at Toronto, considering that the immigrants land at Toronto and not at Clinton ?

Mr. OLIVER. The answer to that is given by Mr. Macdiarmid.

Mr. BLAIN. I understand what Mr. Macdiarmid had stated. I suppose the department has a policy on this subject. But, for myself, I do not understand what advantage accrues to the farmers of Ontario from having an agent stationed at Clinton instead of at Toronto.

Mr. OLIVER. If all immigrants were to go to Toronto, the advantage would accrue to farmers in the vicinity of Toronto. But the benefit of the whole province is the thing sought.

Mr. BLAIN. I am not saying there is no advantage, but only that I am unable to see it, and I would like the hon. gentleman to explain it to me.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. What is the machinery for making the connection between the agent at Clinton and the immigrant when he lands ?

Mr. OLIVER. We have officers. The hon. member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) complains that we have too many officers——

Mr. INGRAM. No, I did not complain ; I was asking for information.

Mr. OLIVER. I thought the hon. gentleman complained. The business of the officers at the ocean port is to do what they can to advance the immigrant to his destination. The object of having an agent at Clinton, or any other point immediately surrounded by farm country, is that such an agent can and does have personal knowledge of the requirements of the farmers in that locality, and of their standing and the likelihood of their using any labour they get, personal knowledge that an officer stationed in Toronto could not have. This agent at Clinton, or wherever it may be, informs the agent at Quebec or Halifax of the requirements of the farmers in his part of the country in regard to help. The agent at the port is informed in the same way of the requirements of Woodstock and all the other places. In reply, he advises these agents that there will be so many men coming on a certain vessel. Let us say there are 100 not otherwise ticketed, that is, not going to any particular destination, but simply looking for employment. The local agents are informed by wire of men who are going there. The local agent is on the lookout and he does his best to distribute these helpers among the farmers according to the requirements that he is made aware of.

Mr. BLAIN. This is a new departure on the part of the minister.

Mr. OLIVER. Entirely.

Mr. BLAIN. I think the hon. minister is to be complimented on it, provided he has good reason for the establishment of each local agent. Will the local agents be permitted to take part in politics, speaking on platforms and so on, during the six months in which they are in the employ of the government. I do not want to introduce politics into this matter, but I am sure that the minister will have a policy and this is an opportune time, when these officers are commencing their work, to state what that policy is.

Mr. OLIVER. We have not taken up that side of the question. But I should think that during the time of their employment, six months each year, it will certainly not be the best possible proof of the necessity of their employment of and of their having plenty of work to do, if they had time to spend in electioneering. I should think they would do their appointment most credit by refraining from meddling in politics, for one good reason amongst others, that we expect them to deal with the public without regard to politics. While we cannot claim the right to restrain their views or even political activity, still I think it would militate against their usefulness as officers of the government to take an active part in politics, at any rate during the time of their employment.

Mr. BLAIN. If these men should continue to take an active part in politics, while in the employment of the government, what would be the penalty ?

Mr. OLIVER. I have not given that consideration to this matter which would enable me to reply definitely. It would have to be considered as occasion arises. We are only taking up this matter as an experiment.

We do not know how it will be received by the people or how it will work out, and I think it rather early in the day to begin to make severe restrictions and regulations which may be very proper in due time.

Mr. BLAIN. One of the appointments at least—and I do not want to say anything disrespectful to the gentleman appointed, Mr. Holmes, of Clinton, who I suppose will make a good agent—it is well known, is an active politician in western Ontario, not confining his operations to his own county but going to other counties, and it seems to me that the minister should lay down a policy with regard to this.

Mr. OLIVER. The policy would be to suggest to these gentlemen to keep out of politics, but when my hon. friend asks me to affix a penalty I say it is rather early in the game to make such provision.

Mr. INGRAM. Has the minister's department consulted with the Ontario department about this matter ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am informed not.

Mr. INGRAM. The hon. gentleman has spoken about agents at Halifax, St. John, Quebec and Montreal and of 24 immigrant agents in Ottawa. What are their duties in Ottawa ?

Mr. OLIVER. Of course their duties are various. The whole immigration system is managed from Ottawa and the records are kept here and orders issued from here. That of course involves a large amount of clerical work. To show the increased work in the department I may read a memorandum showing the number of letters received in the Immigration Department which is kept separately from the other departments :

Fiscal year.	Letters received.
1903-4..	59,404
1904-5..	77,610
9 months of current fiscal year..	99,557
1 month, February, 1906..	12,418
March, 1906..	16,500
February, 1905..	7,188
March, 1905..	8,038

Mr. T. CHISHOLM. Could the minister tell me how many immigrants are likely to be sent to the county of Huron, to Clinton.

Mr. OLIVER. As we are only beginning the work we are not able to give that information yet.

Mr. T. CHISHOLM. What steps would the farmers take to get these immigrants?

Mr. OLIVER. If they inform Mr. Holmes of the class of men they want and the wages they are willing to pay, Mr. Holmes will notify our agents at Halifax or Quebec who will do the best they can to furnish these men for distribution by Mr. Holmes. Of course this is only experimental, we have not as yet made any special organization in the old country for supplying this particular demand. We are working to some extent in the dark, so we cannot give definite information.

Mr. T. CHISHOLM. Of course this is an anxious time of the year for the farmers, and any information the minister would give at this time we would be very glad to communicate to the farmers of that district. We would regard it as a great favour if we could know what the prospects are. At this time of the year farmers wish to get help.

Mr. OLIVER. If they put in their names we will do everything we can to send them men. We have made some little changes in the regulations with the view of encouraging the movement of farm labourers from England.

Mr. T. CHISHOLM. What about female servants ? They are needed very much in that district.

Mr. OLIVER. They are in the same class. We will take applications for them just the same. We are giving some increased encouragement to that class of immigration.

Mr. T. CHISHOLM. Would the hon. minister be kind enough to give us information as soon as he can in regard to the number we would be likely to get ?

Mr. OLIVER. I will see that the hon. gentleman gets the very latest information in regard to the matter.

Mr. INGRAM. The minister was speaking about the number of officials in Ottawa and then he mentioned the number of letters written, records to be kept, &c. Is the immigration literature sent from the head office at Ottawa ?

Mr. OLIVER. The greater part of the immigration literature is sent out from Ottawa. Something over 3,000,000 items of literature were sent out last year.

Mr. INGRAM. That is over the Dominion of Canada ?

Mr. OLIVER. And the United States.

Mr. INGRAM. Does the department carefully scan the literature to see that nothing goes out but what should be in this literature ?

Mr. OLIVER. There has not been in the past, perhaps, as close a supervision as might be desirable. I am not able to say that there may not have been some lapses in the literature that has been issued recently, but our earnest desire is to see that the literature is not only correct but that it puts the case properly and is kept up to date ?

Mr. INGRAM. In Winnipeg you have 32 or 33 officials. You have one man who goes up and down on the train between North

Bay and Winnipeg. What are the duties of these immigration agents in Winnipeg ?

Mr. OLIVER. Winnipeg is the point from which immigrants are distributed all over western Canada. Of course, it is to the western country that the great effort of the department has hitherto been directed. The railways branch off from Winnipeg. We have extensive accommodation for immigrants there. The system is to run the trains through from the ocean port to Winnipeg and when the immigrants arrive at Winnipeg they are given their final distribution by the agents there. As there are people of various nationalities we have to keep interpreters, speaking different languages, at Winnipeg, so that people may get proper direction for their destinations. We have also helpers, clerks and assistants of various kinds so that there shall be the least possible delay in getting these people forward to their destinations. As at ocean ports so it is at Winnipeg, while the staff may seem large, my hon. friend will see how important it is to a poor man or a man of anything but large means who is shifting the whole course of his life and who possibly has a large family with him and dependent upon him that his movements shall be expedited. Every day's delay means a great deal to such a man and it is very important that there should be no unnecessary delay. I think that no one will begrudge the expenditure necessary to enable these people to arrive at their destinations with the least possible delay.

Mr. INGRAM. Then you have between 25 and 30 officials in the United States. You have four located at Detroit, two at St. Paul, one at Milwaukee and one at New York. This does not include men who are paid commissions at a large number of places in the United States. Has it ever been suggested to the minister that owing to the large amount of cheap land in British Columbia, the Northwest and Manitoba, the government is perhaps not justified in expending a large sum of money in the United States or inducing immigrants to come into the Northwest ? Is it not a fact that the American land companies or individual Americans who own land in the Northwest are interested in filling that land up and would they not act as agents themselves for the purpose of selling their land ? Has it never been suggested to the hon. gentleman that it was not necessary to employ such a large staff of men in the United States for that purpose ?

Mr. OLIVER. Of course, that is an open question. It is a fair subject for argument as to whether the advantages in the Northwest have become so thoroughly established in the minds of the people of the United States that we might relax our efforts in regard to advertising in that country. What my hon. friend has said in regard to the exertions of land companies is also correct. There are large land companies that have bought land in the Northwest from the railway companies and they have a very direct interest in securing colonists, but while the ultimate interests of the land companies and of the government are the same—that is to say to get settlers on the land—the method of the companies and that of the government are liable to be radically different. So that we cannot rely upon the companies to do the work which would be done by the government and which is being done to-day. For instance, I might mention a matter that has been a subject of current report for some time in the western papers, there has been a system of what is called blanketing homesteads which has taken its rise very largely from the very great activity and enterprise of these land companies. While these gentlemen are anxious to secure settlers they are anxious to secure sale for their land and they are quite willing to use the government land as a means of forcing the sale at high prices of their own land. Now, the result of their efforts is that they have succeeded in blanketing a great deal of the homestead lands of the country with the view of securing a personal advantage to themselves in the sale of their land. But, it must be evident to any one that a continuation of that system, while, in the first place it is an evidence of enterprise and may in that way have had some effect in securing settlers, is bound, in the long run, to be absolutely detrimental to the welfare and settlement of the country. The land company exists for the purpose of making profits for the land company. The government is in the immigration business not for the purpose of making money for the government but for the purpose of getting settlers into the country who will make the vacant land productive. It might seem as if we are getting no return for the expenditure, and yet it is because of the result of this policy, that those of us who come from the west any way will admit that the country is as prosperous as it is to-day. We may possibly be warranted in relaxing our efforts to secure immigration from the States, but on the other hand we may not be. We know that in the past while our land was as valuable as it is to-day, it was not until Canada had them advertised that we got these people from the States, and that there was the consequent increase in the value of property. We western people are rather doubtful about relaxing the efforts towards advertising the country yet. The government stands for a continuation of an active policy of advertising for the present, with a view of securing the best settlers we can.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I don't understand how a land company could blanket homesteads.

Mr. OLIVER. Under the Act permission may be given for a person to enter for a homestead by proxy, the intention being that a man from Ontario, for instance, who goes to the west would enter a homestead in the name of his son who would follow him afterwards. That being so it is a simple matter for a land company to get a large number of proxies and make entries and then trust to Providence or some thing else that these entries will not be cancelled. The policy of this government and of the previous government has been too lenient with the homesteader and to give him a little latitude as to going on his homestead.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Do you mean that the land company could procure some person to make an entry?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, they might not improperly procure them. It was not until the land speculator got in the field as extensively as at present that any one thought of abusing this privilege of making entries by proxy. A man for instance goes into that country and he cannot find a place to suit him, but the agent of the company says to him: Now, my friend, if you will buy this quarter section from the company I will find you a homestead adjoining and the speculator then proceeds to enter cancellation proceedings against this homestead he has entered by proxy and in regard to which he had never intended the regulations to be carried out.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would the land company obtain permission from persons to make use of their names for the purpose of making entries?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. How long has this practice of blanketing homesteads been carried out to the knowledge of the department?

Mr. OLIVER. It has recently been brought to the attention of the department so definitely that drastic measures are being taken.

Mr. LAKE. I brought it to the notice of the minister last summer.

Mr. OLIVER. The evil has been growing, and while the department has been lenient with regard to the cancellation of homesteads it is believed now that it has become necessary for the department to actively interfere so that homesteads upon which the duties are not being performed will be cancelled.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The entries to which allusion has been made by the minister would not be bona fide entries, because these persons apparently only lent their names for the purpose of accomplishing an evasion of the Act. I could understand that a father going to the west might make an entry in the name of his son who intended to settle there, but when you use the names of persons who never had the slightest intention of becoming settlers it seems to me that is really a fraud upon the intent of the Act, and it does seem desirable that some drastic remedy should be applied to ascertain what homesteads have been secured in that way.

Mr. OLIVER. Provision is being made to find out the standing of homesteaders and to take departmental action for cancellation of such as have been obtained in that way.

Mr. LANCASTER. In these cases which the minister has observed, were the names to the department fictitious names, or the names of actual persons ?

Mr. OLIVER. We could not tell whether a name was fictitious or not. It would not be the name of a resident, because a resident would make the entry for himself. There might be a person representing that he was getting up a colony in the United States and that a number of his desirable neighbours would join it. As a matter of fact, this has been legitimately done in a few cases. We cannot tell which case is legitimate and which is not, except from the results.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. What action has been taken by the department to ascertain what entries are fictitious and what bona fide ?

Mr. OLIVER. The principal complaint has been made in regard to the agencies in the province of Saskatchewan, and for the moment we are concentrating our attention on that part of the country. The land agents are required to make a list of all lands under entry up to one year ago from March 1. We are concentrating there all the homestead inspectors who can be spared from the rest of the country, and they are making actual inspection of the land, and if they find a homestead under entry for more than a year on which there are no improvements, unless the entry has been protected, it will be absolutely cancelled without the usual cancellation proceedings, and without waiting for a protest from the person who has made the entry.

Mr. T. CHISHOLM. Do not the parties who blanket homesteads get the parties for whom they have assumed to make the entry to put in abandonment papers at the opportune time ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, that is what they do.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Has the minister given any permission to persons to buy a township of land, say near Eagle Creek or along the line of the Grand Trunk Pacific, or some other part that is not settled, and in that way to hold homesteads from settle-

ment ? I know of one case in which a notice was put up that certain lands had been recently surveyed and warning people to keep off them. It was found that they were held for a colonization company in the United States. Is there any possibility of that being repeated?

Mr. OLIVER. There is certainly not, in my knowledge.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. Has not the form of entry been altered in recent years ? Is it not a fact that some years ago a person desiring to make an entry through an agent had to make a declaration, whereas under the existing form no such declaration is required ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not able to answer the question, but I do not think that to gentlemen in the service of land companies the declaration would make very much difference. However, instructions have been issued that after the 17th of this month there will not be any proxies, but entries will only be accepted from persons appearing before the agent, or the subagent.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I had one of the forms in use before this government came into power, and it was necessary for the person making the entry to swear that he was a bona fide applicant, and the agent also had to make a declaration ; but the existing form does not require the applicant to make a declaration, though it does require the agent to do so. If the old form were still in use, there would not be so much fake homesteading as there is at the present time.

Mr. OLIVER. As I said before, I do not think the making of a declaration would make much difference to the people engaged in fake homesteading. A few years ago the whole object of the department was to facilitate and encourage the entry of land in every way, especially by permitting men who were likely to bring their neighbours with them from other countries to make entries on their behalf. There is no doubt that it was a good policy at the time, and served a good purpose ; but the conditions have changed so radically that what was very beneficial has become, as we view it at present, detrimental, and the change of conditions has necessitated a change of policy.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Are the instructions sent out to the different land agents and subagents available, where they can be seen ?

Mr. OLIVER. They can be placed on the table.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. Are they published anywhere ?

Mr. OLIVER. I notice that they appear in the Winnipeg 'Free Press' and 'Tribune.'

Mr. SAM. HUGHES.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. In the different land offices, if a party inquires to ascertain who has made an entry for a certain quarter section, are the agents supposed to tell him ?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. That is, the condition of a title to a homestead in the Dominion land office is supposed to be kept secret under existing regulations ?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know that it is required to be kept secret but it has never been the policy of the department to facilitate claim jumping, and the department has never given information which would assist in the disturbance of settlers claims.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. You go to a local land office to ascertain the situation with regard to a certain quarter section, and there is no way you can find out who was the man who entered for the homestead or who the bona fide man is who applies to cancel his entry. The instructions from the head office to the different agencies are not to disclose this information. Are those the instructions ?

Mr. OLIVER. I could not say what the instructions are, but I know that is the practice.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. How has it become the practice ? Is it on the authority of the department ?

Mr. OLIVER. No doubt it is, and I have given my view of the reason for it.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Suppose the minister finds that any of these fake homesteads have been transferred, will he cancel them ? Suppose a speculator blankets a homestead in another name. At the suitable time he gets the other party to cancel and put it in his own name or cover it with scrip, is it the minister's intention to take that piece of land from the speculator ?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know. If man number two has placed scrip upon the land he is the owner.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Suppose he is the man who made the bogus entry.

Mr. OLIVER. That is a matter I have not gone into.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. What is the object of the department in instructing agents to keep the title a secret from the public? Why should not a man be able to go into the Dominion Lands Office and ascertain a homesteader's title just as he can do in a registry or mining office. What is the object of keeping this secret ? A man applies for a quarter section which is vacant, on which there are no improvements, and he is told that it is entered for. He cannot find out by whom or if anybody has applied for a cancellation. Why does the department

instruct its agents to refuse this informations ?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know what the instructions are or that the conditions are as described by my hon. friend, but the practice of not publishing the standing of the homesteads is in line with the policy of the department which was adopted under conditions that were of course different from those which prevail to-day. The conditions may have changed so that that is not sound policy any longer and that is a matter for fair consideration, but as the hon. gentleman has asked me why the condition has been such as he states, I am giving him the information. Any one who has lived in the country a long while and is acquainted with the homestead conditions will fully appreciate the condition.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. It would be impossible for a party applying to cancel to have cancellation proceedings taken unless the man who made the homestead entry has not complied with the regulations, and I cannot see why this should be kept secret.

Mr. INGRAM. Suppose a person induces another to sign an application and the other simply signs to accommodate him, that would be a fake application.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. INGRAM. If it is a fake application, how is the minister to know whether the party complies with the regulations or not.

Mr. OLIVER. That is what I have been telling the committee for some time. Agents are making up the lists of the lands which have been under entry for over a year. The homestead inspectors are sent out to inspect these lands, and if they find them unoccupied and without improvements, the entries are cancelled.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. How many homestead inspectors are there in Saskatchewan at the present time who are outside the limits of their local offices ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not in a position to give that information at the moment, but I will be able to give it when the item of Dominion lands is under consideration.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY. When does the examination begin ?

Mr. OLIVER. The homestead inspectors have not started to work yet. The lists are being made up ready for them to start, and they are to start on the 17th.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There seems to be a great deal in what my hon. friend from Calgary has urged. I have had no experience in the administration of the public lands of the Dominion and know nothing about it practically. But I have had experience of similar matters in my own province, both in the Crown Lands department and in the Mining office. The policy pursued there—and I think rightly—was that every record with respect to applications for lands or minerals was open to the public on the payment of a nominal fee. With this publicity I can understand the danger of claim-jumping which has been referred to. But there are dangers on the other hand, dangers growing out of secrecy in withholding these records. There is always the suspicion on the part of the public that things are being done in an unfair way in the land office, and this it seems to me is a greater disadvantage than the other. There is a public domain belonging to this country which is open to claim under the statutes by any citizen. It seems to me that this being a question of title, the records should not be kept secret, whether in Ottawa or in any land office in the west. They should be open to any citizen, and if there is to be any relief against claim-jumping it should be by means of some discretion vested in an independent officer, in a court, or possibly in some officer of the department. I would prefer that this discretion should be in some independent judicial officer who would act within certain limits fixed by statute. I believe that the minister, on reflection, will say that secrecy in respect of these records is not good policy. I have heard a great many suspicions expressed about the department which I will not remark upon in detail, but which go to prove to me that there is danger in a policy of secrecy. These suspicions, I am willing to concede, for the purpose of this argument, are groundless, but, though groundless, they are nevertheless freely expressed. If the records of the department are open to the public, and if everything done in the department is subject to public inspection, that would afford the best guarantee that the management of the department would be above suspicion.

Mr. INGRAM. I moved some time ago for a copy for all forms of application of homestead entries for a number of years back. If that return has not been brought down——

Mr. OLIVER. I placed that return on the table to-day.

Mr. LAKE. I understood that this discussion was more or less a preliminary canter to give the minister an idea of the information that we would want later on. There is one matter concerning which I would like information. The people of Canada have grown accustomed to divide their immigrants into three classes—first, those from the British Islands ; second, those from the United States ; and, third, those from the continent of Europe. Has the minister a calculation of the cost of procuring the average individual immigrant in each class ? What is the amount expended by the government on each of these branches ?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot give the figures at this moment, but they are contained in the annual report of the department.

Mr. LAKE. I have not had time to go through that report completely. Can the hon. minister bring down an approximate statement of the amount expended on account of immigration into Canada from the United States, covering separately the amounts spent in literature, advertising and salaries of officials, and the same thing for the United Kingdom and the same thing for the continent of Europe ?

Mr. OLIVER. I have given the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lake) the salaries and commissions. The advertising is as follows :

Lord & Thomas, Chicago..	$15,617 65
Chicago Newspaper Union..	10,511 73
Western Newspaper Union..	16,946 96
A. N. Kellogg Newspaper Company	10,675 79
Rand, McNally & Company, maps, &c...	46,500 00

That is the list for the United States.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I direct the attention of the minister to a return, ordered on March 14, of correspondence during the past two years between the High Commissioner and Mr. Preston, also copies of the correspondence between Mr. Griffiths, secretary to the High Commissioner and Mr. Preston. I do not know whether that has yet been brought down.

Might I suggest to the minister that it would be desirable to have it brought down before we finish this item.

Mr. OLIVER. It is in process of being copied, but I will see it is expedited.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If there is any correspondence between the department and Mr. Preston and Mr. Griffiths, relating to the subject of the correspondence mentioned in the return, I would like to have it also to make the file complete.

Mr. LAKE. The minister has not yet given all the information I asked for. I would like to have a table compiled of the sums spent on advertising, salaries, &c., for the three different classes of immigrants in the three different countries.

Mr. OLIVER. All right.

Mr. WM. WRIGHT. Will these officials appointed to distribute immigrants arrange for the distribution of any other classes of immigrants than agricultural labourers and domestic help ?

Mr. OLIVER. Not in Ontario. Of course the general distribution is at Winnipeg for the Northwest, but we are only takng part in the distribution of farm labourer and domestic help in Ontario.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Hon. William Paterson, House adjourned at 12.55 a.m., Saturday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, April 9, 1906.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 98) respecting the Central Ontario Railway.—Mr. Northrup.

Bill (No. 99) respecting the Mather Bridge and Power Company—Mr. German—by Mr. Guthrie.

Bill (No. 100) respecting the Alberta Railway and Irrigation Company—Mr. Turriff —by Mr. S. J. Jackson.

FRUIT MARKS ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 100) to amend the Fruit Marks Act, 1901. He said : Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt the House would like a little explanation of the reasons for this Bill. We have had in operation now for about five years a Fruit Marks Act, which during that time has, I believe, on the whole worked very satisfactorily. The demand which existed for such legislation prior to the passage of that Act has been amply met. But since then there has been improvement and progress in the trade which justify some steps in advance being taken, and for a year or more past representations have been made to me in favour of one or two changes in the Act. In order that the question might be thoroughly discussed and that I might obtain the real feelings of the people interested, I took upon myself this year to call a conference of the fruit growers and others interested in the fruit business, which conference took place at Ottawa about two weeks ago. The administration of this Act and many other matters connected with the fruit business were thoroughly discussed, and the result was the passage with great unanimity, I may say, of a number of resolutions on the part of those present, and it is largely upon those resolutions that the proposed amendments to the Act are founded. I will not go into the general question any further, but I would like to point out the main provisions of the amendments. Section 4 of the Act provides that closed packages for sales shall be marked as follows:

(a) with the initials of his Christian names, and the full surname and address of the packer;

(b) with the name of the variety or varieties; and

(c) with the designation of the grade of the fruit, which shall include one of the following six marks : for fruit of the first quality, No. 1 or XXX.; for fruit of the second quality, No. 2 or XX.; and for fruit of the third quality, No. 3 or X.; but the said mark may be accompanied by any other designation of grade provided that designation is not inconsistent with, or marked more conspicuously than, the one of the said six marks which is used on the said package.

A certain amount of confusion has arisen and a desire has been strongly expressed to simplify the marking of our fruit packages. Those present at the conference who were consulted expressed a strong desire to do away with the X mark, partly to simplify matters and partly because it had been found that those marks were very easily changed. For instance, a package might be marked XX and a purchaser might easily change it to XXX by adding another X, and even X might be changed to XXX without the knowledge of the original packer, and greatly to his prejudice. For these reasons it is suggested that in future this clause should omit the X marks, though they would not be absolutely forbidden. So that, even if the package were marked No. 1, XXX might be put on the package also if the packer or dealer preferred to use the latter mark, but he must put on No. 1, No. 2 or No. 3, as the case may be. This does away with the facility of changing the marks, and will also no doubt in a short time lead to the exclusive use of the terms 'No. 1,' 'No. 2' and No. 3.' There was, however, a very strong feeling evinced that in No. 1, which is the quality of our fruit in a great majority of cases, there is a decided variation. Fruit might not only come up to No. 1 as defined by the Act, but might be a great deal better, and therefore a request was made to have a superior grade to No. 1, which would be called 'Fancy,' so that in the amendment as proposed the new clause will read in this way—I will not read the first parts of it:

(c) with a designation of the grade of fruit, which shall include one of the following four marks, viz.: 'Fancy,' 'No. 1,' 'No. 2' and 'No. 3,' but the said mark may be accompanied by any other designation of grade or brand, provided that such designation or brand is not inconsistent with, or marked more conspicuously than the one of the said four marks, which is used on the said package.

Then I come to the amendment of clause 6 in the Act, which says:

No person shall sell, or offer, expose or have in his possession for sale any fruit packed in a closed package, upon which package is marked any designation which represents such fruit as of finest, best or extra good quality, unless such fruit consist of well-grown specimens of one variety, sound, of nearly uniform size, of good colour for the variety, of normal shape and not less than ninety per cent free from scab, worm holes, bruises and other defects, and properly packed.

That is the only definition in the Act. Grades number two and three have never been defined and there was a very strong feeling amongst dealers and packers that there should be a definition of these other grades as well as grade number one. The only difficulty was to find a definition that would be satisfactory. A great many were suggested but no satisfactory definition of number two could be found. I am glad, however, that at the conference, we came to an agreement on a definition which I think is practical and which I have embodied in this measure. I am therefore proposing a clause which will read as follows:

No person shall sell or offer, expose or have in his possession for sale, any fruit packed in a closed package upon which is marked any designation which represents such fruit as of—

(a) Fancy quality unless such fruit consists of well grown specimens of one variety, sound, of uniform, and of at least normal size and of good colour for variety, of normal shape, free from worm holes, bruises, scab and other defects and properly packed.

That is a definition which is more particular than the definition of number one in the Act. Number one quality remains practically the same, there being no change except a slight one in the wording which makes it better in form. Number two is thus defined:

Number 2 quality, unless such fruit consist of specimens of not less than nearly medium size for the variety and not less than 80 per cent free from worm holes and such other defects as cause material waste, and properly packed.

There was a very long, but harmonious discussion in the conference with regard to these points, anl I am glad to say that it terminated by the practically unanimous decision that these definitions were workable. There is another amendment in section nine of the Bill, which is a more administrative change. The last clause says:

The inspector shall give notice by letter or telegram to the packer whose name is marked on the package before he marks the words 'falsely packed or marked' on the package.

That is a slip in the wording of the Act. Our inspectors have had to ignore it, so that we propose to substitute for the words 'before,' &c., 'within twenty-four hours after' &c. The inspector shall be obliged to notify the packer within twenty-four hours after marking the package instead of before. It is a mere change to make the Act workable without taking from its meaning or intent.

Mr. BLAIN. Will these proposed amendments apply to apples packed in boxes the same as in barrels?

Mr. FISHER. To all closed packages.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

WATERWAYS COMMISSION

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to inquire whether the joint report of the Canadian section of the waterways commission has been printed for distribution and distributed?

Hon. CHAS. S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works). I hope to have it distri-

buted almost immediately. Not a day has been lost since we received the report.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The report of the United States branch is already printed and available to us.

Mr. HYMAN. They may not have reported at the same time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think about the same time.

JAPANESE TREATY.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would call the hon. the First Minister's attention to our request for documents connected with the Japanese treaty.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The Japanese treaty is not yet received.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was it not concluded two months ago ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We had a cable message that it was signed on January 31, but have received no further information since then.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would again draw attention to the delay in bringing down returns ordered. Hon. members on this side complain continually of this delay and business will be retracted in consequesce. I have taken every precaution to prevent any delay by giving the various departments notice ten days before the session that these documents would be moved for. We shall have to request that certain items stand until we have these returns.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe) I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Public Works to two returns that I moved for some time ago. The first was in reference to the dry dock at Collingwood. I think the correspondence in that case must be rather short, and it is some time since the return was moved for. The other return was in relation to the amounts paid for dredging up to the end of last year.

Hon. CHARLES S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works). The former return, I suppose, would not take long ; but I think the hon. gentleman will have to allow some time for the second, because of the fact that the information is not in the department. We have had to engage in correspondence with the outside engineers to get the facts. I will take a note of the point.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries has not yet been brought down, unless it was laid on the table to-day as promised. If the minister (Mr. Brodeur) were here, I would like to ask him whether we may expect it to-day?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). Reference has been made by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) to certain reports moved for but not brought down. I wish to explain that, so far as the Department of Railways and Canals is concerned, I think that practically every return asked for has been laid on the table, with one exception—the return relating to the water powers along the canals and streams. This return involves the Public Works Department as well as that of Railways and Canals. So far as the Department of Railways and Canals is concerned, it is practically impossible to secure immediately all the information called for. The return covers a wide extent of territory and necessitates reference to the superintending engineers of the several canals. Therefore I wish to explain to my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) that he must not expect that return for some little time. We are doing our best with respect to it. So far as the other returns are concerned, I think we have met the demands of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the minister (Mr. Emmerson) examined the list of those in previous years ?

Mr. EMMERSON. As to the point raised by my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) concerning returns moved for in 1904, the custom of the Department of Railways and Canals has been, as I learned by reference to the former deputy, Mr. Schreiber, that, in the case of returns ordered during an expiring parliament, the returns were not brought down to a succeeding parliament. I have instructed the officials to attend to the several returns of last year which were not down at the close of the session. They were returns that involved a good deal of research, and we had to send to Moncton and other points for necessary information, the consequence being that returns were not ready at the time of the prorogation. We shall have these returns, however ; and I gave instructions the other day to have them forwarded at the earliest moment.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of course, if that is the custom, and if the custom is in accordance with usage of parliament, it would necessitate unusual diligence on the part of the department in the closing year of any parliament to have the returns brought down before the close of the session in which they were ordered.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queen's, P.E.I.). I understood the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) to say that the returns ordered by this House relating to his department had all been brought down. I asked for a return on the 20th of March, and I am not aware that it has yet been brought down.

Mr. EMMERSON. Does my hon. friend (Mr. A. Martin) refer to motions made during the present session ?

Mr. A. MARTIN. Yes.

Mr. EMMERSON. I said that practically all the returns were brought down but a few

that had been ordered very recently. The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden), however, gave us notice before the opening of parliament of certain motions for papers that would probably be moved. The preparation of these papers was begun at the time. But the motion of my hon. friend (Mr. A. Martin) was not moved until recently. These papers are being prepared and we expect that they will be brought down before the House adjourns for Easter.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 84) respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Leighton McCarthy.)

QUESTIONS.

PAYMENTS TO WOODS, LIMITED.

Mr. FOSTER—by Mr. Lancaster—asked:

What amount of money has been paid to Woods, Limited, for supplies for the different departments of the government up to December 31, 1905, and what parts of the several amounts have been paid on contracts after public tender had been called for ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The amount paid by the Department of Marine and Fisheries to Woods, Limited, was $6,650.70, all without tender or contract. The amount paid by the Department of Railways and Canals, July 1 to December 31, 1905, was $322.49; by the Transcontinental Commission, July 31 to December 31, 1905, $8,639.99. These purchases were made from time to time to meet the immediate requirements without tenders.

The amount paid by the Militia Department was $93,689.16. Tenders were not called for by public advertisement, but were obtained by letter from other firms in the trade.

The amount paid by the Department of Public Works was $11,036.33—without tender. The amounts paid by the Department of Mounted Police were—under contract, $2,371.20 not under contract, without tender, $2,596.25.

CANADIAN PRESS ASSOCIATION.

Mr. TAYLOR—by Mr. Lancaster—asked:

1. Who constitute the Canadian Press Association ?
2. Does it submit any statement of its receipts and expenditure to parliament ?
3. In what way is the annual payment of fifteen thousand dollars made ?
4. Who is responsible for the telegrams or cablegrams sent to the press of Canada from this source ?
5. Has the attention of the government been called to public statements that news coming from this source is in many instances quite unreliable ?
6. Has the government made any investigation of such statements ? If not, why not ?
7. Has the government made any investigation as to the value to the country of the supposed service of this association

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

1. The Canadian Press Association includes most of the leading papers in Canada. We have not a detailed list of them. The officers are J. Ross Robertson, President; and A. T. Chadwick, Secretary.
2. Under the terms of the Act, Chapter 70 of the Statutes of 1903, the association has to satisfy the Minister of Finance that not less than one half of the cost of establishing and maintaining the service is paid by the association.
3. Payment is made at varying intervals on the application of the association. The full amount of subsidy has not been paid in any year.
4. The association is responsible for the telegrams sent.
5, 6 and 7. There are varying opinions as to the usefulness of the reports, some favourable, and some unfavourable. The government has made no investigation on the same.

WHARF, GRANDE VALLEE DES MONTS.

Mr. MONK asked:

1. On what date was the wharf built at Grand Vallée des Monts received by the government ?
2. What revenue has the government derived from said wharf up to April 1, instant ?
3. Is the government aware of the state in which the said wharf is to-day ?
4. Is it the intention of the government to make the necessary repairs to the said wharf ?
5. Will the said repairs be made this year ?

Hon. CHAS. S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works):

1. Work completed since December, 1905.
2. None.
3. Yes.

4 and 5. Matter under consideration.

OLD FORT AT TORONTO.

Mr. MACDONELL—by Mr. Kemp—asked:

1. Has the corporation of the city of Toronto applied for a transfer to it of the Old Fort at Toronto, for the purpose of preserving it as a historic relic ?
2. If so, what action has been taken in the matter ?
3. If this property has not been transferred to the city of Toronto, is it the intention of the government to maintain it as a landmark of Canadian history ?
4. Has any portion of such land been transferred to any other person or company within the last forty years ? If so, to whom, and at what date ?

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

1. Yes.

2 and 3. An order in council has been passed authorizing the sale of the property to the city.

4. Yes. Transfers have been made as per records of Department of the Interior, as follows :

(1). 150 acres sold to Provincial government of Ontario, June 23, 1871.

(2). 3 7-12 acres sold to government of province of Ontario, April 15, 1872.

(3). 2·72 acres patented to Great Western Railway Company, Nov. 15, 1873.

(4). ¼ acre sold to James Austin and L. W. Smith, Sept. 10, 1887.

(5). 6·03 acres sold to Toronto city, January 27, 1893.

(6). ¼ acre patented to Massey Manufacturing Company, February 12, 1894.

(7) ¼ acre patented to Massey Manufacturing Company, October 28, 1894.

(8). 16·12 acres patented to Canadian Pacific Railway Company, June 14, 1898.

(9). 2·16 acres patented to Chas. S. Blackwell, June 14, 1898.

(10). 2:47 acres patented to Land Security Company on November 18, 1899.

SUMMARY.

Original property comprised 5·02 acres, 2 roods, 1 perch	
Land disposed of as shown in reply to question 4..	183·32A.
Land to be transferred to the city under authority of order in council referred to above..	200·78A.
Total..	384·10A.
In addition to the above, the following has been disposed of :	
50 acres set aside for purpose of Lunatic Asylum, May 2, 1845.	
38 acres subdivided into city lots and sold at various times.	
7·04 acres patented to city of Toronto.	
Total..	95·04A.
	479·14A.

The balance of 22·86 acres, 2 roods, 1 perch, has been used as rights-of-ways for railways.

BUOYS ON THE OTTAWA RIVER.

Mr. BOYER asked :

1. Is it the intention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to have buoys placed at the most important points, during the coming season, along the channel in the Ottawa river between Carillon locks and the entrance to the Ste. Anne de Bellevue canal ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) : The Department of Marine and Fisheries is considering the matter of placing additional buoys in the Ottawa river, where necessary as aids to navigation, during the coming season, and instructions have been given to examine the channel in order to determine where the additional buoys should be placed.

PLASTERERS' LABOURERS AT WINNIPEG.

Mr. RALPH SMITH asked :

1. Has any complaint been received at the Department of Labour on behalf of plasterers' labourers in the city of Winnipeg, to the effect that they have not been paid by the contractors for the government immigration building in the city, the rate of wages set forth in the fair wages schedule attached to the contract ?

2. If so, what action, if any, has the department taken in the matter ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Postmaster General) :

1. A complaint was received on March 20, from the Winnipeg Trades and Labour Council, stating that a number of plasterers' labourers had been paid by the contractors for the Government Immigration Building, at the rate of only 22½ cents per hour, though the schedule attached to the contract called for payment at the rate of 25 cents per hour.

2. The complaint was immediately investigated and was shown to have been well founded. The contractors were informed of the results of the investigation, and were required to make good the amounts due to the plasterers' labourers in accordance with the schedule rate. On March 26, the plasterers' labourers, ten in number, acknowledged receipt in full of the balance owing to them by the contractors.

ROSS RIFLE COMPANY.

Mr. WORTHINGTON—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. Under what statute is the Ross Rifle Company incorporated ?
2. Where is its head office situated ?
3. Who are the directors of the said company?
4. Who are its shareholders ?
5. Has it any contract with the government for the supply of rifles or other articles ?
6. What is the term of the contract ?
7. Has the company any special arrangement with the government with respect to customs duties on articles imported for its use ?

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

1. It is not incorporated under any statute. The name is a declaration of partnership by Sir Charles Ross, Bart, as sole proprietor.
2. Quebec.
3. Not known.
4. Not known.
5. Yes, for the supply of rifles.
6. For one year beginning January 1, 1903, with a provision for continuation during succeeding years.
7. No, except in so far as section 555 b, of schedule B. of the Customs Tariff, 1897, as amended by 2 Edward VII, chapter 33, constitutes such a special agreement. Sub-

sections (a) and (b) of section 555 b have been incorporated in the contract.

SOURIS FISH DRIER.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN asked :

1. Was the construction of the Souris fish drier let by public tender or by private contract ?
2. Who was the contractor, and what was the contract price ?
3. What did the building cost ?
4. What was the cost of machinery and other drying and curing equipment ?
5. Who was the superintendent of construction, and what amount did he receive for his services ?
6. How many persons were employed in operating the drier in 1905, and what were their names ?
7. How long was each employed, and what wages per day were paid each ?
8. Who was manager in 1905 ?
9. Who is the inspector of operations and what is his salary ?
10. What price was paid in 1905 per cwt. for (a) green codfish, (b) green hake, (c) green haddock, (d) other fish ?
11. What was the total cost of operating the drier up to the 31st December, 1905 ?
12. What were the total receipts for sales, respectively, for each product sold ?
13. What is the value of the product, if any, on hand ?

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

1. It was built by day's labour.
2. There was no contract for the erection of the building. Messrs. Bruce Stewart and Company were the contractors for the drying apparatus, the contract price being sixteen hundred dollars. Some changes in the plans, however, necessitated the use of considerable more stock, and extras to the amount of $260.37 were allowed.
3. $3,968.95.
4. Answered by No. 2.
5. James McEachern was the foreman of construction, and was paid $3.50 per day.
6. Fifteen persons were employed at different times, as follows :

	Days.	Rate per Day.
Geo. E. McFarlane, manager	183	$3 00
F. De Young, expert	37	2 00
R. R. McIsaac	20	1 25
"	82	1 50
R. J. McIsaac	132	1 25
Jos. Myers	120½	1 25
P. McDonald	66½	1 25
Wm. Cheverie	68½	1 25
M. Praught	59	1 25
N. McIntosh	32	1 25
L. Cheverie	23	1 25
C. Cheverie	16	1 25
George Roach	10½	1 25
J. F. McFarlane	3	1 25
P. Curtis	2	1 25
M. Poole	1½	1 25

7. Answered by No. 6.
8. George E. McFarlane.
9. There is no inspector of operations.
10. (a) $2 to $2.25.
    (b) $1.50.
    (c) $1.50.
    (d) $1.50.
11. Total cost of operating, including purchase of fish, was $9,838.90.
12. Codfish, $4,670; hake and haddock and pollock, $3,590.
13. On the 31st December the value of the product on hand was about $1,000.

Mr. MICHAEL CAMPEAU.

Mr. WM. JACKSON—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. Is Michael Campeau employed in the Post Office Department ?
2. If so, where, in what capacity, and at what salary ?
3. Is his employment permanent or temporary ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Postmaster General). No.

LEASE OF TATE DRY DOCK, MONTREAL.

Mr. J. D. REID—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. Who is the lessee of the Tate dry dock, Montreal ?
2. What annual rental is received by the government for the use of said dock ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. The estate of Pierre Letendre.
2. $1,000 per year.

DUTIES AND REMUNERATION OF POSTMASTERS.

Mr. FOWLER—by Mr. Lancaster—asked:

1. Has the Postmaster General received a petition from the association of postmasters, asking for certain changes to be made in the duties and remuneration of postmasters ?
2. What answer, if any, has the Postmaster General returned to the petitioners or memorialists ?
3. Is it the intention of the Postmaster General to comply with the request of the said association ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Postmaster General). No.

ORDER IN COUNCIL RE LANDS IN ALBERTA AND ARTHABASKA.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked :

1. Was an order in council re certain lands in Alberta and Arthabaska, Northwest Territories, passed on or about the 27th July, 1900.
2. Will the government lay on the table of the House said order in council, with plans of land and all other papers and correspondence in reference thereto up to the present date ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Yes.
2. Yes, on an address being moved for and presented.

TENDERS FOR SUMMERSIDE BREAKWATER.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked :

1. In calling for tenders for Summerside, Prince Edward Island, breakwater, was there a stipulation re wages of men to be employed thereon?

2. What was the schedule, if any, in regard to this ?

3. If rate of wages was specified by contractor, what was the rate ?

Hon. CHAS. S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works) :

1. Yes, the following clause was inserted in specifications and contract: 'Labour Conditions.' In tendering for the work herein contemplated, the tenderers, when called upon to enter into contract, will be bound to agree to pay to the workmen engaged in the said work such wages as are generally accepted as current in each trade, for competent workmen, in the district where the work is carried out, and the said tenderers, after having signed the contract, will be held and bound to the working and spirit of this clause.

2. No specific schedule of wages was inserted.

3. Answered by No. 2.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—LOCATION OF NEW SHOPS.

Mr. FOWLER—by Mr. Lancaster—asked:

1. Is it the intention of the Department of Railways to change the location of the new railway shops to be erected at Moncton to replace those burned ?

2. Have any sites been offered to the department for the location of the new shops, and at what prices, respectively ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). The matter is under consideration and necessarily there can be no answer given to part 2 of the question. It would not be in the interest of the railway to give that information.

POSTMASTER AT HOPEWELL HILL, NEW BRUNSWICK.

Mr. FOWLER—by Mr. Lancaster asked :

1. Was the dismissal of C. L. Peck, postmaster at Hopewell Hill, Albert county, New Brunswick, the result of an investigation ?

2. If so, who held the investigation, and what charge was made against the postmaster ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Postmaster General). The change was made after investigation by the post office inspector of a complaint that the office was not centrally located for the convenience of those to be served, and that the office was not attended by Mr. Peck himself.

ST. ANDREWS LOCKS, RED RIVER.

Mr. SCHAFFNER asked :

1. What has been the expenditure on St. Andrew's locks, Red river, since the present government took office ?

2. Does the government intend to prosecute the work forthwith, and push it to an early conclusion ?

3. Is the government aware as to whether or not the member for Winnipeg offered to resign his seat in parliament if the said work was not completed in one year from date of last elections ?

Hon. CHAS. S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works) :

1. $115,745.55.

2. Yes.

3. No information.

MAIL SERVICE BETWEEN MIDLAND AND VASEY, ONTARIO.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

1. Who is the contractor for the mail service between Midland and Vasey ?

2. Were tenders called for the service?

3. If tenders called, how many were received, and who were the parties tendering, and prices asked ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Postmaster General) :

1. Peter Belfry.

2. Yes.

3. Five, viz. : Erwin Jones, $485 : Jas. H. Steer, $500 ; reduced to $475 ; Peter Belfry, $500 ; reduced to $470 ; A. L. Mackie, $508 ; Sidney Rachar, $595.

Three weeks after the tenders were opened, a sixth tender for the service at $450 was received from Mr. John Swan.

I.C.R.—LOSS OF STAMPS AT MONCTON.

Mr. FOWLER—by Mr. Lancaster—asked:

1. Has any investigation been held into the loss of stamps at the offices of the railway at Moncton ? If so, by whom was said investigation conducted ?

2. Were George Skeffington, chief Intercolonial Railway detective, one Fletcher, of the audit office, Moncton, Patrick Galligher, hotelkeeper, and the Moncton chief of police, or any of them, called as witnesses in this investigation ?

3. If none of these were called, or if any were omitted to be called, why were they not called?

4. Was there any prosecuting officer who appeared before the investigating official on behalf of the department ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. Yes. H. F. Alward, assistant law clerk of the Department of Railways and Canals.

2. Mr. Skeffington had made a report which contained his knowledge and opinions, so he was not called. Fletcher was examined. Patrick Galligher was not examined. The Moncton chief of police was not examined, as there was nothing to connect him with the case.

3. There was no authority to call any person outside of the government service, as no commission was issued.

4. No, being merely an investigation by an officer of the department, it is not usual to have a prosecuting officer present.

NEW BRUNSWICK PETROLEUM COMPANY.

Mr. FOWLER—by Mr. Lancaster—asked:

1. When did the Honourable H. R. Emmerson retire from the presidency of the New Brunswick Petroleum Company, and when was Fred. W. Summer, his successor, elected to that position ?

2. Were instructions issued to the department by the Minister of Railways to purchase oil from the New Brunswick Petroleum Company, while he, the said minister, was still president of that company ?

3. Was the oil purchased from the said company by contract ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. Mr. Emmerson retired from taking any part in the affairs of the company in March or April, 1904, being unable to give it his attention. Subsequently Mr. Summer became managing director, although nominally Mr. Emmerson, continued as president, his resignation tendered early in the year 1904 after his acceptance of office, not having been formally accepted until March of this year.

2. Yes, instructions were issued to the department, while Mr. Emmerson was nominally president.

3. The oil was purchased on orders from the storekeeper as per instructions given by the general manager.

WHARF AT D'ISRAELI, QUEBEC.

Mr. MONK—by Mr. Bergeron—asked :

1. Has a wharf been erected at D'Israeli, in the province of Quebec ?

2. If so, how much has been expended thereon ?

3. How many steamboats or sailing vessels have called at said wharf since it has been erected?

4. Has a wharfinger been appointed for said wharf ? If so, what is his salary ?

5. What revenue has been received for freight received or shipped over said wharf ?

6. What quantity has been received or shipped ?

Hon. CHAS. S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works) :

1. Wharf at D'Israeli not yet completed.

2. $6,504.81.

3, 4, 5 and 6. Answered by No. 1.

HARBOUR WORKS, QUEBEC.

Mr. AMES asked :

1. Has the firm of Doucet & Lemieux a contract for work at Quebec harbour ? If so, what is the work, when was it let, and what was the amount of the tender ?

2. Has any further or additional work at Quebec harbour been awarded to the said firm? If so, what is such work, and what is the estimated or contract price for such further or additional work ?

3. Were tenders for such further additional work called for ? If so, when, and was the said firm the lowest tenderer ?

Hon. CHAS. S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works) :

1. (a) Dussault & Lemieux is the name of the firm that has the contract for harbour works at Quebec : (b) construction of an extension to breakwater on river front of harbour : (c) contract awarded on May 8, 1903 ; (d) $198,700.

2. Yes, (b) further extension of same breakwater ; (c) $571,689.35.

3. No. Additional work given at rates proportionate to original tender.

POSTMASTER AT WOODSTOCK, NEW BRUNSWICK.

Mr. GANONG asked :

1. Did C. L. Smith, postmaster at Woodstock, New Brunswick, have leave of absence during 1905 ? If so, for what time was he absent from duties, and did he receive salary for the time he was absent ?

2. Has C. L. Smith, postmaster at Woodstock, New Brunswick, received leave of absence in 1906 ? If so, for how long a time, and will he receive salary for the time he is absent ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Postmaster General) :

1. Mr. C. L. Smith, postmaster at Woodstock, N.B., was granted leave of absence in 1905, for four weeks, dating from June 15, 1905, after having arranged for the conduct of his office during his absence. No deduction was made in the percentages or allowances attached to the office for the year.

2. Mr. C. L. Smith, postmaster at Woodstock, N.B., has been granted a month's leave of absence in 1906, dating from March 15, ultimo. The question whether any deduction will be made for the present year in the percentages or allowances attached to the office has not yet arisen for consideration.

COMPLAINTS OF WINNIPEG PRINTERS.

Mr. VERVILLE asked :

What action, if any, has the govenment taken on the communication sent from the Secretary of State for the Colonies, asking for a report on the complaints of the Winnipeg printers ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Minister of Labour). The complaints have been fully investigated by the deputy Minister of Labour, who has reported the results of his investigation. A copy of this report has been forwarded to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and His Majesty's ministers in Great Britain have been asked to consider the advisability of enacting legislation for the purpose of preventing false representations being made in the United Kingdom to induce or deter emigration to Canada.

WATER POWERS ON TRENT CANAL.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES asked :

1. Has the government, or has the Department of Railways and Canals, or other department, sold, leased, or in any other way disposed of any water powers along the route of the Trent canal in recent years, say since 1896?

2. What water powers are now owned or controlled by the government along that route ?

3. If any have been disposed of, as in question one, what are the names of the persons concerned ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. Yes, water powers on the Trent canal have been leased by the Department of Railways and Canals.

2. The canal at present being uncompleted, it is not possible to enumerate specifically all the water powers controlled. It may, however, be stated generally that any water power now or hereafter created by government works along the line of the canal, or its subsidiary waters, is or will be controlled by the government.

3. Leases have been granted to the following, viz. : February 22, 1900, J. A. Culverwell. August 1, 1901, lease issued to Meldrum Stratton & Hall, and assigned in December, 1901, to the Otonabee Power Company, Limited. May 17, 1904, Lakefield Portland Cement Co.

SAGUENAY RIVER—PIERS AND BOOMS.

Mr. HENDERSON asked :

1. What is the estimated annual cost for maintenance and operation of the piers and booms being built above Chicoutimi, on the Saguenay river ?

2. Is the Chicoutimi Pulp Company bound to pay interest on the amount expended in building these works, in addition to the cost of their maintenance and operation ?

3. Is $2,625 the estimated annual net or gross revenue from these works ?

Hon. CHAS. S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works) :

1. $2,420.

2. No.

3. The gross revenue.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

A return showing the progress made and sums expended from time to time upon the construction of the Trent canal, giving the dates of the various contracts let, the completion of said contracts, the names of contractors on said contracts, the amounts paid in extras, and the causes of these extras.—Mr. Sam Hughes.

A copy of the contract with the Chicoutimi Pulp Company regarding the building, maintenance and operation of the piers and booms above Chicoutimi, on the Saguenay river. Also a copy of the reports of the officers of the government under which it was decided to build these works, and of all correspondence relating therto.—Mr. Perley.

A copy of all correspondence, papers, &c., between the superintendent of the Prince Edward Island Railway, or other official, with other interested parties, relative to the acquiring of the Hodgson property, on the St. Peter's road, near Charlottetown, and at the entrance of the new bridge, for the purposes of straightening the road.—Mr. Lefurgey.

A copy of all correspondence and reports relative to the sale of the Giant's Tomb island, or timber thereon, or to any negotiations with any person or persons for the purchase of said island, or timber thereon, or both.—Mr. Bennett.

That the report made by the Deputy Minister of Labour, on the result of his investigation into the complaints of the Winnipeg printers, and any papers showing what action, if any, has been taken by the government on this report, be laid on the table of the House.—Mr. Verville.

ROSS RIFLE COMPANY.

Mr. A. N. WORTHINGTON (Sherbrooke) moved for :

A copy of all contracts between the Ross Rifle Company and the government, or the Department of Militia, for the supply of rifles, ammunition, or other articles, and all orders in council, correspondence, reports, documents and papers relating to such contracts or to the subject matter thereof, or to the operations of the company, or to its dealings with the government, or any of the departments thereof, including the Department of Customs.

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). Invoices are not made public ; I presume the hon. gentleman does not include them in his motion.

Mr. WORTHINGTON. No.

Motion agreed to.

INSPECTION OF FRUIT FOR EXPORT.

Mr. E. D. SMITH (Wentworth) moved for :

Copies of all letters, telegrams, communications and correspondence received since the first day of January, 1905, from any government, corporation, firm, or person, respecting the quality of fruit exported from Canada after having been inspected by the officers of the government, or relating to the inspection of such fruit ; and copies of all letters and communications from any department of the government in reply thereto.

He said : I am moved to propose this motion out of curiosity to know whether there has been during the past year only one case in which a slight mistake has been made in the packing of apples in this country. Having been a member of the committee which first framed the Fruit Marks Act, I am particularly interested to know if the Fruit Marks Act has been so conducive to straight and honest work in the packing of fruit for export, that there has been all through this year only this one slight complaint which

has been published. This complaint was from a dealer in Birmingham ; at least that is the supposition. The government agent in Birmingham, at any rate, forwarded to the department a letter received from a dealer in Birmingham stating that a few barrels of apples had been marked 'A G Russet' and turned out to be 'Rox Russet.' This letter contained some very insulting and apparently malicious statements, and it was published by the government broadcast throughout the country to the serious damage of myself. My charge is that this is the only case, the first case out of perhaps hundreds, perhaps thousands of complaints some of them of the most serious nature where actual fraud no doubt existed that has been so published. Of course, having been intimately connected with the trade for the past 20 years I know that such cases exist in numberless numbers almost, and yet this is the first instance to my knowledge where a matter of this kind has ever been published. Now, the natural question that comes to my mind is : Why was this published and what is the future policy of the government with regard to the publication of every little mistake, or even of gross frauds, that may be committed in the packing of apples. I am perhaps justified in supposing that this publication was purely political or largely political. I am surely justified in assuming that when we know it was the first instance of publication, and that it was in reference to a very trivial matter. Perhaps it may have been done out of revenge, or out of pique, or out of spleen, because the government just a few months before lost the county of Wentworth which had been especially fixed up for them with two townships each of which gave a Liberal majority of 300 or 400 under normal conditions. The government having lost that county in a by-election the natural inference might be drawn that this was done out of revenge. I may be quite wrong in this, but that is an inference which might well be drawn, especially in view of the fact that the minister himself was in the constituency and made a desperate attempt, at least in those two townships, where he was surrounded by a supposed majority of three or four hundred of his friends, to elect a lumber merchant and defeat a farmer. I would not have been so much surprised at that in any other minister ; and under the circumstances I am not surprised that this letter was published, I will not say by the Department of Agriculture, but by the Department of Trade and Commerce.

Now, I would like to know from the minister what is to be the future policy with regard to this matter. Up to the present time, so far as I am aware, no one has been fined or punished in any way for misnaming a barrel of apples. That is something which is sure to happen in the experience of every packer. I defy any man to engage in the work of picking and packing apples for several weeks without making a mistake in the naming of some of the varieties. I could place on the table of the minister twenty varieties of apples which he himself could not name. How is it to be expected, then, that the foremen of thousands of gangs that it is necessary to employ in the short season in which it is necessary to pack apples, should know every variety ? It is impossible the best experts the minister has could not tell the names of some of these varieties. For that reason it would be absurd and ridiculous to punish men who innocently or ignorantly make a mistake. The right principle is to punish them only when fraud is intentionally committed. But here was a case in which there was no charge or suspicion that any fraud was perpetrated; it was only a slight mistake on the part of a packer; but it was published broadcast, simply because in the letter certain assertions were made which were supposed to be very damaging to a political opponent. I would like to know if in the future, in the hundreds of mistakes of this kind which are made in the country, men's names are going to be published ? If not, why was this particular case selected ? I may say that this particular shipment of apples might have been sold as easily for Roxbury russets as for Golden russets. Messrs. A. & H. Goodwin, of Manchester, to whom they were sold, did not ask for golden russets; they simply asked for russets. That fact does not imply that the man who packed them should not have named them properly; but I mention that to show that there was no fraud. The man who bought them in Birmingham has never yet made any complaint to me or to Mr. Goodwin, of Manchester, from whom the apples were bought, in regard to their having been misnamed. What do you think of a man who, instead of writing to, or calling up by phone, the man in the next town from whom he bought the apples, one of the most reputable firms in Britain, and seeking to get redress from him, writes to the government ? And what do you think of the government which, without inquiring into the merits of the case, deliberately publishes that letter throughout the country for the purpose of injuring a political opponent? That leads me to the belief that this man was incited to write this letter, probably by the political agent of the government in Birmingham. I do not wish to take up the time of the House with a personal matter, but it seems to me that this was done for a political purpose rather than for any other.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). Mr. Speaker, I need scarcely say that I am very glad to accept this motion and to ask the House to pass it. The hon. gentleman has spoken about an inci-

dent connected with his own trade, as to which I have very little to say. The letter referred to was published by the Department of Trade and Commerce, not by the Department of Agriculture. It was published along with a number of other letters or statements in regard to the trade of our various products in England. I am not sufficiently versed in the doings of the Department of Trade and Commerce to say whether this is the only statement with regard to an individual that has ever been made in Canada. I am therefore not going to dispute the hon. member's statement, which, so far as his knowledge goes, may be correct; whether it is really correct or not I am not sure. The hon. gentleman seems to think that the letter was published with a design upon himself. I do not think that at all. I do not believe that my colleague, in the administration of the Department of Trade and Commerce wished to make any political capital out of the matter, and I am quite sure that I have not any such intention or desire. The Department of Trade and Commerce has been issuing reports on our trade in England in different Canadian products; and for many years, even before we had regularly accredited agents in England, that department has been advising our people in Canada to be extremely strict and accurate in the way in which they fulfil English orders or the way in which they mark their goods in sending them to England. It has come under my own observation in England, as well as in letters received from England, that one of the complaints frequently made in regard to Canadian exports to the English market, is that they do not strictly fulfil the orders given to them, and not unfrequently send goods of a slightly different character from those ordered. So far as my own personal knowledge goes, I cannot say whether these criticisms are justified or not; but I fear, from the reports which I have received, that they are to a certain extent justified. They are often accompanied with other criticisms in regard to the business methods of our exporters—with regard to prompt correspondence, acceptance of orders the non-fulfilment of orders, and things of that kind. I think it is well that such criticisms should be brought to the attention of our exporters, so that they may see the difficulties that our trade meets in the English market, and endeavour to overcome those difficulties. In my own administration of the Department of Agriculture I have always considered it best not to use the names of parties concerning whose products we have had any report. In our departmental work a great deal comes under our observation which we must summarize and give to the public en bloc as we do in the census reports and other statistical work. It is only in our private communications with individuals that we mention their names. I am not aware whether that is the course followed by the Department of Trade and Commerce. In the case in question, it was not. They did publish the name of the hon. member for Wentworth, but I am not in a position to say if that is the only case.

Mr. INGRAM. In what monthly report of the Department of Trade and Commerce will we find that ?

Mr. FISHER. I do not remember which month. In fact I do not know that the report of the Department of Trade and Commerce in that regard is monthly. I think that the officer at Ottawa in charge of the commercial agencies in Europe generally publishes those reports as they come in. Whenever there is a letter from one of our commercial agents abroad on a matter of public interest, I think the officer in charge publishes it at once or very shortly, but I am not quite sure whether these reports are published periodically or not. I know there is a report of the Department of Trade and Commerce which does come out periodically, but I think that in addition letters from commercial agents on matters of interest to the trade are frequently given the press. I do not know whether the communication referred to was one of those, but my hon. friend from Wentworth will be a better authority on that point. I want to assure my hon. friend that there was nothing political in this matter on my part, nor, I am satisfied, on the part of my colleague. We all desire to improve on our methods in the export trade ; we all desire that the reputation of Canadian products should not be impaired in any way, We all desire that the relations between the Canadian sellers and the buyers abroad shall be of the most satisfactory character. I shall not go into any details with regard to this particular shipment. My hon. friend, who is a dealer in fruit, will know the details better than I do. This is a matter I would like to deal with from an entirely impersonal point of view and that is the way in which I would like to see parliament discuss it. My hon. friend is moving for correspondence respecting the quality of the fruit exported from Canada after having been inspected by the officers of the government. I am doubtful whether there is any correspondence in my department which would come under that motion. Every package of fruit is not inspected, and unless a package had been inspected and stamped 'falsely marked', we would have no correspondence about it. There are hundreds of thousands of barrels and boxes of apples shipped from Canada to Great Britain every year, only a small portion of which are ever inspected. It was never intended that we should have a complete inspection of our export trade and still less of our internal trade. The Act authorizes the appointment of inspectors and provides that fruit, in a closed package, shall be marked in the proper way, but it

leaves the packer to fulfil the law and if he does not he is open to attack. He may be attacked by the government inspector or by the private individual who has suffered in consequence of the wrong marking or packing. Our permanent inspectors are only eight in number with four or five employed only part of the year. If we were to undertake to thoroughly inspect every package of fruit, even of our export trade alone, it would be quite impossible for ten times that number of inspectors to do the work. ' When the Fruits Marks Act was introduced, I was accused of wanting to make places for party friends. Had that been my intention, I might have appointed two hundred or three hundred inspectors instead of only eight permanent ones and four or five temporary. That being the case, I fear that my hon. friend will get a very small return to his motion. We have a good deal of correspondence about fruit packages and the export of fruit, from people on the other side of the Atlantic as well as from people in this country from those who have been warned and from those who have suffered from wrong packing—very interesting matter and from a large number of people. But as the motion reads, it will cover, few, if any, of the letters in the department. I am quite ready to accept a modification of the order, should my hon. friend wish it, so as to cover a larger mass of correspondence. I draw his attention to the fact so that, if he wishes anything different from what he has really said, the amendment can be made.

I do not know that it is necessary for me to enlarge upon the matter to which my hon. friend has referred. The subject is a very interesting one and covers a good deal of ground. It is a subject upon which the department has secured a mass of very important information, because of the somewhat close supervision of the whole trade with such inspection as seems to be necessary to check intended fraud and to find out defects in method and warn people of these defects. By reason of what we have been able to do in years gone by we have been constantly improving in our work of supervision, and have been getting more and more in touch with the trade and have been able from time to time to give them information which is of great use to them and which helps to safeguard this very important portion of our Canadian export trade. I shall be glad to have any suggestion from my hon. friend if he wishes to add anything to his motion.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). Some time ago I saw in the newspapers the correspondence to which my hon. friend from Wentworth (Mr. E. D. Smith) refers. I read that correspondence with a great deal of curiosity. It covered the complaint of somebody who, if I remember well, had purchased about twenty barrels of apples from a dealer in England. He alleged that he had bought a particular kind of russet and that when he came to open the barrels he found that the apples were of a different kind or that there was a mixture of a different kind and he claimed that there has been fraud on the part of the seller. But from the statement of the hon. gentleman, and from the correspondence itself, what are the facts? The facts are that there are two kinds of russets grown in that part of the country so much alike that only an expert can distinguish them. And there seems to be absolutely no difference in the quality—experts would as soon have one as the other. But the two were mixed in the shipment. The hon. member for Wentworth says that in selling the goods he did not guarantee any particular kind of russet. How, then, does it come that this complaint comes from the purchaser outside of Birmingham past the Birmingham seller to Canada and is published as a reflection upon my hon. friend from Wentworth?

Mr. FISHER. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) is not stating the case quite correctly. The apples were marked Golden russets. But apparently they were Roxbury russets.

Mr. HAGGART. The minister (Mr. Fishers differs in his statement from the hon. member from Wentworth.

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. HAGGART. I understood the hon. gentleman (Mr. Smith) to state that the apples were not branded as being any particular kind of russet.

Mr. FISHER. I did not so understand the hon. gentleman. He said the order he received was simply for russets. But under our law, the apples must be marked showing what kind of russet they are. And I understand that they were branded ' Golden russets' when, as a matter of fact, as I understand, they were Roxbury russets.

Mr. HAGGART. The fact remains, as my hon. friend (Mr. Smith) states, that only an expert can distinguish the difference. But what is the queer, the anomalous thing about this transaction ? It is that, although the department has received hundreds of letters of this kind, not one of them has ever before been published with the name of the party affected until this particular letter reached them. And why was this one published? Was it because of any gross fraud perpetrated by the hon. member for Wentworth? Nothing of that kind is even alleged. I have read with interest and with great pleasure the reports of the Department of Inland Revenue showing the results of analyses made of jams, jellies and canned goods from one end of the Dominion to the other. My. hon. friend from Wentworth occupies the proud position of being one

canner—not, perhaps the only one, but standing first among them—in the case of whose goods no adulteration has been found. Why is it that in this particular case he is the only man selected among all the shippers of apples to find his name published as that of one who has wrongly branded the barrels ? It cannot be, as I have said, because it is necessary to repress any gross fraud or crime, for, in this case no wrongdoing worthy of the name is even alleged, because only an expert can distinguish these russets in appearance and taste, and as to quality there is no choice whatever. My hon. friend (Mr. E. D. Smith) is perfectly justified in his statement that the only reason possible is that he is a member, and a prominent member, of the opposition in this House and that he has been successful within the last few months in a contest in his constituency. What petty politics. To what low level hon. gentlemen opposite have descended in selecting my hon. friend who stands foremost as a fruit grower and canner in the Dominion to herald his name from one end of the country to the other as that of one who commits frauds in sending out his goods.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton). There is something further to be said. While the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) professes that he is not able to answer for the Department of Trade and Commerce as to the policy which may be pursued in these matters, there should be some one who can answer for the government. If no one can answer but the Minister of Trade and Commerce, perhaps we had better send to another place and bring that gentleman here in order that he may answer for himself. If it is the policy of the government that whenever a letter such as that referred to has been received by any department of the government it shall, under certain circumstances be given to the public press without any communication to the gentleman whom it affects, it would be well for us to be informed what the conditions are under which this will be done. It is a most unusual circumstance that has been detailed by the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. E. D. Smith).

No complaint was made either to him or to the Manchester firm, and without any such complaint having been made, without any defect or difficulty having been brought to his knowledge, he is confronted with a communication published by the government of this country in every newspaper throughout Canada. It seems to me a remarkable condition. If the rule is a universal one, why has it not been applied universally. In such a case as that, the government would do well to communicate, first, with the exporter and ascertain from him what the real facts are. Differences of opinion might arise, there might be a question of fact, there might be a different explanation of the circumstances. But I now understand they did call upon the hon. gentleman first, and he made a certain answer; yet immediately, without any further investigation, and apparently without any report in respect of what, after all, turns out to be a very small matter, the whole correspondence is published. Will the Minister of Agriculture, or will the Prime Minister, or any other member of the government, inform the House how many complaints of this character have been received, let us say during the last fiscal year ? Is this the only one? If it is the only one, and if the government have adopted the policy of publishing all such letters in the newspapers, we can understand that. If there have been a great many of these complaints and this is the only one that has been published, or if only a few of them have been published, we cannot very well understand that. I think the request of my hon. friend from Wentworth (Mr. E. D. Smith) that the policy of the government in such matters should be declared to the House, is a reasonable request, and one as to which we should have some information before the motion passes.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). In view of the remarks which have just been made by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and in view of the remarks previously made by the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. E. D. Smith), I would like the House to read the motion now in the hands of Mr. Speaker. It is in these terms :

> For copies of all letters, telegrams, communications and correspondence received since the 1st day of January, 1905, from any government, corporation, firm, or person, respecting the quality of fruit exported from Canada after having been inspected by the officers of the government, or relating to the inspection of such fruit ; and copies of all letters and communications from any department of the government in reply thereto.

When this motion was brought to the attention of the government, of course there was no objection to it. Everybody will realize that the hon. gentleman who made the motion was entitled to the information it calls for, though it is of a very broad character, and will involve a very large amount of correspondence. But it seems after all that the object of the hon. mover of this resolution when he asked for this bundle of hay, was simply to get out of it a needle. Well, it was impossible for the government to surmise that the hon. member for Wentworth, when he asked for this vast correspondence which covers months and months of time and reams of paper, which takes in a very large range of subjects—it was impossible to conceive that what he had in his mind was simply to obtain an explanation of the circumstance to which he has alluded.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Minister of Agriculture says that the return as moved for will bring down nothing at all unless it is amended.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It will not obtain the information unless it is amended. But my hon. friend says his object was not at all to take exception to the character of the information that was sought for, but simply to complete it. But I ask the House to note this, that my hon. friend from Wentworth could have reached the object he sought and could have got the information he wished to lay before the House, far more accurately and much sooner if he had stated more clearly what it was he wanted. He now wants to know what is the practice of the government with regard to the publication of this bulletin which the department receives from its commercial agents, and especially with regard to this particular transaction. If he had so stated in his motion there would be no objection at all to give all the information he desires. Now it happens that under our system of government some of the ministers sit in this House and others sit in another branch of the legislature. The ministers who sit in this House can give information on a variety of subjects, but it often necessarily happens that the information which is sought for in this branch of the legislature can only be given by ministers who sit in another branch of the legislature. My hon. friend wants to know what is the practice of the Department of Trade and Commerce with regard to the publication of the bulletins which they receive. That is a reasonable question, but he realizes at once that it is impossible for me or for the Minister of Agriculture, without having some consultation with the Minister of Trade and Commerce, to give the information he desires at the moment. When the papers are brought down then my hon. friend will know what is the practice of the department. But he will surely realize that it is not reasonable for him to ask the department to furnish every detail as to the practice of the department in such matters.

Now let me go a little deeper into this matter. As I understood the remarks of the hon. member for Wentworth, he complained that the Department of Trade and Commerce have not given him any notice—if he did not say so I understood him to say so. I do not suppose there was any wrong intended in that. But it so happens that my hon. friend belongs to the very numerous tribe of Smiths. That is not a fault of the hon. gentleman, on the contrary it is quite a compliment. It is a very numerous family, I admit, and I do not suppose that when the officers of the department found the name of Smith in their correspondence, they at once, with malice prepense believed it was my hon. friend form Wentworth ; I presume they did not think of anybody in particular. Now the hon. gentleman says that it is impossible to distinguish the Roxbury russet from the Golden russet, that only an expert can do it. That is no criticism at all on the action of the Department of Trade and Commerce. But the law makes a difference between these two fruits, because one is some three shillings higher per barrel in price than the other. Therefore if it is impossible for any one but experts to distinguish Golden russets from Roxbury russets, then we either have to amend the law and make no distinction at all, or the fruit grower must employ an expert to pack the apples according to classification. I would be sorry to believe that there was any desire to cast any contumely upon the hon. member for Wentworth, who I believe is a perfectly honourable man. I do not think there was any such intention. At the same time, the Canadian public are very much interested in seeing that the Fruit Marks Act is carried out in its entirety, and they desire that every precaution should be taken to prevent what has taken place last year when complaints were made in the British market that Canadian packers are not obeying the law, and that consequently our fruits have suffered in reputation in that market. I am sure my hon. friend will be the first to agree to this and until I know to the contrary I would hesitate to believe that the Department of Trade and Commerce would desire to bring any contumely upon the hon. gentleman.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I would like to say one word in regard to this matter. I understood from the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) that he regarded it as extremely important that the party filling the order should fill it accurately. The order was for russets, not specifying what kind of russets. Would it not be an accurate filling of the order to fill it with either kind even though they might not be equal in value or quantity ? I take it that the order would be specifically filled if it were filled with either Roxbury russets or Golden russets.

Mr. FISHER. One of the great advantages of the Fruit Marks Act is that fruit in closed packages must be marked with the exact name of the fruit in those closed packages. The dealers in England know that, they expect that the law will be fulfilled and therefore if fruit is marked wrongly it not only violates the law but it deceives the purchasing public in England.

Mr. SPROULE. The Act says that it shall be marked with the name of the variety or varieties. It so happens that there are two varieties of russets. The hon. gentleman says that in the interest of the fruit trade and for the preservation and promotion of that trade they should fill the orders accurately. Does he pretend to say that my hon. friend from Wentworth (Mr.

Smith) was not filling that order accurately if either one kind of russet or the other was put in it? He filled it with one kind of russet. It happens that that one was about equally as valuable as the other.

Mr. FISHER. No, not in the English market.

Mr. SPROULE. If you will look at the quotations you will see that they are exactly the same.

Mr. FISHER. I have in my hand the quotations of two or three months ago and Golden russets ruled from three to four shillings per barrel higher than Roxbury russets.

Mr. SPROULE. There are times and seasons when that will be the case because certain seasons are more favourable to one kind of russets than the other. But, I have heard this discussed among fruit men over and over again, and I have referred to the reports of the market where time after time Golden russets and Roxbury russets were quoted at nearly the same price in the English market. It is only at particular seasons that you see one kind bringing a little better price than the other. But, I am speaking in regard to the filling of the order. There was an order given. That order, I say, was filled accurately whether it was filled with one kind of russet or the other. There was no complaint on the part of the man to whom the fruit was consigned. He did not write back to say that any fraud had been committed or any injustice done him. It passed on to the next purchaser and there was no complaint back to the individual from whoim he had purchased. But, the report comes back to the department. From whom? From the commercial agent. I would like to ask right here! Who was the commercial agent? Was it the celebrated Jackson who used to be in South Oxford, who, for his rascality, might have been behind prison bars at the present time, who had proven himself to be the political tool of the hon. gentleman's friends and who, no doubt, or some one like him, reported back for the purpose of what? Striking a blow at a political opponent because it happened to be important to do so at that particular time. There seemed to be some other object than the protection and preservation of trade. When you consider that out of the hundreds of reports that are sent back of violations of the Fruit Marks Act and that no name is given to the public except the name of a member of parliament who happens to be a political opponent of the Minister of Agriculture you naturally ask yourself why his name is published. Yet, the name is published. I say that of all the picayune, low administrations of an Act that I ever saw or heard of this is one of the lowest, and I venture to say that if we ever get the information we will find that it comes from such a man as Jackson who is only a political tool of the government and who is venting his spleen on a political opponent. All the information should be brought down. The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) says that he cannot answer for the Department of Trade and Commerce. He says that our system of government happens to be such that the representative of a department may be in the other chamber and that that is the case in the Imperial parliament as well as here. But, the universal custom when the minister in charge of a department happens to be in the other chamber is that some member of the government in the House of Commons is delegated to answer for him when information is called for; so that, there must be some one empowered to deal with such questions when they come before the Commons although the head of the department may be in the Senate. Where is the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson)? Does not he belong to the Department of Customs? Where is he? Sitting right before me. And yet the right hon. First Minister says that our custom happens to be that when the head of this department is in the other House they cannot give specific information. Yet, the Minister of Customs sitting there ought to be equally as familiar as the Minister of Trade and Commerce with these questions. We have not the specific information we ought to have in regard to the Department of Trade and Commerce. I do not care whether the Minister of Customs is there or is not there, it is the duty of the government to provide an answer to these questions specifically in regard to any department the head of which happens for the time being to be in the Senate and not in the Commons. I say that the hon. Minister of Agriculture has made an exhibition that is neither creditable to himself nor to his department nor to the commercial agent. The hon. minister has seen fit to give to the public through a little political spleen at a particular time something to injure a political opponent while there are hundreds of greater offenders whose names are never given to the world.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, with your permission I would like to amend the resolution by striking out after the word 'Canada' the words 'after having been inspected by the officers of the government.' I wish to point out in answer to the statement of the hon. minister that Roxbury russets are worth less than Golden russets, that I have in my hand an account of sales. This is the only case that I have been able to get hold of where the two varieties, were sold under the same mark or grade and shipped by the same man. It is therefore a fair comparison. I find in this catalogue that twenty barrels of Golden russets sold for 23¾ shillings; 25 barrels of Golden russets, 23¾ shillings; 25 barrels of Golden

russets, 23¾ shillings; 19 barrels of Roxbury russets, 25¾ shillings; and a little farter down—17 barrels of Roxbury russets, 23 shillings; 18 barrels of Golden russets 22 shillings. These are under the same mark, and shipped by the same man. Still a little farther down in the catalogue I find 26 barrels of fancy Roxbury russets at 25½ shillings, and 24 barrels of fancy Golden russets at 20½ shillings, their being a difference of five shillings in favour of the Roxbury russets. These are the prices as quoted in that catalogue. These apples were of the same grade and packed by the same man.

I mentioned that merely to show there was no fraud, and moreover as my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) has stated this sale was made as 'russets' and there would have been no fraud even if they had been all 'Roxbury russets' and no 'Golden russets'. I believe that every barrel of apples should be properly marked; no one will stand more strongly for carrying out the Fruit Marks Act in its entirety than I will. But the point is that it is absolutely impossible to name every variety correctly and the Department of Agriculture knows that because out of the thousands of instances of violations of the Act in that respect they have never punished any one, and the reason is that it would be absurd to punish a man who had no intention whatever of attempting fraud. I have asked the minister, and it has not yet been answered. What is to be the policy of the government in the future? Is every man going to be punished who happens to name a variety wrongly; if so, then the packing of apples in Canada will have to cease because there are scores of varieties that the best experts cannot name, let alone the ordinary men we have to employ in the fall of the year. The minister knows that and so attempts to punish have only been made in cases of fraud. Now, this was a very simple case that occurs every day, and why was this particular letter published? Well, I believe it was published simply because it contained damaging assertions by the man who wrote the letter in addition to the statement that the apples were of a different variety from that named on the head of the bill. I do not wish to take up the time of the House, but I do want to see whether there is not some one else in this country who has made the same mistake as was made in this case, and whose mistake was not published to the people of Canada.

Mr. FISHER. I am very glad to accept the change in the motion, but it will of course call for a very much larger mass of correspondence than the original. I shall be very glad to have that correspondence prepared as quickly as possible although it will probably take some little time. In reply to my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule); the agent who made this report was Mr. Ball the commercial agent at Birmingham. In reply to my hon. friend from Wentworth, I beg to say that since I spoke I remember that there has been a statement in regard to either an individual or a firm of the name of Coyle, also packers and exporters, which has been published in the last few weeks, very much in the same way that the other statement was published. There may have been other statements of a similar character which have not been published although I am under the impression that there have not been reports dealing with individual names. The statement of the Prime Minister in regard to the department dealing with this matter, had reference to that particular point no doubt. It is not for me here to-day to give a statement as to the policy of the Department of Trade and Commerce, that would have to be discussed with the Minister of Trade and Commerce.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. As to the other case which the minister says has been published; was not that a case where the man was arrested and fined?

Mr. FISHER. He was arrested here and fined for another case, but there was also a statement published as to a shipment of his which had been sold in England and arrived in England and was criticised there by the commercial agent. My hon. friend (Mr. Smith) had reference to one case, and I had reference to another in connection with somebody by the name of Coyle. I do not know whether it is the same person or not; there may have been two Coyles, but I do not know as to that. I instanced that as another case in which the individual was named very much in the same way as in this other case. Whether these are the only instances in which individual names have been complained of, I can only find out by reference to the Department of Trade and Commerce and I shall do so. My hon. friend complains of my not dealing with the matter, but the Minister of Trade and Commerce being in another chamber we can only give certainties after referring to the minister in charge of the department.

Mr. SPROULE. Knowing that this question was coming up one would think that the Minister of Agriculture would be prepared with the information and able to give an answer.

Mr. FISHER. I had not the slightest idea as to what particular point in regard to fruit shipments my hon. friend (Mr. Smith) was going to bring up. In fact the personal turn taken by this debate is quite a surprise to me. Had I known my hon. friend was going to bring this point up I would have tried to get the information, but I thought he was going to deal with the general question of cold storage shipments of fruit and I have at hand information on that question.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Does not the minister consider the publication of this letter an extremely severe punishment for a very trivial offence ?

Mr. FISHER. That would depend altogether upon the offence.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. The minister knows well what the offence is.

Mr. FISHER. I think that probably in many cases the publication of a statement that an individual had been offending against the Act would be as severe, if not a severer, punishment than a fine. The gravity of the publication of the letter is entirely measured by the opinions which would be created by it.

Mr. E. D. SMITH. Is it the intention of the department to punish every case of misnaming of varieties ?

Mr. FISHER. That is a matter I will have to consider.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin). The hon. gentleman from Wentworth is quite justified in speaking as he did on this question and I cannot understand why the Minister of Agriculture should find fault with him.

Mr. FISHER. I am not finding fault with him in any shape or way. I am not criticising him in any way, but not knowing what he was going to say I could not provide the information beforehand.

Mr. INGRAM. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) in his farming operations were criticised as the hon. gentleman from Wentworth has been, he would have come before this House and offered not a mild speech like my hon. friend (Mr. Smith) but probably a more strenuous one. If we look at the report of the Trade and Commerce Department for the year ending June 30, 1905, we will find in it sufficient to draw the attention of shippers and packers of apples to the necessity of properly marking their fruit. At page 19 of this report over the signature of F. C. T. O'Hara, I find :

> The undersigned had occasion to comment last year somewhat severely upon the complaints received from commercial agents with reference to export methods, packing of goods, indifference to correspondence, goods not being up to sample, &c., upon the part of Canadians doing business abroad. Shortly thereafter, one of the most influential boards of trade in Canada suggested that commercial agents should not be so prone to complaining of Canadian business methods. Instructions were promptly sent, however, to the agents to avoid 'arm chair criticism.'

This is no arm chair criticism ; this is sledge hammer criticism perpetrated upon the hon. member for Wentworth.

> —but to continue to report facts whenever they were presented. The general criticism has since been less frequent and the number of specific complaints have also been less numerous. Last year only the worst cases were referred to and they made a formidable array of evidence damaging to the reputation of Canada. This year all the specific charges made by commercial agents are referred to, and though some are severe, on the whole there appears to have been less cause for direct complaint.

Therefore, according to this report the complaints are fewer than they were previously.

Now, it seems to me that the department could have sufficiently served the cause of justice by communicating with Mr. Smith and calling his attention to the matter; but not satisfied with that, the department thought proper to circulate broadcast, in almost every newspaper in Canada, the statement that the hon. member for Wentworth was committing fraud in the shipment of his apples. Coming to Ottawa on the train one day, I was discussing this question with a prominent Canadian shipper of apples, who complained strongly of the working of the Fruit Marks Act. He said that he had shipped thousands of barrels of apples to Great Britain, and had taken every means in his power to have them properly packed and properly marked ; that he had gone so far that in employing men he had paid them more than they had asked for packing apples, on the condition that they would properly pack them and properly mark them ; but after having done all this he had found the very men so employed to be packing inferior apples when he wanted them to pack only apples of the highest quality, and improperly marking them ; and that in many cases he had to take the barrels off the cars and re-pack them in order to have them properly marked. These are some of the difficulties that the shippers and packers of apples in this country have to contend with. He thought that the law was too severe upon men of his class, and that some amendment should be made for the purpose of punishing those men who did not properly carry out what they were employed to do. Therefore the department should exercise greater care and that in dealing with men engaged in this business, instead of circulating throughout the country a report that a fraud had been committed when as a matter of fact there had been no fraud at all.

Motion agreed to.

BARRISTERS IN THE GOVERNMENT.

On the notice of motion :

That in the opinion of this House it is expedient that any member of the government, or

deputy head of a department, should act or appear as barrister, counsel or advocate in an action, suit or proceeding, except where the interests of the Crown are involved, in any court presided over by judges or a judge appointed by the government of Canada.—Mr. Lennox.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). Will the hon. member allow that to stand over? I want to take up this matter when the resolution is moved, and I have not yet been able to look into it.

Motion allowed to stand.

MAPLE SYRUP—ADULTERATION.

Mr. GUSTAVE BOYER (Vaudreuil) moved (Translation):

That in the opinion of this House it is desirable that efficient means be taken at once to prevent the adulteration of maple syrups, a practice resorted to at present on a large scale to the detriment of farmers who produce the genuine article.

Mr. Speaker, during the last session the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Béland) inquired from the government whether they intend taking stringent measures against the adulteration of maple syrup and sugar.

I understand that the then Minister of Inland Revenue, now Minister of Marine and Fisheries, assumed the task of solving that important question, by carrying on investigations at various confectioneries, and factories turning out maple sugar, candies, etc.

As a result of such inquiries, have we sufficient grounds for introducing a Bill, or for amending previous legislation, dealing with the adulteration of all products likely to be adulterated and enacting penalties against any infringement of the law in this connection?

Judging from the complaints which are coming in from all parts, I am still satisfied that these acts are not effective or that they are nowhere enforced. The best evidence on this point may be found in the report of the chief analyst, which I shall now quote:

—		Pure.	Doubtful.	Adulterated.	Total.
1st lot..	I syrup..	17	4	76	97
	II sugar.	12	2	8	22
2nd lot..	III syrup	44	2	29	75
	IV sugar	15	0	3	18
		88	8	116	212

If we distribute these samples by provinces according to their various origins, the following result is obtained:

SYRUPS.

—	Samples.		Adulterated.		Foreign Sugar.
		Total.		Total.	
Prov. of Ontario—					
Kingston	16		10		
Toronto	32		29		
London	18		16		
		66		55	
Prov. of Quebec—					
Quebec	13		2		
St. Hyacinthe	18		2		
Montreal	25	57	13	17	
Nova Scotia	10	10	10	10	
New Brunswick	10	10	4	4	
Manitoba	9	9	7	7	
Calgary	4	4	4	4	
Prince Ed. Island.	4	4	2	2	
British Columbia..	12	12	9	9	
	172	172	108	108	

The adulteration is effected by adding or substituting to, or mixing with, the genuine article foreign sugars or glucose.

The examination of samples collected in the various provinces goes to show that these syrups or sugars have not been manufactured, but are merely offered for sale in the provinces where they are found. The samples found to be spurious were supplied mostly by firms in Montreal, Toronto, Boston, St. John, N. B., Hamilton, London, Quebec, Winnipeg, Vancouver, etc., while, on the other hand, samples found to be pure had been obtained direct from the farmers. The manufacture of maple sugar is not equally developed throughout the various counties. While some have a very small output only, in others farmers derive from the same source a fairly good income. The county of Vaudreuil, whose representative in this House I have the honour to be, may be classed with the latter, a fact which is due to the presence of that picturesque mountain bearing the name of the locality wherein I live. That mountain is covered with maple groves, and a number of farmers living in the vicinity, manufacture either syrup or sugar. Consequently, the farming community of Vaudreuil county, interested as it is in the manufacture of maple sugar, and especially maple syrup, has just as great if not greater cause than, many others to feel anxious over the deplorable state of things which now exists; and, to my mind, they were fully warranted in voting the resolution which I shall submit to the House.

On September 4, 1905, the Co-operative Association of the Vaudreuil County Farmers' Institutes, whose membership reaches eight hundred, held its annual convention in the parish of Ste. Justine de Newton, and it was during that meeting of about 1,500 farmers that the following resolution was carried:

RESOLUTION.

Extract from the proceedings of the general meeting of the Co-operative Association of Vaudreuil County Farmers' Institutes, held at Ste. Justine, on September 4, 1905.

Resolved, That the Co-operative Association of Vaudreuil County Farmers' Institutes call the attention of the Dominion government to the manufacture of maple syrup and sugar throughout the country, and particularly in the province of Quebec. The Co-operative Association, many of whose members convert maple sap into syrup and sugar, are anxious that the Dominion parliament should take stringent measures against those who manufacture syrup and sugar out of various extraneous matters. The members are of opinion that the manufacture of spurious syrup and sugar is greatly injurious to the good name, as well as to the sale, of the syrup and sugar manufactured by themselves.

The association urges the passing of an Act, or the actual enforcing of any Act—if such already exists—distinguishing between the genuine maple sugar and the spurious article, and between the pure syrup and that adulterated by the addition of some extraneous matter or other; and urges further, that penalties should be enacted against those who may offer for sale goods of another description than those defined by law.

As one of the by-industries on many a farm, is the manufacture of maple syrup worthy of the attention of the government? I venture to answer: Yes. Now, let us see whether statistics warrant such an assumption on my part.

In 1901, Canada's output of sugar amounted to 17,804,825 lbs. Out of that total, the share of the province of Quebec aggregated 13,524,381 lbs., and that of Vaudreuil county, 138,961 lbs. In 1903, we exported to the United States and Great Britain for $190,344 worth. During the eight months ended February, 1905, we supplied to the two countries aforesaid for $87,925 worth. Now, let us assume that the average selling price was nine cents a pound; we shall reach, for the census year of 1901, the handsome figure of $1,462,434.25. Out of that, a sum of $12,523.40 was accruing to Vaudreuil county.

The above figures are not enormous, I readily admit; but let us not lose sight of the fact that the industry just now is carried on in a rather small way, and that the period during which the sap is running is comparatively very short.

That industry is not developed to any great extent because it is not giving very large returns to the original producer, who, lacking encouragement on the part of the consumer and baffled in his efforts by the rascally competition which he has to face, has come to consider that industry as unimportant.

Competition is an evil in that sense. Producers are unable to secure for the genuine article the price which vendors of spurious goods obtain for theirs, 50 cents a gallon being the regular price for adulterated syrup.

Many are the farmers who would be in a position to tap a great many more trees than they are doing now; those who are tapping 500, could just as well tap 1,000 or even 1,500, if only the product brought larger returns on the market.

At the same time, a thorough study of the question will reveal the fact that the manufacture of maple sugar would be a paying industry, if only the government provided the necessary protection.

It is asserted that the proportion of pure products delivered on the city markets does not represent twelve per cent of the total quantity of maple syrup and syrup handled by the trade. According to the departmental report, out of 212 samples tested, only 24 per cent turned out to be pure.

That is, Mr. Speaker, the gist of it all. Let us go over the facts of the case. In that industry, as well as in others, we find the actual, honest, producers, and, on the other hand, the dealers and imitators. The latter are those who should be dealt with.

The product of maple sap may be adulterated or modified in various ways, two of which should be more particularly noticed. First, by adding to the syrup, while it is being manufactured or afterwards, extraneous matters, such as linseed or corn sugar, foreign sugars, and so forth, which increase the bulk and enable the producer or vendor to realize thereby larger profits. Secondly, by adding to the sugar while it is being manufactured, stale syrups or sugars, muscovado or sweets of any origin. Third, by making a so-called maple syrup or sugar which does not contain a particle of maple sap. That form of adulteration, which is the worst, is also the most widespread. Fourth, if I am rightly informed, there is still another process of adulteration, which, although it may not be carried on with a bad intent, is none the less injurious to trade. I mean the act of the confectioner, who brands certain sweets as being made from pure maple syrup or sugar, when such is not the case. However, in this case the injury is not so great, the manufactured article having a value by itself through its exquisite flavour and make-up. Lastly, these articles remain in the country, while the syrup and sugar are for the most part exported to the United States. At the time of sale, these various adulterated, modified, or imitated products resemble very much the first-class quality of the genuine article, and in a great many cases, it requires an expert to know one from the other. However, at the end after a longer or shorter period, the adulterated product loses its flavour and its keeping quality is not equal to that of the genuine article.

There are to be found in our country two classes of adulterators: first those who carry it on in a small way, and secondly those who practice it on a large scale. Those

of the first class do greater harm to themselves than to any others. They are mostly farmers who manufacture maple syrup and sugar in fairly large quantities and who alter these products by the processes which I have just mentioned, for the purpose of satisfying their greed. Their trade is always a local one, and, as it does not extend beyond the limit of their locality, they soon make a bad name for their goods and, the following year, have great difficulty in finding a market for them.

Adulterators on a large scale are more to be feared by the public at large and are liable to injure the country's good name as regards the sale of that particular product on foreign markets. These adulterators have a variety of ways of attaining their object. I may mention two instances to illustrate my point. The owner of a large sugar bush, in a county which I shall not name, at one time made up his mind to double his output of maple syrup. Being provided with the most modern apparatus, he is in a position to turn out a first rate article ? Now, what do you think he did ? He bought out all the inferior syrup manfactured in that vicinity, mixed it with his own, added to the mixture the quantity of glucose prescribed by experts in that art. A large shipment was first sent to this very city of Ottawa. The buyers found out the inferior quality of the product and its adulterated condition and refused to accept it. The owner then shipped it West ; he failed to dispose of it in Manitoba, and a part was forthwith shipped back to the maritime provinces. In brief, to make a long story short, the Ottawa buyers rejected the syrup and sent it back, in two other provinces the syrup is rejected, but not returned. However, in both cases, the dealer did not receive the price of the goods and the shipment was to him a net loss.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if such cases are of frequent occurrence, what will become of the good name of that industry ? The producer to whom I have just referred, himself shipped to England in cans of various capacities and bearing the name of the locality and of Canada, quantities of syrup. However, in the latter instance, I am not in a position to state that the article was adulterated, as it had not been manufactured in the same year as the lots I have just mentioned.

Here is a second instance. I stated previously that certain adulterators manufactured syrup which did not contain a particle of maple sap. To my knowledge, in a certain parish which I might name, some individuals have provided fraudulent vendors established in cities with water in which maple bark had been put to boil, and in which subsequently some essence had been introduced as the finishing touch to this almost miraculous transformation of water into genuine maple syrup, that great relish of epicures.

In view of these facts witnessed and deplored by all, would not the Government be justified in taking efficient steps towards repressing these evils. Are the existing laws against the adulteration of food products applicable to the adulteration of maple sugar and syrup ? I am of opinion they are to a certain extent. On the other hand, they appear to be inadequate and to afford protection of a very uncertain kind to honest producers, that is to farmers generally. Moreover, the manner in which they are to be enforced does not seem to be quite clear in the minds of those who are intrusted with their enforcement. In consequence, I submit that this honourable House should see to amend these Acts in a way that will insure from their enforcement more satisfactory and practical results.

Such a law should oblige any producer, selling maple syrup or sugar outside of his locality, or even within his locality to dealers who in turn will sell it, to brand his cans or packages with his name and that of the locality wherein he resides. In that way, whenever a government inspector chooses at random on the city markets, or in the wholesale stores, or at the retailers, samples of these products, he will be in a position, after testing them to find out by means of the brand, the person or persons who manufacture the spurious article or that of inferior quality.

Moreover, the wholesale dealer should be required to obtain from the producer a certificate guaranteeing the quality of the goods he is buying.

Penalties should be enacted against all adulterators. Lastly, provision should be made for protecting the honest against the dishonest producer.

It should be declared a misdemeanour to use packages or cans branded with another person's name for the sale of one's own modified or adulterated product. Laws stamped with the wisdom characteristic of the law-makers who make up this House, would no doubt help immensely in forwarding the interests of that industry.

The immediate result of such legislation would be to instill courage in the minds of honest farmers, and to induce them to carry on that industry on a larger scale, and in a more systematic way. For, I repeat it, the law should be unmerciful towards those unscrupulous producers who will soon have destroyed the bright prospects of that national industry. My object, Mr. Speaker, is not to stamp out entirely the manufacturing of syrup through the admixture of foreign syrup or sugar. I recognize to every man the right to dilute his wine with water. But what to my mind should not be tolerated, as unfair to the producer of the genuine article, it is the act of the adulterator, who sells as a pure article, that which is otherwise. In order that each one should have his share of credit and remuneration, it is necessary that a line of demarcation be

drawn, and that the bottles, cans, &c., be branded in a way that precludes error and makes clear the true quality of the goods contained therein.

The manufacture of maple sugar in our country, especially in the province of Quebec, is worthy of the whole attention of the government. True, it is a by-industry as regards farming; but it is nevertheless a paying industry when properly managed. It is likely to give large returns, just as large as those which may be expected from other industries considered important. The dairy industry, at its outset, was not what it is to-day. It has developed largely as a result of the untiring efforts of governments, through their experimental farms, their schools of agriculture, their lecturers, their agricultural papers and periodicals, their bulletins, and the various bonuses granted in that connection. The bacon industry, which at the present time is carried on profitably in one province only, will before long have a strong foothold throughout the Dominion. And why? Because the Dominion government and the provincial governments have started a vigorous campaign in that direction. Now, let us see what the statistics say. The country as a whole has turned out last year, for a period of twelve months, about $80,000,000 worth of dairy products, both butter and cheese. Of bacon, it turned out about $20,000,000 worth, which gives an average of about $6,000,000 worth per month of dairy products and $1,500,000 worth of hog products.

On the other hand, the maple sugar industry turned out in the course of three weeks in the year 1901, an average approximately of $2,000,000 worth a handsome return, especially if we consider that the heavy expenditure required to carry on the former industries was unnecessary in this case.

The maple sugar industry is likely to develop, if we extend some inducement to those who are carrying it on, and if we build up a reputation for its products, in the markets of Europe.

Our country is equipped, if I may be permitted the term, for the manufacturing of maple syrup and sugar, and it will be for a long time to come. We have large maple groves in every direction. Even the older settlements in our counties, still have, for the greater part, sugar bushes of value distributed here and there, on the various homesteads.

As settlement goes on from day to day, new lands will be opened up for the incoming settlers, and a still greater field will be offered to that growing industry.

Just now settlers in the newer parts of the country, as well as the farmers in the older part, engage in that industry, more in the way of a pastime for the family than as to a business enterprise. However, things will take another turn, should the commercial aspect be attended to. Farmers will find therein a new source of income which will induce them to preserve the woodlands on their farms; and the settler, on the other hand, will be helped thereby in his efforts towards establishing a home for himself.

Then again, if nature has favoured us in this respect, it must also be stated that our farmers, have provided themselves with all necessary apparatus.

The modern evaporator has replaced the old-time caldrons; the sap spouts made of sumac have been replaced by others of more modern style, more serviceable and convenient. The work is carried on in a more rational and business-like way. The new methods permit a saving of fuel and consequently of time. Lastly, a great deal of drudgery, which in by-gone days rendered the work wearisome and slow, has been done away with under the new system. In many localities the only remnants of the past are those quaint customs in accordance with which lively groups of parents and friends congregated around the great black caldrons, lighted up by the flare of bonfires. I do not mean in any way to say that there are no more pleasure parties in the sugar bushes when the sap of the maple is running, but, at the same time, within the last decade or two, the plant and methods in use have progressed wonderfully.

We are apt to praise our beautiful country, we are apt to praise the resources contained in its soil. We are fond of expounding its forest and mineral wealth. We eulogize agriculture because it brings forth the producer, and thereby to the country, immense returns every year. People flock towards gold-mining countries, such as the Yukon, to Cobalt and elsewhere, to rend from the earth its precious metals. However, the natural riches which Providence has lavished on our country should not solely attract our attention. Should not the manufacture of maple sugar, whose development I am advocating just now, be considered as precious a gift of nature as the resources I have just mentioned? I say, the government would be warranted in doing whatever is required to turn the attention of the people towards that industry and to induce those who are in a position to do so to apply their energy towards the production of large quantities of a first-class quality of maple sugar and syrup. Let then the government begin right now to extend a helping hand to those who are manufacturing these products, by protecting them against adulterators of all kinds.

I beg to move that the motion be adopted.

Mr. EUGENE PAQUET (L'Islet). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest to the magnificent speech delivered by my hon. friend the member for Vaudreuil (Mr. Boyer). I am unable to follow

him over the ground which he has covered, but I am able to say that the industry he has referred to, is not only of importance from the farmers' point of view, but is important as well from a business and even a national standpoint.

My hon. friend who has just spoken is not only the representative of the county of Vaudreuil, but the spokesman as well of all sensible people and an exponent of my own views on the subject. His eloquent appeal on behalf of that fine industry will go straight to the hearts of our farmers. He has the esteem and respect of all men who love agriculture and the industries connected with it.

I, for one, do not hesitate to say that the member for Vaudreuil is a very able lecturer, while at the same time quite capable of vindicating his principles, his ideas, and his opinions. But he is above all a man intent on vindicating on all occasions and under all circumstances, the interests of the farming community and of the labouring classes. He is a man whom I respect, because he is a lecturer for the provincial government. And right here, Mr. Speaker, let me state that the government of our provinces of Quebec and Ontario, have often sent throughout the country, to spread information concerning agriculture and industry men who unfortunately do not know anything about agriculture, industry and commerce. To-day my hon. friend for Vaudreuil, has expressd in a most admirable way the best feelings and the best thoughts which a noble-minded man can entertain towards the farming community.

This debate, Mr. Speaker, has taken me unawares. But there is one thing which strikes me just now, and especially as regards the province of Quebec, and it is this, that our governments have not always selected the most capable men to instruct the farming classes in the various constituencies. I must say that the hon. member for Vaudreuil is exceedingly well versed in agricultural science and his nomination by the government has been a very happy one.

I wholly agreed with the opinions expressed by the member for Vaudreuil on the manufacture of maple sugar and syrup. That industry has, within the last few years, made remarkable strides. It supplies quite a large trade, and I see with pleasure that the farmers in the various districts of our province, as well as of Ontario, have materially improved their equipment and their methods of work. They have kept up with the progress of science. Now, Mr. Speaker, these farmers, who turn out an excellent and pure article, who offer for sale genuine goods, are asking the government to protect them against the competition of spurious products which threaten to flood the market.

I do not intend just now, to engage in a political discussion; I only wish to invite the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) to follow on the footsteps of his predecessor, the hon. Mr. Brodeur, the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and who in that new position so well fulfils the duties of his new position. He is a man whom I respect, he is a man whom I esteem, for I believe that he is truly at heart a French Canadian. When he was Minister of Inland Revenue he well knew how to defend the interests of our race. Now that he is Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I trust that he will show in the future, as he has shown in the past, a spirit of fairness, and that not only will he be friendly to Montreal, but friendly as well to Quebec, and develop the route of the St. Lawrence, that route which is bound to be a means of insuring the prosperity, not only of our province, but of the country at large.

It seems to me that this question of the manufacture of maple sugar involves a good deal more than one would judge at first sight, and is closely interwoven with that of forestry. Too much importance then cannot be given to it. It should be taken up not only from the viewpoint of the local market but also from that of foreign markets which may offer very favourable outlets. You are in power, and consequently you are in a position to protect that industry. You exercise patronage, and have the right to enforce the existing laws, and, if necessary, enact new ones. You may appoint the necessary officers for the protection of that industry, in the same way as you can appoint lieutenant-governors, judges, or grant contracts to your friends.

For some years past, farmers have been going to considerable expense towards adopting modern methods and improving the processes of manufacture of maple sugar and syrup.

The output of these products has increased considerably through the efforts of our farmers. Our exports have gone up very much. In 1901, we exported for $96,000 worth of maple sugar; in 1902, $91,000; in 1903, $128,000; in 1904, $141,000. These statistics illustrate the forward movement of that truly national industry.

Besides, our farmers deliver on the local markets, at Fraserville, Lévis, and Quebec, a pure first rate product, free from adulteration. But they are anxious to be adequately protected against fraudulent vendors. On the 20th of February, 1905, in answer to my friend the member for Beauce, the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue stated :

> The department is taking stringent measures towards preventing the adulteration of maple sugar and syrup. Prosecutions have been instituted under the Adulteration Act. An inquiry will be made.

I have no doubt, the hon. minister has

earnestly endeavoured to protect the interests of the farming community.

On the 24th of February, 1906, the hon. minister also said :

> As regards maple syrup and sugar, they are adulterated on a large scale with all sorts of ingredients. Usually cane sugar and glucose are used, and this constitutes an adulteration under the law, unless the manufacturer states on the brand that it is only a mixture.

I may urge on the government the necessity of exercising a more rigid oversight as regards these adulterations.

On the 20th September, 1905, at the fruit growers' exhibition, in St. Jean-Port-Joly, with Mr. Auguste Dupuis, one of the best horticulturists of Canada, as its distinguished president, we expressed our disapproval of the adulteration which is going on of maple syrup products. At that convention, experts had occasion to admire our exhibits of maple sugar and syrup.

That industry should be the object of the greatest attention on the part of the government. I repeat it, our farmers nowadays adopt the most modern methods. They have made sacrifices to further the progress of that industry.

The law protects them, but it may be that it is not enforced. And I hope that the department will take still more stringent measures with a view to safeguarding the interests of the agricultural community.

At 6 o'clock House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. WILLIAM TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue). There can be no objection to our adopting the motion of my hon. friend. I am rather inclined to think that its adoption and the debate which we have had will be a great encouragement to the department in taking further energetic measures to prevent the adulteration of sugar in this country. At all events it will impress upon the public mind the necessity for a more rigid enforcement of the Act. I might draw attention to what has been done since 1905 in this respect. In 1905, there were collected 212 samples of maple syrup and maple sugar, of which 116 were adulterated. There were two collections in that year, the first being a collection of samples to the number of 119 and the second a later collection to the number of 93. In the first collection the adulterations were much more numerous than in the second.

Mr. TALBOT. What time of the year?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. In February, 1905. The first collection consisted of samples from the old crop and the second from the new crop. The adulterations in the first were very large indeed; fully 75 per cent of the total number of the samples analysed while in the second the adulterations were fully 37 per cent. The latter applied I suppose to the collection of the new crop, and the samples came from the producers they contained more adulteration than we expected to find under such circumstances. All this emphasizes the necessity for more stringent measures to be taken to enforce the law. There is an increasing demand in the country for pure maple sugar and syrup, and no doubt if the entire product were pure the prices would be higher. The product of maple sugar and syrup a few years ago approximated in value about $1,750,000. We are told by the Agricultural Department that it is quite possible to increase the annual output five or six times, so that it would reach the value of from $8,000,000 to $10,000,000. If we can do that by a more rigid enforcement of the Act, it is clearly our duty to do so. The department has already issued instructions for the collection of samples. There are now over 110 samples collected from the sugar on the market and collections are being made from the sugar being brought in from the producers. Analyses will be made of these samples, the results will be published in the bulletins as usual, and energetic measures taken to enforce the law. I understand that the penalties paid by those found responsible for adulterations in the past have about equalled the cost of the analyses in each case, or about $9. Possibly it may be found necessary to somewhat increase the penalty so that in course of time we shall be able to stamp out altogether the adulteration in the article of maple syrup and sugar.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries.) (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the hon. member for Vaudreuil, on having called the attention of the House to the adulteration of food products and particularly to that of maple syrup and sugar.

Shortly after my entering the Department of Inland Revenue, I was informed that there was being offered for sale throughout the country, a large quantity of adulterated maple syrup. I then gave instructions to have samples of that product collected, in order to ascertain whether, as a matter of fact, that condition of things existed. I am very sorry to have to state that, on these samples being tested, it was found that 66 per cent of them were adulterated. It is really unfortunate to find that a food product, which I might almost call a necessity of life, should be adulterated to such an extent. Of course, it was judged that under the circumstances stringent measures should be taken towards putting an end to this evil, and I considered it my duty to institute proceedings against persons who had been guilty of such action.

I should state, however, that these adulterations were effected, for the most part, by manufacturers who buy that maple syrup

and sugar in small quantities, and in their factories, at Montreal, or elsewhere, put it to boil and add to it some essence, or else maple twigs or pieces of bark, in such a way as to give to the product which is a mixture of maple syrup, cane, sugar and glucose, a taste approaching that of the genuine article.

That is what I found when Minister of Inland Revenue. I ascertained that there were throughout the country several factories established in cities, which were carrying on an illicit trade by putting on the market a product which had only the name of maple. As I stated a moment ago, I ordered that the persons responsible for such frauds be prosecuted at once. They were convicted by the courts. Efforts were made to induce my department to remit the penalty; but I refused, for the good reason that I thought that was the only means of remedying such a condition of things.

We then gave instructions, to collect, in the spring, and also later on, further samples of maple sugar and syrup. I found that these further samples made a better showing, although, to speak the truth, the result was not entirely satisfactory. The fact is, we found that out of 212 samples tested in June, 1905, 116 were adulterated, 88 were pure, and 8 were doubtful. 116 out of 212 samples, that is rather a high proportion and I believe that under the circumstances it was the duty of the department to prosecute those who were guilty of the offence.

These adulterations have still another deplorable result. Not only are they injurious to one of our home industries, inasmuch as they inflict serious losses on the producers who are members of the farming community, but the people who thus open factories specially with the object of turning out adulterated products, export these to England and elsewhere, more particularly to England. I fear that, within a few years, if we are not in a position to put a stop to the exportation of such products, our trade in maple sugar, will be entirely ruined.

That is another consideration which has induced the Department of Inland Revenue to adopt the stringent measures referred to. I know that the present Minister of Inland Revenue is anxious to enforce energetically the same policy and to take inspiration from what has occurred in the past.

No doubt, we should take measures to put an end to such a condition of things, and once more, I congratulate the hon. member for Vaudreuil on having called the attention of the House to that important question.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I regret that I have not the advantage of being able to understand the language in which the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) spoke. I regret it all the more because, I think, that probably, could I have understood it, I would have agreed with what he said. I commend what I take to be the motive of the hon. gentleman who moved this resolution and whose argument, I am sorry to say, I was not able to follow for the same reason that I was not able to understand the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I take it that the object is to call attention to a dangerous and growing evil. The proper discussion of this question, the calling of the attention of the government to the evil that exists, is one which will benefit the producer as well as the consumer of this important article of commerce which is now under consideration. It may not be known to those living in the province of Quebec what this all means to them. For many years past those living in my section of the country have regarded the province of Quebec as the one place where they could find pure, unadulterated maple syrup. There has been a large and rapidly increasing market for this article in Ontario, not only in the towns and villages but among the farmers as well. I myself have received numerous requests from people who wished to be advised where they could get the pure maple syrup. Until recently I have advised them to send to the Montreal grocery houses handling this class of goods. There has been a greatly increased demand for the pure syrup and it is spoken of in the highest terms. But I regret to find, that during the last two or three years, the product which we get from Quebec has not been what it used to be. And I would like to show the people of Quebec what an injustice this is doing them and how it injures them more than it injures any others. This adulterated maple syrup has been sold under the name of 'pure maple syrup' from Quebec.

Mr. BRODEUR. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) would allow me to interrupt him, and with the permission of the House, I would say that when speaking in French, I explained, that when I was at the head of the Department of Inland Revenue, I found that large quantities of maple syrup were put on the market that were certainly adulterated. This syrup, I found, was manufactured extensively in Montreal, and in Toronto also, there being two or three houses engaged in the manufacture of it there. This product is manufactured from cane sugar and glucose with some other materials. In some instances a small quantity of maple sugar is added. I was informed also that sometimes the manufacturers use what is called 'maple syrup extract.' This is a very strong extract so that a few drops will transform gallons of the mixture into 'maple syrup.' I was shown a number of bottles of this maple syrup extract. I learned that the syrup thus produced was sent not only to Ontario and other parts of Canada but was largely ex-

ported to England. That is why we took such energetic measures to stop this evil. This adulterated maple syrup is not sold by the farmers. If my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) would consult bulletin 102 he would find that the samples of maple syrup taken from the farmers in Quebec are nearly all genuine but that the samples of the product of the factories, for example in Toronto, when analysed were all found to be adulterated.

Mr. SPROULE. It was with regard to these things that I intended to speak, because it is easy to see that a great injustice is being done to the farmers of Quebec who are producers of the genuine article. As an example I may state that within the last three weeks, in the village in which I live, I found a syrup on sale the package of which was labelled 'Quebec maple syrup,' which, when I tested it I found to be not maple syrup at all. I told my friends that this was nothing less than a libel on the farmers of Quebec, and I gave them the names of parties to whom they could write for the genuine article. I was told that this manufactured syrup came from Toronto and Montreal. I was informed also that there was one trick in the manufacture which the Minister of Inland Revenue has not mentioned. When the sugar is dissolved, the manufacturer takes a quantity of the inner bark of the maple tree and boils it with the sugar, thus giving it a slight flavour of the maple. Of course, if this adulteration goes on it will ruin the reputation of Quebec maple sugar and will be a serious injustice to the farmers of that district. We have few people in our section who make maple syrup. The product from Quebec is greatly preferred because it is brighter, clearer and has in perfection the peculiar maple flavour. It is everything that could be desired. But this adulteration, which is a fraud upon the public and injustice to the farmers of Quebec demands attention at the hands of the government. What has already been done is not enough—it may be a fair beginning, but it is only a beginning. More vigorous measures must be adopted to put down the unprincipled individuals who improperly use the name of the province in which they are sheltered and thus libel and injure the farmers of that province who make a pure and valuable product. There may be instances of farmers indulging in some form of adulteration of these goods, but I believe that not one in fifty is guilty of this fraud. For twenty years past I have ordered this product from parties in the province of Quebec and I have never yet received a sample that I did not think was pure. Of course, I have ordered direct from the producer, usually a farmer.

I have already said that this practice of adulteration of destroying the reputation of innocent producers and depriving them of a market that was valuable and rapidly growing. The Department of Inland Revenue is doing all right, so far as it has gone, but it is not going far enough. It is not vigorous enough in its assaults upon those who thus make inroads upon the rights of innocent people and who destroy the market for one of the most valuable products of the province of Quebec and the eastern part of Ontario.

Mr. BRODEUR. Will the hon. gentleman tell me how the Department of Inland Revenue can do more than they have done, when they have prosecuted those who have been guilty of adulterating maple sugar ?

Mr. SPROULE. I have not noticed any prosecutions yet, I have noticed examinations. I say that the department should have first given fair warning, and followed that up by prosecutions, moderately mild, if you like.

Mr. BRODEUR. I will give the case of the Imperial Syrup Company of Montreal, against whom action has been taken, and also a man named Genne.

Mr. SPROULE. Then increase the penalty until you stop the adulteration, because you cannot find to-day one sample in a hundred of the pure product that is on sale in the province of Ontario—unless it has come in within the last week or two. One can understand how necessary it is to stop this evil at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). I did not hear the beginning of this discussion. But I agree with my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) that it is highly necessary that effective measures should at once be taken to put a stop to this terrible abuse. I listened to the ex-Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Brodeur) telling us about what he had done when he presided over that department in order to abate this evil. But his efforts have been fruitless, there is no doubt of that, he admits it himself, and asks my hon. friend from East Grey if it was possible for him to do more than to prosecute the offenders under the Inland Revenue Act. Let me venture a suggestion in view of the utter sterility of the efforts made by the late head of that department. I suggest that the Minister of Agriculture turn his attention to this subject, and see if he could not put an end to these adulterations. He has certainly done something of value in regard to fruit. He has made serious endeavours in that direction which have borne fruit in the province of Ontario. Why could he not extend that protection to the manufacturers of maple sugar and maple syrup ? Surely it is possible to obtain a marking of the packages of maple sugar and cans of syrup that would prove as effectual as similar measures have proved in reference to fruit. The

adulteration of maple sugar and syrup is doing a great deal of harm in the province of Quebec, and I do not see why some modification of the Fruit Marks Act might not be applied to the product of our maple trees. I think my hon. friend the present Minister of Marine and Fisheries has been making laudable efforts, but in the wrong direction. It is not by the operation of the Inland Revenue Act that he will be able to overcome the crying evil that has been pointed out by my hon. friend from East Grey. We must try something else, and I think the Department of Agriculture might well direct its attention to the sterility of the efforts so far made by the government, and see if it is not possible to frame an Act on the lines of the Fruit Marks Act to protect the honest farmers in our province who manufacture every year such a large quantity of maple sugar and syrup, and afterwards find that frauds are perpetrated to their disadvantage by people in the city of Montreal, or by exporters from that city to Ontario and elsewhere.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). I am glad to accept the compliments of my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). I am only sorry that the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) who usually sits beside him is not in the House, because the member for Halton is always complaining that the Minister of Agriculture tries to absorb too much of the work of other departments. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier now wants me to take a little work from my colleague the Minister of Inland Revenue.

Mr. FOSTER. Because of the sterility of his efforts.

Mr. FISHER. I accept also the compliment of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), and I am glad to know that my own efforts have not been sterile. But this afternoon hon. gentlemen opposite were not so complimentary to me in discussing the Fruit Marks Act, as is the member for Jacques Cartier. The member for Jacques Cartier and the member for East Grey have both criticised the Inland Revenue Department as not having succeeded in preventing the adulteration of maple sugar. In the first place, let me say that it is only a little over two years ago that any method of analysis was discovered by which adulterations of maple sugar with any other sugar could be detected. If any hon. gentleman will look at the bulletins he will find that a great deal of this adulteration is a mixture of maple with cane or beet sugar—which may not be very harmful, but is all the same a fraud upon purchasers, who think they are getting pure maple, and it is also a fraud upon those who sell pure maple sugar or syrup. It is only about three years ago that a method of analysis was discovered in the state of Vermont by which you can detect the presence of other sugars in with maple sugar or syrup. Soon after that discovery was made it was reported to the Department of Inland Revenue, and that department is now able to detect these adulterations in maple sugar, and the late head of that department took the steps which have been outlined. I may say that for seven or eight years complaints have been made by farmers who manufacture pure maple sugar and syrup, of the difficulties they encounter because of unscrupulous people mixing cane or beet sugar with maple and selling it to the detriment of the makers of pure maple. People may say that this is no great harm, but as a matter of fact it is a fraud. Maple sugar is sold chiefly as a dainty article of food, and is prized because of the peculiar flavour that it has. Now those who adulterate maple sugar with other sugar usually adopt this course. There is a great deal of what I may call coarse or strong maple sugar manufactured, not as pure, stronger in flavour, looking darker to the sight, and tasting stronger; and a great many people who do not know much about maple sugar, who are not connoisseurs in that article, think that such an article is the pure maple sugar. Now as a matter of fact that strong, dark maple sugar or maple syrup is not pure in this sense, that although an analysis may show it to be genuine maple sugar, it is made in a dirty and slovenly fashion. It is darkened by bits of bark or twigs and leaves falling into the sap buckets when the sap is running in the woods, it is darkened by carelessness in cleaning the utensils and conducting the operation of the work, with the result that the flavour is stronger and coarser, and the article is lacking the peculiar delicate flavour of first rate maple sugar or syrup. Now, I can say that real first rate maple sugar or maple syrup, when well made, is as clear in colour as any other kind of sugar, as much so as any of these adulterated sugars which are largely mixed with cane and beet sugar. It depends upon the methods of manufacture, it depends upon the cleanliness of the operation as to the colour, the fineness and the clearness of the maple sugar and maple syrup, but, there is a fine distinct maple flavour to our really pure maple sugar that no adulterated sugar or syrup has. It may taste just as strong and to the uninitiated it may have a maple flavour, but it has not that fine, delicate flavour that really pure, unadulterated maple syrup and sugar, made in a cleanly and successful way, has and nothing can get that except maple sugar or syrup made in the manner I have outlined.

Mr. MONK. I understand that if a man labels a can 'compound of maple syrup' he can pass it as maple syrup whether it is

adulterated or not and there is no law against that. Is that the case ?

Mr. FISHER. I think it is the case if he marks it with the word 'compound' as conspicuously as the part of the label bearing the word 'maple.' It may be that it would be advisable to amend the Adulteration Act in some way so as to obviate the facility which thereby seems to be given for passing off a compound article for the genuine article. But, I may say, that the Department of Inland Revenue last year in dealing with these cases pointed out that simply putting the word 'compound' in an inconspicuous place on the label with the word 'maple' in a more conspicuous way was not a fulfilment of the intention and spirit of the law. I know that labels which were submitted to the department to see whether they fulfilled the law, having the word 'compound' in an inconspicuous place, were rejected and the people were warned that if they put these labels upon their cans, boxes or paper wrappings they would be prosecuted and fined. It is possible, however, that it would be better to amend the law in some slight way so as to make sure that that could no longer be done. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier(Mr. Monk) was good enough to say that the work of the Department of Inland Revenue had been ineffective. Just to indicate its effectiveness I might say that in the spring of last year, before the true maple sugar season had really begun, a large number of samples were collected. It was not known every where that the departmental officers were collecting these samples. In the first collection there was a percentage of 24 per cent found to be genuine. Later on in the season, after the word that the officers of the Inland Revenue Department were investigating this matter, were taking samples, after the people had been warned of what was going on, another set of samples was taken and what was the result? As my hon. friend (Mr. Brodeur) says after prosecution had taken place and after these prosecutions had been published by the newspapers and it was known among the maple sugar manufacturers and producers 63 per cent were found to be genuine or only 37 per cent adulterated, as against 75 adulterated in the first set of samples taken.

Mr. SPROULE. When was the last set of samples collected?

Mr. FISHER. Later in the season or when the maple sugar season was well advanced.

Mr. SPROULE. There never was a time in our part of the country when half as many spurious samples were offered for sale as there was this winter.

Mr. MONK.

Mr. FISHER. I am sorry to say that I have information that this winter again people were selling adulterated maple sugar and syrup. I do not know whether my hon. friend has carefully watched the labels, but I know that in a good many instances these labels do contain the word 'compound' or have some word which would indicate that they are not pure.

Mr. SPROULE. They are labelled 'pure maple syrup from Quebec.'

Mr. FISHER. That may be also. I am sure that the Department of Inland Revenue which several weeks ago started in to take samples again will find a great many of these and will do its duty in prosecuting the offenders. It may be that the penalty is not sufficiently severe. I do not know exactly what the law is in regard to the penalty, but I am quite sure that if the Department of Inland Revenue finds persistent offenders under this law it will inflict the severest penalty the law allows, and if it is found that that is not sufficient I venture to think that we will be able to so amend the law as to increase the penalty and do away with this misrepresentation of a very useful article of diet.

I am glad to say that in Canada we have a very large business in the production of maple sugar. At the time of the taking of the census, some five years ago, the amount of maple sugar and syrup made in Canada was seventeen and a half million pounds—a very respectable figure—and the actual value was about one-tenth of that or $1,750,000. In the eastern townships, where the industry is very largely prosecuted, I know that it has increased in the last five years and I have no doubt whatever that to-day there is very nearly $3,000,000 worth of maple sugar and syrup made annually in Canada. The advantages and importance of the industry are such that the government ought to do all it can to promote its success. It is an industry which is a very useful one for the farmers to prosecute. The work is carried on at a time of the year when there is very little else to do on the farm—in the spring when the roads are breaking up, when the people cannot do teaming work, before the spring work opens and after the winter work is practically done. It is a useful industry and it gives a very fair profit for the labour and the investment. I know as a matter of fact of personal knowledge that within the last few years a very considerable investment in up to date plants for the manufacture of maple sugar have been made. I know a large number of men who have put in evaporators and other appliances, who have invested very considerable amounts of money and who are looking forward to reaping a good profit and return on their investment. They can only make that good profit and return if the price they receive

is the price of genuine maple sugar. If the market is cut from under their feet by a spurious article they will not be able to make a fair return on their investment. They will not be encouraged to continue the business and the business will practically die out.

While I am saying this in regard to the business there is another point which I know is of considerable importance in our province. As long as the people can make a profit out of their maple woods they are going to retain these woods and keep them as a sort of forestry reserve, which is going to keep a considerable bit of wood land scattered all through our province. We know what an immense advantage it is to the agriculture and climatic conditions of our province and how much better the conditions will be in every way if we have all over the province these maple groves if they are destroyed and the land used for other purposes. The only way in which these maple woods can be preserved and the industry carried on is to secure for the men who make pure maple syrup the benefits of their work and of their honesty. I may tell my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) that while I have not undertaken to do the work of the Inland Revenue Department in this matter, I have undertaken a little work which may perhaps be of advantage to this industry. In preparation for the maple season this year I have had prepared in my department—and I think I may say it is well prepared—a little bulletin on maple syrup and maple sugar making which has been sent out in the last week or two. The French copy was put in the hands of the printer at the same time, but I am told it will not be ready until next week, and then thousands of these bulletins will be distributed immediately. This bulletin not only contains a description of the best process of manufacture, but it includes the Act with refernce to adulteration and also information as to what has been done and can be done to protect the maple sugar manufacturers in their industry. I trust it will be of help to those engaged in the industry, and I believe it contains useful pointers as to how they may protect themselves.

Mr. MONK. In view of the very important admission made by the Minister of Agriculture I wish to ask if it is the intention during the present session to introduce these amendments to the Inland Revenue Act which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) says are necessary; particularly in reference to the abuse which is now made of the word 'compound?' Does the Minister of Agriculture also intend to introduce legislation this session on the lines of the Fruit Marks Act, in order to protect the farmers of the province of Quebec against such injustices as have been pointed out?

Mr. FISHER. I said that if it were found necessary it should be done but I did not say it had yet been found necessary. I do not know that the Fruits Marks Act would apply to this industry, but if the efforts of my colleague are found to be ineffective through defects in the law, then as always the Department of Agriculture will be willing to do all it can for the welfare of the farmer.

Mr. G. W. GANONG (Charlotte). To one who knows something about the sugar business it is a little ludicrous to hear all this talk about pure maple sugar. If you would make a law to compel the farmer to make some pure sugar first, there would be a good deal less trouble in the country. Perhaps this pamphlet that the Minister of Agriculture speaks of may be along the right lines and I compliment him on it, but it does not go far enough. I speak of what I know. I happen to be a manufacturing confectioner and have had as much experience with maple sugar as any man in this House, and I can say that the class of stuff that is sold by the farmers of this country as maple sugar is outrageous; it is the poor quality of it that requires the harmless adulteration of it by adding granulated or other sugars. You get it so black and muddy that it is not fit to use. It is sold to confectioners, they have to clarify it and in doing that it discolours so that there is an absolute necessity to use granulated or some bright sugar to give it a colour in order that people will look at it at all. My hon. friend talks about the Vermont sugar, but he cannot find as dirty stuff in Vermont as is sold in the province of Quebec and the other provinces of Canada. The demand for good sugar and the law as well, has forced them in Vermont to make a decent article which is almost as white as Quebec sugar that would have one-half or one-third of granulated sugar in it. First make the farmers give us good sugar before they are allowed to market it at all, and if you do that there will not be so much demand for the adulterated material.

Mr. FISHER. I have frequently had confectioners refuse to buy good maple sugar because they said the dark sugar was better for their purpose.

Mr. GANONG. There are confectioners and confectioners. I use several carloads a year and while we find about ten per cent that we can handle and ship for the trade, 90 per cent of it is such that the trade will absolutely refuse. Not only that, but there is a good deal of sugar carried over in the province of Quebec and when kept for six or nine months it becomes dark, so that it is utterly impossible to place that sugar on the market without using some other sugar with it to give it a colour. I am far

from justifying the adulteration of maple sugar, but let there be a quality of sugar put on the market that does not require adulteration and then you will find less trouble. The remarks with regard to the adulteration of syrup are all right in their way, but the very moment you allow it to be compounded you induce people to adulterate it so that 90 per cent of the people will be deceived in it.

Mr. R. N. WALSH (Huntingdon). I wish to speak in support of this motion notwithstanding the remarks of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Ganong) we have always flattered ourselves in the province of Quebec that we make pure maple sugar, while in Ontario they ask you to take it with something on the side. I believe we produce pure maple sugar and maple syrup in the province of Quebec and I gave the hon. member from Charlotte (Mr. Ganong) a sample last year which I think he will pronounce to be absolutely pure, although he is a confectioner.

Mr. GANONG. It was excellent.

Mr. WALSH. Well, that came from the province of Quebec. We produce the purest maple syrup and sugar in the province of Quebec, and if you can prohibit this adulterated article which is made after the sugar leaves our province then you will be conferring a benefit on our farmers. I am not condemning what has been done by the government already but we ask for more legislation in order not only that from the point of view of afforestation the maple trees may be preserved in our province, but also that from the trade point of view the products of the maple may reach the consumer pure and unadulterated.

Motion agreed to.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—SURVEY BETWEEN QUEBEC AND MONCTON.

Mr. O. S. CROCKET (York, N.B.) moved for :

Copies of all correspondence had between the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and the government, or any department thereof, and between the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and the Transcontinental Railway Commission in reference to the survey and location of the proposed Transcontinental Railway between Quebec and Moncton.

He said : My object in making this motion is to discover if I can the real position of affairs in regard to the Quebec-Moncton section of the proposed National Transcontinental Railway. During the first week of the session I obtained an order of the House for a return of all the correspondence had been between the government and the Transcontinental Railway Commission with respect to the surveys and location of the route in the province of New Brunswick. On Friday last the Minister of Railways laid a return on the table which it seems to me cannot possibly contain all the correspondence asked for by that order. That return contains three letters. The first letter is from the late Mr. F. D. Wade, chairman of the Commission, to the Minister of Railways, and is dated April 26, 1905. That letter asks the government for a decision with respect to the two routes in the province of New Brunswick. The second letter dated April 28, is from the Minister of Railways to Mr. Wade in reply to his letter of the 26th. This letter asks Mr. Wade to furnish a concise report on the result of the surveys made in New Brunswick and an advisory opinion as to the route between Chaudière Junction and Moncton that it will be advisable to adopt. The third letter is dated April 29, and is simply an acknowledgment by Mr. Wade of the Minister of Railway's letter, with a statement that he has directed the chief engineer to make the necessary report. The only other document contained in the return is a communication signed by Mr. Lumsden, the chief engineer of the Commission, and addressed to the Commissioners of the Transcontinental Railway, setting forth the results of the surveys in the province of New Brunswick. There is nothing before April 26, 1905, and there is nothing after April 29, 1905. It seems to me to be absolutely clear that there must be a great amount of correspondence that has passed between the government and the Railway Commission in regard to this subject which has not been brought down, and I would like to ask and to understand distinctly now from the Minister of Railways if this return does in fact contain all the correspondence that has passed between the Commission and the government and any department thereof, as set forth in the motion, in regard to the subject therein indicated.

Mr. EMMERSON. Mr. Speaker, perhaps I shall be courteous beyond the courtesy shown by my hon. friend. I do not think that any hon. member should assume that a department would bring a return of all correspondence that was not a full return. I want to say to my hon. friend, from the courteous standpoint, that he has in that return a full return to the order of this House, and that all the documents and all the correspondence have been brought down.

Mr. CROCKET. In relation to the surverys in the province of New Brunswick ? Well, that is rather surprising to me, because we know that after the interim report of the commission was laid upon the table of the House last session, and the results of the surveys in the province of New Brunswick became known to the people, a delegation from the province of New Brunswick waited

on the Governor in Council in reference to the matter, and that subsequently a re-survey was ordered. In view of that fact it is certainly surprising to me to learn that no communication has passed between the government and the Railway Commission with reference to that feature of the matter, at any rate. I was in hopes that when this return was brought down, if it did not reassure us with respect to the intention of the government to go on with the construction of the Quebec-Moncton section of this line, it would have at least shown us where we were at and what had been doing in that regard ; but I am bound to confess that the return that has been brought down, has failed to give the assurance which I had hoped it would. The House will not be surprised, in view of what has occurred, to learn that there has been a considerable feeling of apprehension in the province of New Brunswick as to the intentions of the government with regard to the Quebec-Moncton section—a feeling which I may say has been growing from day to day, until it has ripened almost into a conviction in the minds of many that the government have practically decided to abandon that portion of the work. I believe the same feeling exists in those portions of the province of Quebec through which it was intended that the road should pass. Rumours to the same effect are multiplying in all parts of the country and are finding expression in the press of the various provinces. I sincerely trust that time will prove that these rumours and these fears are not well founded, though I am bound to confess that the history of this whole project from its inception down to the present, exhibits altogether too many circumstances which for my liking rather go to confirm these misgivings. In the first place, it was well known to every member of the last parliament that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, with whom the government made this contract, did not want the Quebec-Moncton section of this road, that they strenuously opposed the proposition for the extension of the line from Quebec eastward to the Canadian Atlantic seaboard, and in the end only with great reluctance accepted the contract as it was confirmed by this parliament in the session of 1903. It is not difficult to understand the position of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company with respect to that matter, in view of the identity of its interests with those of its parent company, the Grand Trunk Railway company and the latter company's enormous interests and investments in the port of Portland, Maine, as well as in its existing line of railway from Montreal to that United States port. It need only be mentioned in order to be seen, that the building of the Quebec-Moncton section and its lease to the Grand Trunk Pacific Company under the terms of the contract, practically involve the putting of that corporation into competition with its own Montreal and Portland connection, and that it would pay the Grand Trunk Company twenty times over to haul the freight which it collects in the west over the 297 miles of its road from Montreal to Portland, or over the 318 miles from Quebec by Richmond to Portland instead of hauling it from Quebec to Halifax, a distance of nearly 800 miles or from Quebec to St. John, a distance of 600 miles for shipment by these ports, in which it has no other interest than the adverse interest of the promoters of a rival competing port. That was the first feature of this contract which made us sceptical in regard to this matter, and that scepticism was considerably augmented by the knowledge of the fact that the Transcontinental Railway contract as confirmed by Act of Parliament, contained a provision by which the specifications for the construction of the whole eastern division from Winnipeg to Moncton must receive the approval, and the line must be constructed to the satisfaction, of the Grand Trunk Pacific Company's engineers. The section of the Act to which I refer is subsection 7 of section 1. It reads :

> In order to insure for the protection of the company as lessees of the eastern division of the said railway, the economical construction thereof in such manner that it can be operated to the best advantage, it is hereby agreed that the specifications for the construction of the eastern division shall be submitted to and approved of by the company before the commencement of the work and that the said work shall be done according to the said specifications and shall be subject to the joint supervision, inspection and acceptance of the chief engineer appointed by the government and the chief engineer of the company, and, in the event of differences as to the specifications, or in case the said engineers shall differ as to the work or the questions in dispute, a third arbitrator shall be chosen in the manner provided in paragraph four of this agreement.

It is only fair to state that the Transcontinental Commission, in its interim report dated March 30, 1905, which was laid upon the table last session, did state that the Grand Trunk Pacific had already approved of the specifications, but those must necessarily refer only to the general specifications relating to the general character of the work, inasmuch as, according to the information which was furnished by the right hon. the Prime Minister, in reply to a question I asked a few days ago, there has been no portion of the Quebec and Moncton section definitely located even yet. Then in addition we have in mind the precipitancy with which this contract was negotiated and closed with the Grand Trunk Pacific, behind the back of the then Minister of Railways and Canals of this government (Mr. Blair). We remember also the fervent plea of the Prime Minister on the occasion of the introduction of this Bill in the session of 1903—'when the flood tide was upon us'—for haste, for the avoidance of

all delays, for non-deliberation, for immediate, instantaneous action. He said:

> This is not the time for deliberation ; this is the time for action ; we cannot wait because time does not wait. We cannot wait because in these days of wonderful development, time lost is doubly lost. Our duty is immediate and imperative. It is not of to-morrow, but of this day, of this hour and this minute.

I must confess that these were encouraging, hopeful, words which ought to have gone a long way to allay the misgivings that arose because of the aversion of the Grand Trunk Pacific to the Moncton and Quebec section. We did not expect immediate instantaneous action. We did not expect that the work would be undertaken that moment nor even that hour or on that day, but we did think that possibly some little headway might have been made with the eastern division, as with the western division, before the lapse of a year. We discovered, however, very soon that although time does not wait, that truism does not necessarily or logically prove that we cannot wait. We found out in fact that we could wait and had to wait, and we discovered also that the government could wait and that the government could delay and procrastinate, and, may I say, humbug as well. In the first place, when the Grand Trunk Pacific, after this Act had passed parliament, ascertained that they could not conveniently finance for the five million dollar deposit required by its terms and that there were many other points with respect to which that contract might be altered to their advantage, that company did not hesitate to ask the government to wait, and the government did not decline to wait in order to make the alterations required. The contract was therefore held up for a year, and a session of parliament was called for the express purpose of modifying it in the interests of the Grand Trunk Pacific. This, Mr. Speaker, was a circumstance which was calculated to somewhat impair the confidence inspired by the Prime Minister's eloquent words, and which, proving as it did, how ready the government was to accede to the requests and yield to the interests of the Grand Trunk Pacific has had a great deal to do with the creation of the fears and the doubts of which I have spoken.

There are numerous other depressing circumstances, but before proceeding to discuss them, I think it is only fair to the government to state that they did at one time develop some little haste and celerity in connection with the eastern division. That haste was indeed a feverish haste so long as it lasted, but it did not last very long. The House will remember that the last parliament was dissolved on the 29th September and that writs were issued for a general election to take place on the 3rd November. This haste to which I have referred began simultaneously with the publishing of the proclamation dissolving the House and practically ended, so far as my constituency is concerned, on polling day. The first annual report of the Transcontinental Commission, which was laid on the table a few weeks ago, states that twelve surveying parties were organized for work in the province of New Brunswick. These were assembled at Moncton on the 27th September—two days before the dissolution of parliament—and simultaneously with the commencement of the campaign they were despatched to as many districts as possible most of them to those districts which contain the largest voting population. Although the Transcontinental Railway contract provided for the construction of this line of railway through the central part of New Brunswick by the shortest and most available route, and although, in the discussion of the Bill, the Prime Minister, the Minister of Finance and the present Minister of Railways and Canals intimated very plainly that it was proposed to construct this line in the province of New Brunswick from Edmundston to Moncton through the central and unsettled portion of the province, four of these survey parties were despatched, simultaneously with the beginning of the campaign, into territory which, if we are to believe the speeches made in this House by the gentlemen to whom I have referred, was never contemplated in connection with the location of this road.

In the county of York, which I have the honour to represent, the proceedings began with a rush and were carried on for a time at an extremely lively pace. In such a hasty way were these proceedings begun that one merchant in the city of Fredericton whose adhesion to the party of forgotten free trade and economy was not thought to be sufficiently assured, was required to sign the nomination paper of the government candidate at the same time that he accepted an order for a supply of goods for the commission, and was required to discuss at the same time the probability of future purchases at his establishment. To the city of Fredericton, the parties came in force, the surveyors, transit men, chain men, axe men, and other employees chased each other up and down the valley of the River St. John and moved through the city of Fredericton driving stakes in a conspicuous route through the city and along the valley of the St. John, always where they could be seen to the best advantage. And the voters of that fertile river valley who were thought not to be endowed with quite as much discernment as they proved themselves to possess, were expected already to see and hear the great trains of the transcontinental railway speeding past their doorways on their way to and from the beautiful city of Fredericton. Now, these proceedings lasted

just until the advent of polling day. The report I have already referred to states that the two parties, one sent to work up the valey of the St. John river from the city of Fredericton and the other down from Woodstock to Fredericton, met about the 1st of November, when they were promptly detailed to work on the back route. I believe that some work was done on other sections of the road which would be comprised within what might be properly called the river route from Chipman to the city of Fredericton and from Woodstock to Andover. But the report shows that no work was performed on any portion of what properly is the river route after the close of the year. In order that there may be no misunderstanding as to the position which was taken by the three members of the government to whom I have referred when the Bill was going through the House, as to the route that should be adopted, I desire to read the statements then made by these hon. gentlemen. In the first place, the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) said :

At the town of Edmundston that line will connect with the system of railways which now gives direct connection with St. John. From the town of Edmundston the road will proceed eastward to the town of Moncton, it is impossible to say at this moment by what route, perhaps by Chipman or in the vicinity of Chipman, at all events from this point it is impossible to locate any precise line or to say where it will be ultimately. Suffice it to say that we desire to have the best and shortest line between Lévis and Moncton.

Then the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) said :

The line upon which it is proposed to build this road to-day is practically one of the three main lines that were examined and reported upon and recommended by the surveyors for the Intercolonial Railway as far back as 1864.

It is true that that refers to the Sir Sandford Fleming lines, and it is true that one of Sir Sandford Fleming's lines touched the city of Fredericton, but it came through from Tobique and did not follow the valley of the St. John river. So, it is clear that the Minister of Finance did not have in his mind for one moment that this road should follow the valley of the St. John. We have also a statement from the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Emmerson) as follows :

I have received, within the last two or three days, a letter from an engineer who was engaged in that survey——

Referring to the survey, I believe, that was made by Mr. Davie, in 1890, for the Temiscouata Railway, in conjunction with the Grand Trunk Railway Company.

—confirming the statement I made, and this route does not follow down the valley of the St. John river, as stated by my hon. friend——

Referring to the hon. member for South Lanark (Mr. Haggart).

He has quoted from the report referred to showing that any line between Edmundston and Moncton must necessarily follow down the valley of the St. John, and he took us down the present location of the Canadian Pacific Railway to Woodstock, then he took us either by the back country or river route, following the curves of the river down to Fredericton. He could not reach Gibson by either route. No doubt these routes are excellent ones. I do not call them in question, but I do know these are not central routes, neither is a central route through the province of New Brunswick, neither is the shortest route, and neither of these routes which are condemned by Sir Sandford Fleming is the route to which I made reference, the one that was surveyed in 1890, the one that is capable of being on a line for this traffic and on a line for opening up a vast extent of rich country.

Then, speaking of the course of the railway across the centre of the province the Minister of Railways speaking of going down from Edmundston, said :

—going from thence down to Grand Falls and on through a section of country splendid for the building of a new railway, because I speak whereof I know, having travelled over every foot of it myself. . . . I have had occasion to travel through what is known as the Gaspereau valley, and I venture the assertion that it is one of the richest valleys, one of the most promising agricultural sections, one of the most beautiful spots that I have ever visited in the province of New Brunswick.

These extracts from 'Hansard' of 1903 show clearly that it was not in the mind of the government to construct this route down the valley of the St. John river at that time, at least. If further evidence were wanted it is found in the fact that a specific resolution was presented to the Railway Committee at the time this Bill was going through, providing for the construction of the route down the valley of the St. John and to the city of St. John and was voted down by the Liberal majority in this House, which I regret very much to say included one hon. gentleman who represented a constituency in whose behalf that claim was being pressed. And there is still further evidence in the fact that an amendment which was moved by the hon. member for King's and Albert (Mr. Fowler) providing for the construction of this line of railway by way of Fredericton was voted down by the Liberal majority in this House. I think, therefore, that what has taken place with reference to the surveys of the route in the province of New Brunswick cannot be expected to give much confidence to the people of the city of Fredericton and those along the valley of the River St. John.

Now I have referred to the first annual report of the Transcontinental Railway Commission which was laid on the table of the House a few weeks ago. I have read that with some care, if not with much satisfaction, and I desire to point out some facts and circumstances which I think show clearly that the St. John river route was not

given anything like a fair chance by the surveyors. In the first place, we find that there were twelve surveying parties organized in the province of New Brunswick and detailed to work in various places. Of these twelve parties only four worked at all on what is known as the river route; the other eight parties worked exclusively on the back route. Of the four parties who were engaged on the river route, I find that three devoted more than two-thirds of their time to the surveys on the central route, and only one party, No. 5, worked exclusively on the river route. That party worked from the 27th of September to the 1st of November, 26 days, from Woodstock down to the river, and from the 1st of November to the 22nd of December, 45 days, from Grand Falls to Andover on both sides of the river, making 71 days which that party devoted to the work on the river route, while the other three parties that did any work on that route, as I have already mentioned, gave two-thirds of their time to the back route. These three parties were parties No. 3, 4 and 11. I find that party No. 3 gave 78 days, from the 27th of September to the 30th of December, from Chipman to Fredericton, while they devoted 89 days from the 1st of January to the 13th of April, working from Tobique eastward on the back route, and from the 14th of May to the 30th of June, from Chipman to Armstrong's Brook, also on the back route, 41 days. So that party devoted 130 days to the back route and 78 days to the river route. Party No. 4 was occupied from 27th of September to the 1st of November from Fredericton up the river, 26 days. From the 1st of November to the 27th of November, 24 days, they worked from Edmundston to Grand Falls, which was common to both routes. Then from the Intercolonial from Boiestown west, 21 days, making 162 days which party No. 4 gave to the back route, and 26 days to the river route. Then party No. 11 worked from the 19th of October to the 30th of December, from Woodstock up the St. John river, 63 days, and was from the 1st of January to the 2nd of April, 80 days, in the Miramichi country.

Now the eight other parties devoted to the back route the following number of days: Party No 1, 197 days; party No. 2, 141 days; party No. 7, 131 days; party No. 8, 144 days; party No. 9, 174 days; party No. 10, 141 days; party No. 12, 36 days, or a total of 964 days. In addition, party No. 6 worked exclusively on the back route, but the number of days is not stated. But supposing the smallest number of days that appear in the figures I have stated as having been devoted to the back route namely, 131, we find that these eight parties devoted 1,095 days to the back route, which makes, with the addition of the 372 days which the other three parties devoted to the river route, a total of 1,467 days that were devoted to the back route against 238 days to the river route. Mr. Speaker, I think that shows pretty conclusively that the St. John River Valley route was not treated fairly by these surveying parties. I notice also in reading this report that but one alternative line was tried in connection with the St. John river route, namely, from the town of Grand Falls down to Andover on both sides of the river, while all through this report we find reference after reference to alternative surveys having been tried on the back route and attempts having been made to improve and shorten the different surveys. This report, I may say, bears date 30th of June last. Now in the description of the work of party No. 4 we find an illustration of what I have said:

> This party was disbanded on the 15th of April but reassembled on the 6th of June with instructions to start a survey from their old crossing of the Intercolonial Railway west of Boiestown and work westward, improving and shortening their first preliminary. They were still at work on the 30th.

The same with reference to party No. 6. They were reassembled on the 27th of June, and were sent into the same district with instructions to run further lines with a view of improving and shortening the line already run. Party No. 9—several alternative lines were also run by this party. And so on. Also party No. 11:

> They completed this survey about the end of the year, after which they proceeded to the summit of Lindsay brook on the Miramichi range, and from that point ran north easterly to the old Gulquack lakes with a view to determining whether there was any possibility of crossing this range further north with a lower summit.

So on through all this report, showing clearly that every attempt was made to get the shortest possible route in the centre or back country, but that practically no effort was made to shorten the line of the proposed river route. I have had the pleasure and the great privilege, Mr. Speaker, of reading the report of Sir Sandford Fleming of the surveys he conducted in the year 1864 to find a route for the Intercolonial Railway which was then projected, and I may say that I was very much impressed with the completeness and the fulness of the details which were furnished by Sir Sandford Fleming in the report which he presented as contrasted with the meagreness of the information which is contained in the reports of the Transcontinental Railway Commission that have thus far been brought down. For instance, all we have from the Transcontinental Railway Commission in regard to the distances found on these two routes in the province of New Brunswick is this statement from their interim report, page 59:

River Route.	Miles.
Moncton to Grand Falls, via Salmon river (near Chipman), Fredericton, Woodstock and Andover	249
Grand Falls to Edmundston	37
Edmundston to boundary between New Brunswick and Quebec	25
Boundary to junction with Parties District 'B'	22
Total distance	333

Back Route.	
Moncton to Grand Falls	232
Grand Falls to Edmundston	37
Edmundston to boundary between New Brunswick and Quebec	25
Boundary between junction with Parties District 'B'	316
Total distance	316

That is practically all we have in the reports which have come down to the present time from the Transcontinental Railway Commission in respect to the relative distances of these two suggested routes. Now, the House will observe that we have there two very long stretches of country, from Moncton to Grand Falls, via Salmon river, Fredericton, Woodstock and Andover, 249 miles, and by the back route, Moncton to Grand Falls, 232 miles, in reference to which we have nothing more than that very general statement. It seems to me to be very significant that as soon as Grand Falls is reached, which would be a point common to both routes, we have from Grand Falls to Edmundston 37 miles, from Edmundston to the boundary 25 miles and from the boundary to the junction with Parties District B 22 miles. It did occur to me in view of the fact that the relative merits of these two respective routes were the very question which these surveys were to determine, that we ought to have had something more detailed in respect to distances. For instance, I think we might at leaast have had the distance from Moncton to Chipman and from Chipman to Fredericton, the capital of the province, and an important city. We have no distance from Chipman to Fredericton, nor from Fredericton to Woodstock, another very important point, and nothing from Woodstock to Grand Falls. We have all these important sections grouped together in this general statement of 249 miles for the whole distance. I just wish to refer to another fact in connection with this report which I think adds something to the significance of the matter I am now alluding to. When we turn to district B where there were not two rival routes to be decided between we find a very different statement from that which we have in reference to the distances in the province of New Brunswick. This is the way that district B is set forth in the report.

TABLE OF ESTIMATED DISTANCES AND MILEAGE.

Party.	From.	To.	Engineer in charge.	Estimated distance.
				Miles.
1A	Quebec Boundary	St. Alexandre Road	A. F. Macallum	52·0
1	St. Alexandre Road	St. Philip Road	E. H. Pierce	23·5
2	St. Philip Road	St. Marcel	P. C. Talbot	40·5
3	St. Marcel	St. Philemon	C. Garnet	34·0
4	St. Philemon	St. Jean Chrysostôme	C. A. d'Abbadie	60·0
	St. Jean Chrysostôme	Boundary, Co. Portneuf	E. A. Hoare	16·0

It seems that the two portions were dealt with very differently by the respective parties in control. In view of the fact that there were these two rival routes in the province of New Brunswick it seems to me that there was far more necessity for setting out the different sections as the different parties found them than there would be in regard to the route from the New Brunswick line to the city of Quebec.

I want to refer for a moment, Mr. Speaker, to the manner in which Sir Sandford Fleming dealt with the line he ran in 1864 and to contrast his report with the statement I have just referred to. Sir Sandford Fleming's general line was from Rivière du Loup to Apohaqui. He divided the line into eight sections as follows:

	Miles.
Rivière du Loup to Trois Pistoles	24·5
Trois Pistoles to Green River Forks	32·7
Green River Forks to Restigouche	32·3
Restigouche to Tobique	45·4
Tobique to Keswick Summit	55·6
Keswick Summit to Little River	61·6
Little river to Coal creek	26·3
Coal creek to Apohaqui	31·6
Total	360·0

We have in reference to each one of these sections, in Sir Sandford Fleming's report, a detailed statement showing the distances, as I have already pointed out, and not only that, but the characteristics of the country traversed, the gradients and curvatures of each section and the advantages and disadvantages as they appeared to him in re-

spect to each section. Any one reading Sir Sanford Fleming's report can trace the line for himself and can form an intelligent conclusion as to the advantages and disadvantages of each section. For instance taking the section from Keswick Summit to Little River via Fredericton, this is the way Sir Sandford Fleming deals with it:

Keswick-Little River Section.

The line enters the Keswick Valley near the source of the west branch and continues within its limits until the River St. John is reached. Probably the east branch may offer a more favourable approach to the main valley of the Keswick river; but the season was too far advanced to admit of proper examination by this route being made.

From the ninth mile the line winds along the side of the river, occasionally crosses it and then continues on the flats until it finally reaches the north side of the River St. John at the twenty-ninth mile. For twenty miles up to this point the grades are remarkably favourable, in no case being over forty feet to the mile and generally under twenty feet to the mile.

From the mouth of the Keswick the line runs along the north bank of the River St. John almost on a dead level, crossing the River Nashwaaksis at the thirty-seventh mile. It reaches the Fredericton upper ferry at thirty-eight and a half miles and the lower ferry at the end of the thirty-ninth mile. About three-quarters of a mile further on the line arrives at the Nashwaak, an important river 500 feet wide, where it is crossed. Soon after crossing the Nashwaak the line leaves the banks of the St. John and, turning round Barker's Hill, follows an easterly direction with very favourable undulating grades to the Little River, where this section of the survey terminates. The bridging in this section is comparatively light. From the Keswick to the Little river it is believed that stone for all the bridges and culverts may be found readily. Material for ballast, although not of the best quality, can be had in abundance on this section. The timber for cross ties in this locality consists of spruce, hemlock and cedar.

Then, with regard to the Little River—Coal Creek section, he says :

Little River-Coal Creek Section.

From Little River the line continues in an easterly direction to the head of the Grand Lake navigation. For this distance the grades are undulating and favourable. Near the ninth mile the line crosses the Newcastle river and in this locality it passes close to several coal mines, where coal of fair quality crops out on the surface.

Then, generally, he says with reference to this line :

Generally.

The course taken by this line from the Rivière du Loup towards the southern part of New Brunswick is generally direct and at some distance from the eastern frontier of Maine. . . . . The line continues on a course towards the city of St. John, generally direct until Fredericton is reached. From Fredericton it was my object to find the shortest route to St. John on the east side of the river, the crossing of which is in some respects objectionable.

To reach St. John on the easterly side of the river it was found necessary on account of difficulties that could not be easily overcome to pass round by the head of Grand Lake, and in this direction, though rather circuitous, a favourable line was found to a point of connection at Apohaqui with the existing railway leading to St. John. This is probably the most direct line that can be had to the city.

Then he points out :

Fitness for Settlement.

From the River Miramichi on the line surveyed to the River St. John at Fredericton there is for the most part a fine growth of hardwood timber and judging from the portion already cleared along the lower part of the Keswick valley, the soil must be of a superior quality. For a distance of twenty-five miles northwest of Fredericton the country is already cleared and cultivated. Between the line surveyed from Fredericton to the head of Grand lake and the St. John river the land is low, but of excellent quality. From the Grand lake southerly and over the coal fields the soil is rather indifferent. Before reaching Apohaqui the line passes through the Valley of Studholme Mill stream ; here the soil is very good, producing annually excellent crops of potatoes, oats, buckwheat and hay.

He says further :

By crossing the river in the neighbourhood of Fredericton St. John may be reached much more directly by way of Oromocto and Douglas valley on a line carefully surveyed last summer by Mr. Burpee for the New Brunswick government. This would without question be the most direct central route from Canada to the harbour of St. John on the Atlantic seaboard.

He gives the grades on the different sections, the number of miles that are level, the number of miles that have a grade of twenty-one feet to the mile, the number of miles that have a grade of thirty-feet to the mile and so on, so that any one by referring to that survey could trace the line and the advantages and disadvantages of each section. Now, we have nothing of the kind in the reports of the Transcontinental Railway Commission; we have nothing further than the general statement to which I have referred and which fact is regarded as very suspicious by a great many of the friends of the St. John River Valley route. In addition to tracing the general line Sir Sanford Fleming gives no less than twelve alternative routes from Rivière du Loup to the European and North American Railway; six of which touch at the city of Fredricton. In refrence to the second alternative route he traces it in this way :

No. 2.—Rivière du Loup across to St. Basil, on River St. John by Madawaska valley, thence across the Grand river about ten miles from its outlet, passing about five miles east of the Grand Falls, crosses Tobique about fifteen miles from its mouth, thence across the Ottellock and Munquart rivers to the St. John at Hardwood creek, across the St. John and along to

connect with the existing railway to St. Andrews, four miles west of Woodstock.

The distances he gives are: Rivière du Loup to Newburg Junction, 223 miles; along the railway to the proposed western extension from St. John, 45 miles; along the surveyed line by Douglas valley to St. John, 82 miles; making the distance on that route, 350 miles, or if we add the 123 miles from Chaudiere Junction to River du Loup it gives 473 miles as the whole distance from Chaudière Junction to the point of intersection with the European and North American Railway.

Mr. EMMERSON. Is that point Apohaqui in all cases?

Mr. CROCKET. Yes; there are some to Moncton but they are not among those to which I am making reference. Then No. 3 is:

No. 3.—Rivière du Loup to Grand Falls across Salmon and Tobique rivers to headwaters of Munquart river, which it crosses and joins the line surveyed by Mr. Burpee at Fredericton.

Of this route he says:

This is the most direct line between Rivière du Loup and St. John which is likely to be found practicable. It crosses and re-crosses the air-line drawn from the extreme points to the northeasterly angle of Maine no less than twelve times, and does not diverge from it at any point more than ten miles. There is, it must be confessed, some little uncertainty with regard to the feasibility of this line between the forks of the Miramichi and the River Tobique, as well as between the Degele and Rivière du Loup, these sections having been imperfectly explored, but there is good reason to expect that a careful survey would result in showing that a line not unfavourable might be had through these sections as well as elsewhere. This line would require a very costly bridge over the St. John near Fredericton, another over the same river at the city of St. John.

This requirement of a bridge at Fredericton would not exist now because we have at the city of Fredericton a bridge which is owned by the government, which was erected in contemplation of the building of the Harvey—Salisbury branch and which would be available for the Transcontinental Railway. The distance from Rivière du Loup to Fredericton, is 235 miles; from Fredericton to St. John, by Oromocto and Douglas valley, 66 miles, a total of 301 miles from Rivière du Loup to St. John, or 424 miles from Chaudière Junction to St. John. Route No. 4 is from Rivière du Loup by Squatook lakes and Head Waters of Iroquois river to Green river lake, thence to the west branch of the Restigouche, along the Restigouche to the source of the Grand river, thence by Two Brooks, the River Tobique, the north branch of the Miramichi and Keswick valley to Fredericton. By this route the distance from Rivière du Loup to Fredericton is 260 miles; from Fredericton to St. John by Oromocto and Douglas valley, 66 miles; a total of 326 miles, or 449 miles from Chaudière to St. John. Route No. 5 is from Rivière du Loup by Island and Eagle lake, the south east branch of Toledi, the northwest branch of Green river, Moose valley, Gounamitz valley, Boston Brook, Two Brooks, north branch of the Miramichi and Keswick to Fredericton, a distance of 262 miles; from Fredericton to St. John by Oromocto and Douglas valley, 66 miles; a total from Rivière du Loup to St. John of 328 miles, and from Chaudiere Junction to St. John of 451 miles. Route No. 6 is identical with the line surveyed in 1864 by Sir Sandford Fleming. From Rivière du Loup to Fredericton and the head of Gravel lake to Apohaqui, the distance is 343 miles; from Apohaqui to St. John, 37 miles; a total of 380 miles; or 503 miles from Chaudière to St. John.

I have referred to these different routes, detailed by Sir Sandford Fleming, for the purpose of showing the thoroughness with which he prosecuted these surveys, and for the purpose also of showing that there were many other routes by which this road could be constructed than the two routes which are reported by the Transcontinental Commission. I think that the extracts I have read show that there is a very marked contrast between the manner in which the surveys were conducted to find a route for the Intercolonial Railway in 1863 or 1864, and the manner in which these surveys have been conducted by the Transcontinental Commission for the present proposed railway.

I have already referred to the great expedition which was exhibited during the election campaign of 1904 along the valley of the St. John river. In connection with that I wish to refer to an interview which was given to the St. John 'Telegraph' by the late lamented Mr. Wade, the Chairman of the Commission, during the excitement attending the general election. That interview I take from the 'Telegraph' of October 17, 1904:

F. B. Wade, chairman of the Commission said last night that in two months they should have sufficient information to be in a position to determine which of the two New Brunswick routes for the Grand Trunk Pacific will be the better.

We are making two surveys in New Brunswick between Grand Falls and Moncton—one down the St. John River valley to the Nashwaak, the other across country by way of Plasteric Rock to Boiestown. We know there is a good line down the river route and the matter of grades on the other route will determine its value. In two months from now we should have information sufficient to permit a decision as to the better New Brunswick route. We were much impressed with the St. John River Valley country, its resources and apparent prosperity. We found the parties in New Brunswick in full swing and doing good

work, and district engineer Dunn is highly pleased with the personnel of the parties.

Mr. Wade said good progress was being made with the survey in Quebec province. Under the Act, he added, construction work has to be commenced and carried on simultaneously along the whole line and this we are also applying to the surveying. It is probable that surveys will be sufficiently advanced that contracts will be given out on each end of the line—from Moncton west and Quebec east and Winnipeg east—in the early spring.

The friends of the St. John valley route have looked in vain in the reports which have thus far come from the Transcontinental Commission for any allusion to the splendid advantages with which Mr. Wade was so impressed at that time. Indeed, the reports practically ignore the St. John valley route, make no reference to its real advantages, whereas everything which it was possible to say in favour of the back route seems to have been said. Speaking of the alleged advantages of the so-called central route, the interim report, to which I have already referred, makes special mention of two. It refers to the value of the timber land between Tobique and the Miramichi, and also points out with some enthusiasm the excellence of that country as a game country. Mr. Dunn, the engineer of the district, speaks of it as the most magnificent game country to be found in the Dominion. These are put forward as two of the principal advantages of the so-called central route. It occurs to me that these very facts are very good reasons why the road should not be built through the central portion of the province, because the construction of that line would destroy the very value which the Commission speak of in these lumber lands, and I think it is a fact that there are no persons in the province of New Brunswick who are more strongly opposed to the construction of that line of railway through the central part of the province than the owners of these very lands, because of the fact that it would subject them to great danger from fire. Then it seems to me that the construction of a line of railway would also have a very detrimental effect upon this country as a game country. For some miles at least from the proposed line the construction of the railway would destroy the value of the country for hunting or game, so that the very reasons put forward by the Commission why the road should be constructed through that portion of the province are rather reasons why it should not.

According to the interview given to the St. John 'Telegraph,' by Mr. Wade, the late chairman of the Commission, in the month of October, during the election campaign, the Commission was in two months from that time to have sufficient information to enable them to make a decision as between these two routes. Well, Mr. Speaker, these two months have elapsed and seventeen others besides, and yet we are really further behind as regards the location of this road in the province of New Brunswick than when Mr. Wade gave his interview. In addition to Mr. Wade's statement we have the statement contained in the interim report of the commission dated March 31, 1905:

> The commission is now in possession of sufficient information to enable a decision to be arrived at as to whether the line via Fredericton and the St. John River valley or the one across the centre of the province should be adopted.

The commission also said:

> In this connection it is proposed to commence location surveys in districts A and B as soon as the local conditions will permit, probably the first week in May. It is expected that location surveys of districts A, B and F will be completed so that tenders may be called for in early autumn.

Then the present Minister of Railways (Mr. Emmerson)) said in Halifax in the month of August last, and I take this statement from a little Fredericton newspaper, the organ of the Minister of Railways.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have no organ.

Mr. CROCKET. Here is what it says:

> Since he had left Ottawa the final preliminary surveys had been completed and they will probably be considered next week. The location of the line will depend entirely on the report of the engineers. . . . It is hoped, he said, to ask for tenders for the construction by the end of the present year; so as to give the contractors an opportunity to start work early in the spring.

Now we have these three statements as to when we might expect the completion of the location work on the eastern division and when we might expect the construction work to begin. Notwithstanding, as I have said, we appear to be further behind to-day than we were eighteen months ago. After the interim report of the Railway Commission was published last session, there was quite an agitation in the province of New Brunswick on behalf of the St. John River valley route. Boards of trade, town councils and county councils passed resolutions and a very influential delegation was organized which came to Ottawa and pressed very strongly upon the government the choice of the river route. I know that the delegates who returned to Fredericton were very much encouraged with the belief that it would not be long before a decision was arrived at, and the general hope was that the decision would be in favour of the St. John Valley River route. Some time later a resurvey of both lines was ordered. That survey began last fall. The parties were assembled and set to work, but no sooner did they get fairly started than orders came from Ottawa calling them off. The work was suspended, the parties were disbanded towards the end

of December, and practically nothing has been done since.

Mr. EMMERSON. They stopped at Christmas, did they not?

Mr. CROCKET. Yes. I believe the reason assigned for the suspension of the work was that it could not be advantageously carried on during the winter. That statement, however, is accepted with very considerable doubt, because the work on the first survey was prosecuted during the previous winter, which was, in the words of the commission in their interim report, the most rigorous winter with the heaviest snow fall in the memory of living man, whereas the winter which has just elapsed is known to have been the mildest and most favourable experienced in New Brunswick for many years. It is not, therefore, unreasonable that people should be very apprehensive with respect to this matter in view of the very sudden and mysterious suspension of the work at that time. We have in the ordering of a resurvey, very strong confirmation of our suspicions as regards the bona fides of the original surveys. We are told by the Commission in its report at page 21, the following:

> In taking up this part of the work——

That refers to the alternative lines through the province of New Brunswick.

> —the commissioners decided to have an exhaustive and minute examination made of this country, and to acquire and present such information as would definitely settle and determine these conflicting contentions. We deem it best to ascertain beyond doubt which was right and which was wrong in order that the public minds would be set at rest.
>
> To this end we directed our engineers to make the most exhaustive and careful explorations and surveys, so that having before them all that has been written or said they would be able to make a complete and decisive report.

Now, the Commission stated that these were the instructions with respect to the first survey. Notwithstanding this, it has been deemed necessary to order re-surveys. It seems to me that this fact proves either that the surveying parties did not heed the instructions which they received, or that the re-survey was entirely unnecessary. The re-survey certainly, can be justified only upon the ground that the first survey was unreliable or inadequate. And that is my impression, and, I may say, it is the general impression in the river counties of the province of New Brunswick. The people believe that these surveys were not honest, genuine surveys made with the view to bring before the government the real advantage of the river valley route.

The House will remember that only a few days ago I asked the government as to when the location work would be completed on the eastern division and I received for answer from the Minister of Railways and Canals the statement that it was impossible at present to say. That statement I may say was very disappointing, in view of the high expectations that the people must have had if they accepted the assurances that were made in the first place by the chairman of the commission by the commission in the report, and more recently in Halifax by the Minister of Railways himself.

Now, while this is the condition in respect to the section from Quebec to Moncton, what has been taking place with reference to the section from Quebec to Winnipeg ? I believe that the government has at the present moment under consideration the awarding of two contracts, one for a section of 245 miles from Winnipeg east, and another for a section of 150 miles from Quebec west. That is a fact which certainly causes the people of New Brunswick to be somewhat suspicious in regard to the real intentions of the government as to this Quebec-Moncton scheme, more especially in view of the fact that the letting of these contracts is, as I shall show, a direct violation of the statute in that regard. Section 10 of the amended Act of 1904, says:

> The work of construction on the eastern division of the National Transcontinental Railway shall be commenced, as nearly as may be, simultaneously at Moncton, at Quebec, at the point at or near either North Bay or Nipissing Junction, and at Winnipeg, and shall be carried on westward from Moncton, eastward and westward from Quebec, eastward and westward from the point of junction aforesaid, and eastward from Winnipeg, in such manner that the section between Winnipeg and Quebec, and that between Quebec and Moncton shall be completed as nearly as practicable at the same time.

The contracts that are about to be let provide that these sections covered by the contracts must be completed not later than September 1, 1907. And this notwithstanding that we have the statement of the Minister of Railways made within the past few days as to the Quebec-Moncton section, that it is impossible to say when even the surveys will be completed. In this connection I wish to refer to a statement made by the Prime Minister in his speech on the occasion of the introduction of this Bill in the session of 1903, as to the importance of parliament standing by its solemn pledge. At this time the right hon. gentleman was referring to what he termed a gross breach of faith by parliament in reference to the abandonment of the projected Harvey-Salisbury route, via the city of Fredericton. I may point out that the faith of parliament was not, in point of fact, pledged to that scheme as it is to the present project. We in the province of New Brunswick expected that route to be built, as I believed it was expected in the province of Nova Scotia. The Bill passed this House, but unfortunately for the city of Fredericton it was defeated in the Senate. But, as the

quotation that I am to give from the Prime Minister will apply in the present instance to a statute which was passed by both the Senate and House of Commons and is now a law in full force and effect, it is clear that the Prime Minister's words will have more force, a great deal, than with reference to the matter of which he was then speaking:

No, the policy which we propose, apart from all other considerations may be taken as a step, tardy though it be, to implement the solemn pledge which was made in 1885. I confess, that perhaps this of itself would not be a sufficient reason, though in one respect it ought to be a sufficient reason, because if there is one thing as to which the parliament of Canada ought to be firm, it ought to be that the solemn word of parliament is to be sacred and that every promise made by parliament should be implemented.

Now, I would ask the Prime Minister and the members of this government to bear that statement in mind in connection with what is at present going on in relation to the construction of the eastern division, more especially the letting of contracts on the Quebec-Winnipeg section at a time when even the location work has not been completed in the province of New Brunswick.

Now whether this road is ultimately to be built or not, we will suffer a material injustice by reason of the delay that has taken place up to the present time if the work goes forward on the other division. I need not point out to this House the effect of the construction and operation of the section from Quebec to Winnipeg upon the future business of the section from Quebec to Moncton, if the construction of the latter line is to be very much delayed. We all know that when traffic becomes settled or established in a certain channel, it is practically impossible to divert it into any other. I would like to confirm that statement by the authority of the Minister of Railways. In his speech on the Transcontinental Railway Bill in the session of 1903, he said :

We will have to push forward this railway scheme, it would be criminal not to do so. The hon. gentleman from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) sounded the alarm when he said that unless we do something now, traffic will seek other channels, and we all know that when once traffic has found a certain channel it is almost impossible to divert it into others.

I would ask the Minister of Railways to bear in mind that statement in connection with what has been doing with respect to the Winnipeg-Quebec section, and what has not been doing in respect to the Quebec-Moncton section. Now, Mr. Speaker, just a word with reference to the result of the surveys that have been made I had the honour to ask the government a few days ago what portion of the proposed railway from Winnipeg to Quebec had been surveyed and located, and the right hon. the Prime Minister in his answer gave a statement of the distance from Chaudière Junction to Moncton as 514 miles, by the central route in New Brunswick, and 531 miles by the river route. Now that information was very diappointing, and must have been especially so to those who placed much faith in the predictions that were made by the Prime Minister and other members of his government when the Bill was being put through in the session of 1903, because it showed very unfortunately that the projected line would be eighteen miles longer than the Intercolonial between the same points. It will be remembered that the Prime Minister, in introducing the Bill, estimated that a saving of distance would be effected between the two points of from 120 to 140 miles. I need not weary the House by reading the statement which was made, though I have it here. The Finance Minister was a little more moderate than the Prime Minister, he estimated it at 110 miles, but to be on the safe side he put it at 100 miles. The present Minister of Railways went so far as to declare that a saving in distance would be effected of some 200 miles.

Mr. EMMERSON. Oh, no.

Mr. CROCKET. I will read the statement of the Prime Minister as it appears on column 7662 of 'Hansard' for 1903 :

The Intercolonial Railway makes a long loop towards the north, it describes almost a complete semicircle, the distance covered is no less than 488 miles. We have to follow the line of the state of Maine and following that line we believe we can bridge the distance between Moncton and Lévis by from 120 to 140 miles.

Then by way of excusing what was suggested as a very serious blunder on the part of the government who constructed the Intercolonial, the Prime Minister said :

The Intercolonial was placed where it was for political reasons. Certainly those who built that line, those who conceived it, those who planned it, never contemplated at the time that the day would come when it would be used for transcontinental transportation, yet, scarcely had the last rail been put down, scarcely had a train commenced to run upon it when it was discovered that the long, tortuous meanders of the line were a serious impediment to trade, even to the comparatively small trade of the Canada of that time.

The Finance Minister's statement, in that connection, was this :

Taking the air line and allowing 35 miles for curvature we would have 380 miles as against 496 miles. I propose, however, to treat the mileage of that road as being in round numbers 400 miles.

Now, I have the statement of the Minister of Railways and I will have to ask the House to excuse me for the little delay I have caused by the search for it. I understood the minister to shake his head as if to dissent from the statement I made. This is the statement which he made in the session of 1903, as I have it from 'Hansard:'

Now, this must be borne in mind that by the Intercolonial Railway from Chaudière to Moncton the distance is 488 miles or nearly

that, and to the city of St. John by the Intercolonial is 89 miles. I was informed only very recently by an official of the Intercolonial Railway that the actual mileage from Moncton to St. John is 90 miles. That makes the whole distance from Chaudière to the city of St. John by way of Moncton and Intercolonial Railway 588 miles. So if the route projected is followed, the central route through the province of New Brunswick by way of Chipman to St. John you have a saving of distance of at least 200 miles in round numbers, bringing the winter seaport at present used nearer by that distance to the city of Quebec than it is now by way of the Intercolonial Railway.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, but my hon. friend made a statement in respect to the distance between Chaudière Junction and Moncton. There is a vast difference between that and going around by Moncton to St. John.

Mr. CROCKET. If I made that statement I stand corrected; I should not have said that. But we have, notwithstanding, the statement that in the then judgment of the Minister of Railways a saving in the distance would be effected of 200 miles between Quebec and the city of St. John.

Mr. EMMERSON. Precisely, between Chaudière Junction and the city of St. John. Comparing the distance by way of the Intercolonial Railway via Moncton with a line from Chaudière direct through the province to Chipman and thence to St. John there would be that saving, but between Chaudière and Moncton by the Intercolonial Railway and Chaudière and Moncton by the proposed Transcontinental Railway there would only be a difference of 110 miles.

Mr. STOCKTON. Did you say there would be a saving of 200 miles ?

Mr. EMMERSON. By going all the way around.

Mr. CROCKET. That would make a saving of 110 miles in the judgment of the Minister of Railways and Canals between Chaudière and Moncton.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is what I figured it at.

Mr. CROCKET. I think that in view of these predictions the country must feel very much disappointed—those at any rate who are interested in the Quebec-Moncton section—at the result of the surveys as it has been disclosed of late. We realize that this can very readily be made a pretext by the government if they are desirous of acceding to the wishes and yielding to the interests of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company by abandoning this section of the road. I sincerely hope, however, that they will not do so and I believe that the people of the maritime provinces will insist that the government implement, in the words of the Prime Minister, the solemn pledge that this parliament has given in connection with the construction of this line of railway. I think it will be conceded upon all hands that the assent of the representatives and of the people of the maritime province to that measure at all was secured upon the faith of the undertaking that the road would be built not only to Quebec but that it would be carried from that point eastward to Moncton. It does seem, however, that the government are up against a little difficulty in this matter, because of the greater length of that projected road over the present line of the Intercolonial Railway between the same points. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, very respectfully to the government that the proper way out of that difficulty is to do now what the government should have done in the session of 1903—make St. John the terminus and objective point of that line and test then the Transcontinental and the Intercolonial Railway from that point. It will be found then that if the road were constructed from Chaudière, down the St. John River Valley to the city of Fredericton and from the city of Fredericton to the city of St. John, a saving would be effected of 85 miles over the Intercolonial Railway, which, taking into consideration the superior grades on the new route, would be a most important matter and one, which, I think, would justify the government fully in carrying out its pledge to the people of the maritime provinces to construct this section, only that St. John should be the terminus and objective point.

Just a few words before closing in reference to the report of Mr. Lumsden, the engineer of the commission. In the report which the Minister of Railways brought down Mr. Lumsden states :

> The back route running from Moncton westerly across the province in the vicinity of Boiestown, Plaster Rock and Grand Falls to Edmundston is by the preliminary survey lines seventeen miles shorter than the river route, running from Moncton via Chipman, Fredericton, Woodstock and Grand Falls up the valley of the St. John river to Edmundston, the section between Grand Falls and Edmundston being common to both routes. On the back route the final location line will be shorter than the preliminary by at least six miles, whereas the location will lengthen the river route five miles, making the back route some twenty-eight miles shorter than the river route. The difference in bridging and minor structures will be very great. The river route crosses the St. John river twice, calling for 3,000 feet of bridge, and as it also crosses all the lateral drainage of the country close to the St. John river, all the minor structures will be larger and more costly than on the back line. The earth work on the back route will be considerably lighter than on the river route.
>
> On the whole I am of the opinion that the difference in cost between the two lines will not be less than $1,500,000. The difference in the operating value of the two lines is as follows :
>
> (Based on the Intercolonial Railway trains mile cost for 1903 of $97.65 per train mile.) For

minor savings in distance such as here considered, it can be shown that the cost per train mile is 56 per cent of the average cost per train mile. Hence we get from each day train over the route : 28 miles x 2 x 5 per cent of $96.65 x 313 days equals $9,585 per daily train per year.

I assume that 5 per cent is a typographical error for 56 per cent.

For ten trains daily (the usual assumption in such comparison) it gives us $95,850.11 per year, which sum capitalized at 4 per cent equals $2,396,252.75 ; to which we must add the estimated savings in first cost of $1,500,000, making a total value of the back route over the river route, $3,896,252.75.

Should a pusher grade be made use of from the Tobique river easterly a further saving in distance of say 13 miles would be effected, but the expenses of operating would be of course considerably increased.

3. The back route opens up a new country well adapted for settlement and at present without transportation facilities.

4. The river route is already supplied with railway facilities, and will be connected with the Transcontinental Railway at a number of points.

5. I therefore have no hesitataion in recommending the adoption of the back route with a rate of grade of 0·4 per cent equals 21·1 feet per mile rising eastward, 0·06 per cent equals 31·68 feet per mile rising westerly as the preferable line.

Now, I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I consider that the engineer of the Commission has been most unfair to the river route in the report I have just read. The first matter I want to call attention to is to the basis upon which he tests the value of these two lines which have the same grade, and the only difference in which is that a distance of 28 miles is saved, according to Mr. Lumsden, by the back route over the river route. The test which he applies is the train mile cost of the Intercolonial which is 97·65 cents. I submit in the first place that that is most unfair in view of the statement that appears in the interim report made by the assistant engineer of the commission, Mr. Butler, who is the present Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals. Mr. Butler at page 22 of the interim report points out that the cost of operation of this new line will be very materially less than the present cost of the operation of the Intercolonial, and I sincerely trust that it will be so if the road is ever built. Mr. Butler makes a calculation in which he says that the same motive power that will haul 660 tons on the Intercolonial, will, by the line secured haul 1,260 tons going east and 990 tons going west. Now, taking that both ways it would be a saving of 41 per cent in the motive power according to Mr. Butler's figures. The same percentage is derived from the figures which Mr. Butler gives in reference to the cost of hauling a given quantity of pay tons over the Intercolonial as compared with the proposed Transcontinental Railway. Mr. Butler says :

It will thus be seen that the annual operating cost to the Intercolonial Railway for the said quantity of freight is $3,016,711.21, while that of the Transcontinental will only be $1,782,-518.72, a saving in favour of the Transcontinental of $1,237,192.47, which capitalized at four per cent per annum equals $30,854,812.25.

That as I stated would show a saving of 41 per cent in the cost of the operation of the Transcontinental Railroad by reason of its superior grades as compared with the cost of the operation of the Intercolonial. And yet the chief engineer, Mr. Lumsden, when he comes to test the relative value of the back route and the river route applies the Intercolonial test, which, from the quotations I have made from the interim report, it would appear would be just 41 per cent too much. I say, therefore, in the first place that from that $95,850 which Mr. Lumsden says will be the cost of the operating expenses of the 28 miles, we are entitled to have deducted 41 per cent which would bring the cost of operation down to about $56,000 instead of the $95,850 which was there given and which would reduce the capitalization by practically $1,000,000. That is the first point in respect to which the chief engineer it seems to me is very unfair to the St. John River Valley route. But to my mind where he is more decidely unfair is, that while he points out in this report that the operation expenses of the river route would be $95,850 more than the operation of the central route, he ignores entirely the difference in the earning capacity of the two routes. Mr. Lumsden knows, as I assume all these engineers and surveyors must know, and as the people of the province of New Brunswick know, that a railway built down the St. John River Valley would serve 15 or 20 times more people than would a railroad through the back route. Mr. Lumsden's own statement is that with respect to the back route it opens up a new country. We know in the province of New Brunswick that there are not a thousand people living between the Tobique and Chipman.

Mr. CARVELL. There are not any.

Mr. CROCKET. The report says there are some.

Mr. CARVELL. Between the head of the Miramichi and Chipman there is not one.

Mr. CROCKET. The statement of my hon. friend (Mr. Carvell) is that there is not a soul living in that district between the head of the Tobique and Chipman. I think it is not unfair to say that between Grand Falls and Moncton there would not be 2,000 people within reach of that railroad from whom local traffic could be expected, whereas, down the valley of the St. John river we have such important places as Andover, Woodstock, and Fredericton, and all the intervening towns and villages along that river which is probably the best settled and the most flourishing section of

the whole province of New Brunswick, and furnishing a population of probably between 60,000 and 75,000 people who would be in more or less direct touch with this railway. And yet Mr. Lumsden takes care to point out to the government in this report the increased cost of the operation of that road on a most excessive basis, and never mentions the fact, which one would think would occur to the mind of an engineer who was disposed to make a fair report, that there would be an immense increased traffic secured by the construction of the road down the St. John River Valley over that of the so-called central route. There can be no question, I think that the section from Quebec to Moncton would be largely dependent for its earnings on local traffic; I think railway men will concede that proposition; and if the facts which I have stated—and I think they ought to be sufficient for the purpose—establish that the earning capacity of the railway by the St. John River Valley route would be from fifteen to twenty times more than by the back route, then I submit that this statement is one of the very strongest arguments that can be put forward in behalf of the St. John River Valley route. Why, Mr. Speaker, the road would have practically no local traffic if it went by the back route, whereas if it went down the St. John Valley its earnings would not only wipe out the operating expenses, but would yield the only profit that would be earned on the whole line.

Another point with reference to which the chief engineer is manifestly unfair is in his estimate of the increased cost of the river route over that of the central route, which he puts at $1,500,000; and yet we have in the interim report of the 31st March last this statement as to the cost of the road :

> We cannot estimate accurately the cost of the proposed line from Moncton to Chaudière, but we think that we are safe in stating that it will not exceed an average of $33,000 per mile, and we hope to very considerably reduce this estimate.

And that would necessarily include all the bridges and culverts. Now, twenty-eight times $33,000 does not make $1,000,000; and yet we have $1,500,000 put down as the cost of the St. John River Valley route over the central route. These two facts of themselves show pretty clearly that the St. John River Valley route has not been given anything like a square deal in the location of this road. Then, there is this further remark by Mr. Lumsden, which I submit is an absolute mis-statement :

> The river route is already supplied with railway facilities and will be connected with the Transcontinental Railway at a number of points.

Now, it must have been known to all the members of these surveying parties who travelled up and down the St. John river that there are no railway facilities between Fredericton and Woodstock along the valley of the St. John river, a distance of sixty-two miles. There is a line of railway, the Gibson branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway, which runs from Fredericton to the mouth of the Keswick, about nine miles on the eastern side of the river, and then runs through the back country and on to Woodstock. That is the only railway which touches the River St. John between Fredericton and Woodstock. He further states that the river route will be connected with the Transcontinental Railway at a number of points. I wish in the first place to point out the significance of these words : 'Will be connected with the Transcontinental Railway at a number of points,' rather indicating that Mr. Lumsden, from some cause or other, had already made up his mind that that road, if it were to be constructed at all, would be constructed through the central portion of the province. There are only two points at which that road would be connected with the valley of the St. John river. There would be, in the first place, a connection with the Tobique Valley Railway, running down to the mouth of the Tobique, at its junction with the St. John river. There is only one other point at which there would be a connection in the whole length of this line from Grand Falls to Moncton, that would be at the point of intersection of this road, if it is constructed by the back route, with the Intercolonial Railway, at a point thirty or forty miles from Fredericton. And yet the engineer states that the river route will be connected with the Transcontinental Railway at a number of points.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what I have pointed out—and it is all capable of verification—is, I think, sufficient to destroy entirely the value of this recommendation of Mr. Lumsden, the chief engineer of the commission. The delegation on behalf of the St. John River Valley route that were heard by the government in the month of July or August last, were, I believe, given to understand that the route to be selected would depend on the report of the engineers. That is the statement that has been made from the beginning. I do not want unnecessarily to question the honesty or genuineness of any recommendations or reports that have been given or that may be given by the engineers; but I must say that there is great suspicion that these engineers have been primed and kinked in favour of the back route, and in the interest of the province of Nova Scotia. I need not ask the House to accept my statement as to that. I can refer the House to the Minister of Railways and to the statement to that effect made by his newspaper organ in the city of Fredericton, one of the most pap-hungry and sycophantic papers published in the Dominion of Canada. So strong is the feeling in the province of New Brunswick with respect to the genu-

ineness of these surveys that even that journal, which would swallow almost anything in the interest of the government, made the statement that the surveyors and surveying parties were kinked and primed in favour of the river route. If this matter again comes before the government for the purpose of choosing between the two routes, I ask that these matters to which I have referred be taken into consideration and the fact noted that the reports which so far have been made have ignored entirely the advantages which the river route possesses and exaggerated those possessed by the central route.

In conclusion, I sincerely hope that a very short time will show there is no substantial foundation for the apprehension that exists in New Brunswick with respect to the intention of the government in connection with this eastern division. The solemn word and faith of parliament is pledged to put this road through, and if it be abandoned, its abandonment will be regarded as one of the grossest breaches of faith ever perpetrated on the people by any parliament or government in this country.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Carleton, N.B.) At this late hour I think it would be an infliction on hon. members to ask them to listen to me for any time at all, but the matter brought up is so important to the people of my province that I consider it my duty to reply to some extent to the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. Crocket), as well as to give my own views as briefly as possible. I regret exceedingly the standpoint from which my hon. friend has chosen to discuss this question. When I saw that he was to bring this matter up and learned from himself a week ago that he intended speaking upon it, I looked forward with pleasurable anticipation to an honest effort on his part to induce the government to look at this matter from the same point of view as he and I do. But judging from the speech we have just heard I fear that he would not shed many tears if the government should never build a road at all through the province of New Brunswick. He certainly closed his remarks by imploring the government to build the road down to the port of St. John, but I think it is a fair inference to draw from his argument that in his heart he has not forgotten the speeches which he made during the late election campaign when he told the people of New Brunswick that the government had no intention of building the railway through that province and that the whole eastern section was purely a delusion and a fraud from beginning to end. Why that was the stock argument of the hon. gentleman's party all through the province of New Brunswick. I can assure you, Sir, that no proposition ever created such interest and excitement throughout that province as this did during the late election, this proposition to build the eastern section. The discussion that then took place in the maritime provinces will be within the memory of most hon. gentlemen in this House, more particularly because of certain events which transpired in the province of New Brunswick of more than ordinary importance. The whole political situation, from the Liberal standpoint, was considerably disturbed.

Mr. CROCKET. Am I to understand my hon. friend to say that I made the statement in the county of York that the government would never build this eastern division at all?

Mr. CARVELL. The argument of the opposition candidates during the last election all over the province of New Brunswick was that the road would never be built.

Mr. CROCKET. I can only speak for myself. No such argument was advanced in the county of York. We were all apprehensive with respect to the river route and the position of the government in that regard, but no suggestion was ever made that the road would never be built through the province of New Brunswick at all.

Mr. CARVELL. I must accept the hon. gentleman's statement, but let him go into the reading room and read the St. John 'Sun' during the recent election campaign, or any other Conservative paper, and he will find what the contention of his party then was. Who does not remember the cartoon in the 'Daily Telegraph' entitled the Portland Cow, in which the cow was depicted standing across the boundary line, feeding on Canadian soil and being milked by Uncle Sam from Portland. The argument put forward by the Tory party everywhere was that the road would never be built. I have heard that prophecy in this House and it will no doubt be heard again. And I repeat that a reasonable inference to be drawn from the speech made by my hon. friend to-night is that the road may never be built and that in that event he will not shed any tears.

Mr. CROCKET. I venture to say that you will if it is not built.

Mr. CARVELL. Beyond doubt this is a matter of importance to me personally. It is important to the constituents I represent, to the provinces of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and I contend to the whole Dominion. I accept the statement made by the government at the inception of this transaction as an honest, upright and frank statement made in the best of faith. I believe it was the intention of the government and of every patriotic Liberal in Canada then, as it is to-day, that this road should be built from ocean to ocean, entirely on Canadian soil and have its terminals at Canadian ports. As long as the government is presided over by the right hon. gen-

tleman who guide its destinies, I shall require better evidence than the insinuations and arguments of the hon. gentleman opposite before I will believe that it will deviate one jot or tittle from the contract it made in 1904. It comes with very bad grace from any hon. gentleman to accuse the government of any intention to abandon the eastern section because it has not commenced that section as soon as he hoped it would. I am sorry it did not begin that construction sooner, but I can give some of the reasons—in fact I can give all the reasons—why it has not yet been begun. I myself may as well plead guilty to being one of those who are to blame for the delay, and I have no apology to make for the course I took. But before I go into that part of the case, I may say that I have always understood, since I have taken the trouble to look up railway matters, that modern railway transportation was a question of curvatures and grades rather than distances. Therefore, in considering this matter I have taken considerable time and trouble to look up the question of grades in the different roads which run to the Atlantic ocean. I find that if we take the Grand Trunk Railway to Portland the summit has an elevation of 1,377 feet. I am not in a position to state to-night just what the percentage of grades on the Grand Trunk Railway is, but I do know that many of them must be 1 per cent.

Mr. EMMERSON. Some over that.

Mr. CARVELL. I am informed that some are over that. This must have an important bearing when we attempt to discuss the carrying powers of the Grand Trunk Railway as compared with those of the new transcontinental line. If we take the Canadian Pacific Railway going across the state of Maine, we find that they have a maximum summit of 1,854 feet from Montreal to St. John ; and, it is within the knowledge of every hon. gentleman here that there are dozens and dozens of 1 per cent grades on that line, and I think I am safe in saying that a large number run to 1¼ per cent. If we take the proposed route from Quebec to the St. John river, we find a maximum elevation of 1,500 feet. But as the route crosses the St. Lawrence river at a very great height, I think I am safe in saying that we might consider 1,350 feet to be the elevation of the high lands between the St. Lawrence river and the St. John river. Now this 1,350 feet must be climbed ; and if we want to make this route short we must make the grades heavy, if we want to make the grades light we must extend the road. The standard according to the government has been 4-10 per cent, or not more than 21·1 feet per mile. That is the reason the road has been lengthened. And I am willing to admit that it has been lengthened more than the advocates of the road thought would be needed when the discussions took place in 1903-04. These elevations had not been taken into account though I presume there were figures in existence which would give some idea of what the elevations would be. But there are the facts you have an elevation of 1,350 feet, and with maximum grades of 21 feet to the mile, it takes a certain number of miles to get over the grades. But I understand that it is impossible to build a road with every inch at the maximum grade, therefore it must be longer. But the road must overcome the summit of 1,350 feet in order to reach from the St. Lawrence to the St. John, and there must be hills en route to be overcome as well. In that way, I am willing to agree with my hon. friend from York to some extent, although I cannot agree with him altogether. It seems to me to be a preposterous thing to say that after the elections in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia have been run on this issue, the building of the road should be turned down because the Grand Trunk Pacific do not want to build it. Does the hon. gentleman mean to insinuate that the Grand Trunk Pacific or the old Grand Trunk is the government of this country ? Does he mean to say that that this country is going to break its word given to the maritime provinces, and not go on with the building of this road ? It seems to me that it comes with poor grace from the hon. gentleman to say that nothing will be done at all. They had better wait at least one more year to see what the government will do before they make these wholesale charges of bad faith on the part of the administration. I have here a number of altitudes of the Intercolonial, but it is unnecessary to quote them all. Suffice it to say that, in going over the Intercolonial looking up the altitudes of Canada, there is not a division —and I doubt if there is a section—on the whole line of the Intercolonial which has not grades of at least 1 per cent, and in some places 1¼ per cent. The principal of the important altitudes I may give to the House as it may be a matter of interest to the reading public. I will start where the Intercolonial leaves the St. Lawrence. Before that, I have not taken the trouble to ascertain the figures, though I think there are a number of 1 per cent grades on the route down the St. Lawrence :

	Elevation.	Distance. Miles.
River Ouelle to St. Alexandre..	381	25
Trois Pistoles to St. Fabien.. ..	382	22
Rimouski to Kempt station.. ..	662	33
Nepisiguit river to Bartibogue..	431	20
Barnaby river to Rogerville.. ..	250	12
Dorchester to Evans station.. ..	207	5
Little Forks to Spring Hill junction..	203	5
Oxford Junction to Folleigh station..	524	22
Truro to Summit near Brookfield	121	5

These are only a few of the important summits that have to be climbed by the Intercolonial Railway. And my hon. friend in making his argument as to the fact that this road is longer than our friends supposed it would be at the inception, failed altogether to read the report of Mr. Butler which I think he should have read in all fairness, because he quoted from the interim report exclusively. He might have told the reporters to take in the whole interim report in his speech and then we should have had it in 'Hansard.' Well, I do not like to read reports, and will not trouble the House with any reading of this report of Mr. Butler's, though I think it is a very admirable one and a credit to the gentleman who made it, showing his ability as a railway man, and also the attention he must have given to the question. But Mr. Butler in this report tells us that, were the grades of the Intercolonial reduced to the grades on this new road through New Brunswick, even by the back route—which, I shall show later on is not the proper route—the Intercolonial would be lengthened by 100 miles. Therefore, instead of the two roads being practically the same length, it will be found when the new road is ready, it will be for all practical purposes 100 miles shorter than the Intercolonial from Quebec to Moncton.

Mr. LENNOX. If you lengthen the Intercolonial ?

Mr. CARVELL. It does not matter. If you reduce the grades of the Intercolonial to the standard of the new road, you will have to lengthen the Intercolonial by 100 miles ; or, if you make the grades of the new road the same as the Intercolonial, you will have it, 100 miles shorter than the Intercolonial is. Therefore, the carrying capacity of this road will be greater than that of the Intercolonial, because either it will be 100 miles less or because it will have superior grades at the same distance. I think that, in all fairness, my hon. friend (Mr. Crocket) should have quoted that part of the interim report for it is there in plain English and has a very important bearing upon the question under discussion to-night. And this, if for no other reason, would be enough to justify the government in building this road, in fact would compel them to build it. For, Mr. Speaker, the most important matter in Canadian politics to-day is the transportation question. Anything which will facilitate the transportation of our western goods to the east must be of sufficient importance to be discussed in this House. This question is of so much importance that we must discuss it. If we can get a road that is, for all practical purposes, 100 miles shorter than the Intercolonial we shall accomplish wonders in the transportation problem of Canada.

Now, I am sorry that the report which my hon. friend has read here to-night has been brought to the attention of the people of Canada, for the simple reason that my hon. friend knows—and it is known to nearly every hon. gentleman in this House, and by very many in the country—that this report will never be acted upon ; and for this simple reason, as stated by my hon. friend, that resurveys have been ordered and will be completed. And just here I might tell him that, while the Minister of Railways could not tell him when the surveys will be completed, if he had changed his question so as to ask when these surveys will be commenced, the minister could have told him that they would be commenced about the 1st day of May.

I am not revealing any secrets, it is a matter known to the public and it must be known to my hon. friend, that these surveys will be resumed about the 1st day of May, and will be pushed forward with reasonable speed, and the two routes through New Brunswick will be accurately and I believe honestly surveyed, and will be reported upon, and when that report comes down I believe that an honest decision will be made, and the road will be built by that route which should be adopted from an engineering standpoint. Well, while I never had the privilege of seeing this report until it was laid on the table last Friday, yet from the interim report which was referred to and which was brought down in April of last year, and from information I have received from different quarters, and which was indeed current talk around the city, I came to the conclusion that the surveys through New Brunswick, while I do not say they were dishonest—I won't go so far as that, and I am going to make no comments on these reports because, if I did, I might say something uncomplimentary to somebody—but I do say that they were very incomplete, and I think it is a great pity that when Mr. Lumsden made that report, he did it upon such meagre information. However, Mr. Lumsden was asked to make a report, and he submitted, I presume, the best report he could after getting all the information possible. But, Sir, from my knowledge of the country and from the knowledge which many other people in the province of New Brunswick possess, from the common knowledge of the country, when we read that interim report we saw that great error in judgment had been committed by somebody ; and I at once, in conjunction with Senator Thompson and Senator King, went to the Premier and told him that we believed an injustice had been done, and he told us at once that if that were the case everything would be held up until the matter could be investigated, and he assured us that nothing but justice would be meted out to us. Then the matter was published in the maritime provinces, and the result was that a delegation came here on the 1st

of August, and as a result of that delegation the commissioners made a trip to New Brunswick, and during that trip—I presume it was decided before that—but it was announced then that re-surveys would be made. They were resumed, and were continued until Christmas when they were suspended, and are to be taken up again about the 1st of May. My hon. friend finds fault because these surveys were not prosecuted in the winter time. I think if there is anything for which the commissioners are entitled to credit it is the fact they did not push the surveys through in the winter time. It is true that many of my friends were disappointed, I was disappointed myself, that the surveys were not completed earlier. But I feel that this is a matter of too much importance to be put through in the winter time when it is impossible to tell exactly what conditions we may find. The object is to make a location survey, to be able to tell the amount of rock to be cut as nearly as possible, to tell the amount of earth to be removed, the grades to be encountered, and everything in fact that will put the commission in a position to make an accurate report, exactly the same report which the hon. gentleman claims was made by Sir Sanford Fleming. I think I can assure him that when these surveys are completed the report will be exactly as the circumstances demand. That is the whole reason why these surveys have not been completed yet, and I think when my hon. friend thinks it over he will realize that he has been a little unfair in chastising the government the way he has done to-night.

Mr. CROCKET. For not doing what you say now they should have done ?

Mr. CARVELL. For not doing what they could not do successfully in the winter time.

Mr. STOCKTON. Which they intended to do the winter before last.

Mr. EMMERSON. Those were only preliminary surveys.

Mr. CARVELL. When I got hold of this interim report and certain information which evidently was consolidated in this report, I came to the conclusion there was something wrong with the surveys down the St. John river. From my knowledge of the St. John river I knew that there ought not to be any grades at all from Grand Falls to Fredericton. I found a map laid on the table about one year ago in which the elevations were given at different points in the province of New Brunswick, and by that map I found that the difference in the elevations between the head of Grand Falls and the city of Fredericton was about 400 feet. I found the only elevation between Fredericton and Chipman, was about 100 feet. From that I came to the conclusion that in the interim report and Mr. Butler's report they were basing the carrying capacity of these two routes as exactly the same, and from my knowledge of the country I knew is was impossible. I have travelled over practically every rod of the distance of this road from the Tobique river and some distance down the Miramichi, I have travelled over the mountains, I do not mean to say that they are equal to the province of New Brunswick knew that Rocky mountains, but they do look like the Rocky mountains, as compared with St. John valley : I knew and everybody in the there was something wrong, because all of these reports were based and figured out as though the two routes were exactly the same so far as grades were concerned. I never knew where this information was obtained until the time the Transcontinental Railway Commissioners went through New Brunswick when one of the engineers who had a hand in the work along the St. John river, and especially from Fredericton north, assured us that it was impossible to buildl a road along the St. John river without climbing hills 100 feet to 150 feet in height. I was amazed, and I asked him if he, in his surveys, found hills 100 to 150 feet high, and he said he had. Then the matter was plain, it was perfectly plain to my mind why, in all these reports, it was assumed that these two routes would be exactly the same thing as to the question of grades, because if they found hills 150 feet high, that would mean a grade seven miles long in order to climb it and five miles long of a descent on the other side. Now I am in a position to tell this House and this country—and I do not think I am revealing anything which ought not to be revealed, I presume the information is in the hands of the department, but I do not care whether it is or not—I may tell you that this road has been surveyed from Grand Falls to Fredericton in the months of October, November and December, with the exception of about 24 miles north of Woodstock, and the statement which we made to the government in August was more than verified, because the only grade in all of that distance of 137 miles is a hill of 30 feet somewhere below Woodstock. Now you cannot find a road in America 137 miles long with as great a carrying capacity as this road will have down the St. John river if built according to the latest surveys. It is true that 24 miles norh of Woodstock have not been surveyed, but from my knowledge of the country I do not think there will be any greater difficulties in this 24 miles than in the other 100 miles. What do we find on the other route ? When you leave Grand Falls the first hill you climb is going out the basin of the St. John river, you have a hill a little over 300 feet in height.

You then go down into the Salmon river. You have to climb out of the Salmon river over a hill 400 feet in height. Then you have to go down to the Tobique river and you have to climb out of the Tobique river

over a hill 750 to 800 feet in height. Then you strike the Miramichi where you encounter great engineering difficulties. The distance from the Miramichi to the Tobique is about 13 miles but the engineers have had to extend the route to a distance of 38 miles in order to reach the desired point. That would mean that you would have an elevation of 21·1 feet per mile, but according to the instructions given in this interim report it was to be a compensated 4-10ths per cent grade which means that on every curve the grade must be reduced 4-10ths of one per cent, which, going eastward, would make the road level on the curves with a maximum 4-10ths grade all the rest of the way to the summit with a maximum 6 degree curvature and that means that the road will probably extend two or three miles further. If you add these hills together—and I am not taking into account all the smaller ones because you are going right across country from one river to another and the whole distance is practically a succession of river basins and watersheds—you have about 1,500 feet of hill to climb or as great an engineering difficulty as that of getting from the St. Lawrence into the basin of the St. John. I ask this House, I ask the people of Canada to consider whether it is a reasonable proposition to climb a hill 1,500 feet high when it is not necessary to do it, when you can carry the road for 137 miles through a country which has no hills in it but which is a little down hill all the way. The grade will be somewhere about two feet or a little better to the mile or less than 1-10th of one per cent going west and it will be a little down hill going east. The ground which I have taken in all my discussions with the different officials, the ground which I have taken and the ground which I intend to take in the future is that it is not a question of whether this road is going to open up new country or not,—I will discuss that a little later on—it is not a question altogether whether it is going to satisfy or accommodate a certain number of people, although that is a very important question, it is not a question of anything else except a question of engineering because this road is a link in a great transcontinental system, this road is to be a road by which the products of the west are going to be carried to the sea-board and I never heard in the first discussion in parliament or in the country that this road was regarded as anything else than a purely transportation proposition. Therefore, my position is and always has been that this road should be located according to the route over which the greatest amount of traffic can be carried for a given amount of money. I think that is an eminently fair proposition and if this route is honestly decided upon, no matter which way it goes, I will be content and I will find no fault with the location. But, I want it to be honestly located. I want the evidence upon which the location is to be based to be honest and while not casting any reflection upon what has taken place in the past, I propose, as far as in me lies, to see that this evidence shall be pretty nearly honest and if this evidence is obtained in that way then I will have no fault to find with the decision. I just want to say to the government, not in the spirit of lecturing in any way and in no hostile spirit at all, that I do think that when this information is obtained it should be given to the public and that we should have a chance to discuss it as well as the commissioners, engineers and officials of the government. This may be, perhaps, asking a good deal but I think it is only a fair proposition when we come to consider the immense importance which it is to the people of the province of New Brunswick; not only to the people of the province of New Brunswick but to the people of Canada as a whole, because one of the hardest things we can possibly do in this world is to divert trade into an unnatural channel and if we have not facilities for carrying this trade equal to what they have on other roads I fear that we will make a dismal failure of the attempt in future. When you come to consider the distance from Quebec to Portland, which route is our great competitor, via the Grand Trunk you will remember that it is 317 miles and that in that 317 miles there is a hill 1,377 feet high to climb. I have no knowledge, though I presume we could find it out, as to how much you would have to lengthen the Grand Trunk road between Quebec and Portland to get grades equal to the grades going over the summit from the St. Lawrence to the St. John, but I think I am fair in assuming you would have to lengthen it 50 miles to make it equal to the new road, so that the distance is not 317 miles in comparison with that of the Transcontinental Railway but it is probably nearer 400 miles. Now, what do we find on the other side? Just here I might as well take up a question, which is no doubt one of some delicacy, one which might lead to some discussion and perhaps to some opposition, but nevertheless I will discuss this thing not from the standpoint of a New Brunswicker, nor from the standpoint of a Nova Scotian, but I will try to discuss it purely from the standpoint of a Canadian. I say the object of this road is to get to Moncton because that is the contract, that is the bond, and it must not be departed from one inch. I was very much surprised this evening to hear from my hon. friend from York, N.B. (Mr. Crocket), suggest that this parliament should go back upon its contract, go back upon the arrangement made with the people of Nova Scotia, go back upon everything that it had done in good faith and say that it will enter into a new scheme and make St. John the terminus and objective point of this road. I perhaps have as much respect for the city

of St. John as my hon. friend has, but I have no reason to ask the government to stultify itself in the eyes of the people of Canada and I think I voice the sentiment of the right thinking people in the country when I say, that, the government having made a contract with the people of Nova Scotia, ought to keep to it in every respect and carry it out to the letter. Therefor, I do say that this contract should be carried out. I also insist that it is not the prime object of this road to get to Halifax or St. John, but I say that the prime object is to get Canadian products over Canadian territary and to Canadian seaports. I do not care which seaport it is ; is must be a Canadian seaport and I think there is no question whatever, and our Nova Scotia friends might as well face it, that no matter how hard engineers may attempt, no matter how hard politicians may attempt to divert the traffic from St. John the geographical conditions of the country are such that St. John in the end must get a very large share of the heavy freight traffic of that road. On the other hand I hope to live to see the day, and I hope to see it very soon,—and I believe that as soon as this road is completed and perhaps before we will see it—when a fast line of steamships will be plying from Liverpool to Canada and I have no hesitation in saying that the only natural and proper terminus for this steamship line on the Atlantic ocean is the port of Halifax. Therefore, this road must be built to Moncton in order to accommodate the mails, it must be built through in order to accommodate the passenger traffic and it must go to Halifax in order to carry fast and perishable freight. At the same time I think it is only fair to assume that the heavy freight of the country will find the shortest and cheapest means of getting to the sea-board and it does not make any difference how we may arrange it, it does not make any difference what our wishes may be, this freight will find its natural outlet and that natural outlet must be the port of St. John.

Let us see what the distances are. I regret to say that in the distances which are given in the discussion to-night, and also in the newspaper press, the objective points are taken as Quebec to Moncton, whereas I contend the objective points should be Quebec and tidewater, no matter where it is. And nobody claims that Moncton is at the head of tidewater, although of course they do have a tide there. I say in all seriousness that it was a fair proposition to say that the people of Nova Scotia were entitled to whatever benefits would accrue from this transcontinental line, just as much as were the people of Quebec and New Brunswick, and the people of the west. I say it was only reasonable and proper that Moncton should be the objective point of this railroad. But Moncton was never put forward as a seaport although our friends of the opposition sought to make much merriment of the point in discussing this question as though we were trying to get to Moncton as a seaport. I have no knowledge which I presume is not in the possession of many hon. gentlemen present, but I can tell the House that while it is true that the figures given by the Prime Minister a few days ago in answer to a question by the hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket) show that both the back route and the St. John Valley route had a greater mileage than the Intercolonial Railway, as a matter of fact such is not the case. I am sorry that when the material for this answer was furnished for the Prime Minister we were not given the results of the recent survey. I do not know what they are, but I do know that the answers given by the Prime Minister were the result of the surveys as given in the interim report of March, 1905, because the figures given by the Prime Minister come out exactly to a mile as they appear in the interim report.

Mr. CROCKET. Then, that was not what was asked for.

Mr. CARVELL. I have no opinion to express upon that; I merely state the fact.

Mr. STOCKTON. You don't suggest that the Prime Minister was not telling the truth.

Mr. CARVELL. No, Sir. I suggest that the Prime Minister furnished the information exactly as it was given to him. I don't say that the re-surveys will change it to any great extent, but I do say they will change it to some extent and I will point out why. We are told by the Prime Minister that the distance given here is from Quebec to Moncton, but the figures given in the interim report are from St. John Chysostôme to Moncton and so there would be a difference there of six miles which would have to be deducted, because when you take the distance of the Intercolonial Railway you are taking the distance from Lévis to Moncton and not the distance from the Quebec bridge to Moncton, the Quebec bridge being six miles further away than is Lévis. Therefore, in comparing the two you have to take the distance of the Transcontinental from Lévis to Moncton and there must be six miles deducted at once. I have heard it said—I am not giving this as authoritative—but I make the prediction that at one place in the province of Quebec a saving of ten or eleven miles will be made from the figures as contained in the interim report. I have also been told that there are some savings made on the back route in the province of New Brunswick, and I know as a matter of fact that instead of an addition of five or six miles as contained in Mr. Lumsden's report to the river route, there will be a reduction of from eight to ten miles. I will tell you why I know that. The figures give the distance from Quebec

to the boundary as 220 miles; from the boundary to Grand Falls, 62 miles; and from Chipman to Moncton, 59 miles; which distances are common to both these routes. That makes a total of 341 miles common to both routes. If you take that from 531 miles the total distance given, we have 190 miles as the distance from Grand Falls to Chipman via the river route and 173 miles as the distance from Grand Falls to Chipman via the back route. Now, it is within the knowledge of every man who ever lived on the River St. John what the distances are down that river. For the benefit of hon. gentlemen who have not been along there, I will make the statement that at no point along that river can the route vary more than ten or twenty rods either the one way or the other. The banks are high on both sides, with, at different places a small interval never more than fifteen or twenty rods wide. Then again you cannot change the distances of the route down the St. John river more than a mile or two, I don't care who surveys it, how it is surveyed or when it is surveyed. I am now giving the distances furnished on the map of the province of New Brunswick, I am giving the distances furnished by the Crown Lands Department which has surveyed every inch of it; I am giving the distances known to every traveller in the province of New Brunswick and they are as follows :

	Miles.
Grand Falls to Andover..	24
Andover to Woodstock..	50
Woodstock to Fredericton..	62

There cannot be any question about the distances between these three points. I admit there may be some little difference of perhaps a mile or two in the distance from Fredericton to Chipman, but this has been surveyed so many times (there is a carriage road from one end to the other) that there cannot be a difference of more than three or four miles no matter how it is surveyed, especially when we remember that according to the plan laid before this House there is only an elevation of 100 feet to be overcome between these two points which practically means that you can make that grade in ten or twelve miles by using less than the maximum grade. I am placing the distance from Fredericton to Chipman at forty-five miles although it may vary a mile or two either way. Taking forty-five miles as the distance from Fredericton to Chipman, that makes 181 miles from Grand Falls to Chipman. There can be no doubt about the accuracy of this, whereas the interim report says that this distance is 190 miles. There are nine miles that must be taken out of the river route no matter how it is surveyed or by whom. Then again, I have no doubt whatever that by making a slight change in the vicinty of Chipman, a saving of from four to six miles can easily be made. Of course that is only my opinion, but I have no hesitation in giving it as my opinion and I am satisfied that when the reports of the survey come in you will find that there will be a saving of from four to six miles at that point. Therefore we will have to make a reduction of from thirteen to fourteen miles on the river route as compared with the distances given in the interim report. What the saving will be on the back route I do not know. Now, Sir, when we consider that the difference in distance between these two routes is so very slight, I believe we were more than justified in asking the government for a re-survey, and I firmly believe that the result of this re-survey will more than justify all the expense and all the trouble which the government has gone to in the matter. I believe, when these surveys are all brought in that from a purely engineering standpoint the government or the commission can come to no other conclusion but that the route down the St. John river is the only route which can be properly accepted. Now, Sir, my hon. friend quoted from Mr. Butler's report where he claimed that the amount of motive power which would haul 660 tons on the Intercolonial between these two points would haul 1,260 tons by the new route with its four-tenth grades. If that be true why didn't they go on and tell us how much the carrying capacity of that same motive power would be down the St. John river; because, Sir, you must remember that when you have reached the St. John river twenty-five miles out of Edmundston you have got a down grade from there to Fredericton, and practically the same thing on to Chipman.

I am not an engineer, and therefore I am not in a position to give these quantities. I can say, however, that I saw a letter from the manager of one of the important American railroads not long ago in which he stated that where their road had a maximum of only three-tenths they were able to haul ninety loaded cars without any difficulty. Therefore I think it is fair to assume that the carrying capacity of this same motive power down the St. John valley instead of being forty-two cars, as stated by Mr. Butler, would be from 75 to 100, or all that it would be possible successfully to couple behind one engine.

I want to give a few figures of the respective distances of the different routes—not necessarily with a view of showing the superiority of St. John, because that is not my object. I may say there is no burning desire on my part to do more for St. John than I ought to do, and I think I can say the same of all the politicians on our side. You must remember that St. John is a very unknown quantity; it is Liberal at one election and Conservative at another. The people of St. John have no politics except their port, and just here I may say that they have done more towards improving their

port than any other city in the Dominion of Canada of the same population. They have spent over a million dollars of their own money in building wharfs and other port facilities. But when you show the people of St. John that anything is going to injure their port, you are pretty sure to rouse their opposition. Who does not remember that in 1900, when the Hon. Mr. Blair went there and made his notable fight, placed his back against the wall and told the people that he was going to stand by the port, the people believed him and gave him a majority of one thousand, but four years afterwards when they got afraid of the Portland howl they gave his opponent a majority of more than a thousand. I am saying that St. John is entitled to justice and no more, and that is nothing more than any one can ask.

With respect to the distances, while I have not the actual distance from Quebec to Portland, if you reduce the grades of the Grand Trunk down to those of the new Transcontinental Road, it must be in the vicinity of 400 miles. By the shortest route the distance from Quebec to St. John is about 475 miles; that would be down the St. John river and utilizing the Canadian Pacific Railway. The distance from Quebec to St. John via Chipman would be 536 miles; from Quebec to St. John via Moncton, by the river route, 608 miles; from Quebec to St. John, by the central route, 598 miles, assuming the figures of the interim report to be correct, which I contend would be materially reduced. The distance from Quebec to Halifax via Moncton by the central route is 694 miles. Now, the distance from Quebec to St. John via Moncton and the Intercolonial Railway is 578 miles, but from Quebec to St. John direct, by the shortest route, the distance is 478 miles, a saving of 100 miles compared with the Intercolonial Railway route, while 100 miles can be saved on account of the superior grades of the new railway over those of the Intercolonial. So that if you take the common sense route, you can for all practical purposes reduce the distance from Quebec to St. John by 200 miles and make the distance so close to the distance from Quebec to Portland that the difference would not be worth considering. On the other hand, if it is contended that the freight must be hauled to Moncton and then back to St. John, you are throwing away all the advantages which geography gives us. If you contend that it must go to Halifax, you are asking people to perform an impossibility, or to do what the ordinarly logic of business will not allow them to do.

My hon. friend has dwelt upon everything necessary to show the advantages of the river route. It must be remembered that the eastern section of this railway is to be a through line for only about five months in the year, while it must be maintained and operated for the other seven months; and if it is constructed through the woods and over the mountains which I have described, where is the money going to come from to pay for its operation during the summer months when there will be no through business? On the other hand, if it is built down the valley of the St. John river, it will pass through a settled country, with a population which my hon. friend puts at 75,000, the finest agricultural portion of New Brunswick and as fine a portion as can be found anywhere in Canada. It will pass through a settled country, inhabited by a wealthy people, people who will travel, and who will furnish enough local traffic from the beginning to make the road a paying proposition during the seven months of the year when it is not used for through freight.

There are some other features of this question that I would have liked to have taken up; but the hour is so late that I have perhaps said enough. I feel anxious about this matter. It is a matter of immense importance to the province of New Brunswick and to all the people of Canada, and I sincerely hope that when the question of the route is decided, it will be decided only after giving due notice, with every consideration and every endeavour to get perfect surveys and to adopt the best route from an engineering standpoint, so that no trouble will arise in the future.

Before I close I want to say a word as to the commission. There has been considerable rather heated discussion about the commission, and perhaps some hard things have been said; but I want to add publicly my testimony to the manner in which this question has been treated by the commission since the first day of August; as to anything before that time I know nothing. I am speaking of it since the commission was reorganized, with Mr. Parent as chairman, and Mr. McIsaac added to the commission. In saying this I am not saying anything against the other two members of the commission, because under the arrangement made, they have to consider the other two sections, and practically the eastern section is not under their control. But so far as Mr. McIsaac and Mr. Parent are concerned, we have received from them nothing but kindness, nothing but an attempt to make this survey as perfect as possible, and I believe that Mr. McIsaac, in whose jurisdiction this portion of the road is very largely, is actuated solely by a desire to make the survey as thorough, honest and practical as can be. I feel it my duty to him to make this public acknowledgement of his acts. He has done everything possible in order that a conclusion best in the public interest may be arrived at; and when the matter is decided, I am confident that our people will feel satisfied that the best decision has been come to.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that the commissioners are divided up into different sections and that each one has a particular section under his control instead of giving his attention to the whole ?

Mr. CARVELL. The eastern section is looked after very largely by Mr. McIsaac, and I think that is the most natural and sensible course to adopt. I only say this because when I go to the commission, I am referred to Mr. McIsaac. I believe that is what any four gentlemen would do under the circumstances. But of course when it comes to a question of making a decision, I would not for a moment say that every commissioner does not take his full share of responsibility and give his full share of attention to the matter to be decided, and give it as much attention as any particular section concerning which he might have more particular knowledge.

Mr. LENNOX. What does the hon. gentleman mean by saying that the other commissioners would have to sign cheques and reports and things of that kind ?

Mr. CARVELL. I never mentioned it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I so understood him. I would like to ask the other question. He says it would extend the rail distance to Portland to 400 miles if the grades were reduced to four-tenths per cent. Does he found that statement on any survey ?

Mr. CARVELL. I do not.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How can you tell without a survey ?

Mr. CARVELL. I tried to state explicitly that I had not the information but will tell the hon. gentleman on what I base my conclusion. He will find it stated by the commissioners in their interim report that the road from Quebec to the head waters of the St. John river would have to be lengthened some 50 or 60 miles in order to reduce it from one per cent grade down to four-tenths. And I assume that as the elevation to be overcome on the Grand Trunk Railway is the same as it is from the St. Lawrence to St. John you would have to extend the Grand Trunk Railway the same distance as you would have to extend the new road from a one per cent grade down to a four-tenth grade.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It is a mere matter of surmise.

Mr. CARVELL. I think it is a pretty correct surmise.

Mr. COSTIGAN. I would like to say a few words upon the subject but as the hour is late, I would move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT—TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY CONTRACTS.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN I would like to ask whether or not the contracts, to which I have referred two or three times, have yet been awarded and if not what is the reason of the delay. There are rumors flying about, whether founded on fact or not, I do not know. It is said that the commissioners are equally divided on the question. It would appear, from statements we have heard this evening, that this subject might be entirely within the jurisdiction of one commissioner, but apparently that view has not been adopted in this instance. It is said that the commissioners are equally divided, and referred the matter to the cabinet, and that the cabinet are divided eight against six. Is there any possibility of an agreement or will the jury be locked up over night ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Like the Supreme Court of the United States, eight to seven.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I accept the correction of the hon. minister—eight to seven. If that is so, it is a very interesting question as to when the cabinet will be able to arrive at a conclusion and as to what is the important matter which is delaying their determination. I would suppose that the question would be one of the lowest tender. I would suppose that within a period of four weeks—because these tenders have been in about four weeks—it would have been possible for the commissioners in the first instance—and if not for them for the cabinet—in a week or ten days to come to a conclusion as to who is the lowest tenderer. Apparently, however, there are some considerations other than the amount of the tender, which have to be weighed by the administration in this matter. Is there any information to be vouchsafed to-night on this question ? And if it cannot be given to-night, when is it likely that the cabinet will be good enough to make up their minds —or what they may be pleased to call their minds—on the subject. It seems to me remarkable that after a lapse of four or five weeks, no decision can be come to either by the commissioners or by the cabinet. Perhaps I am in error and the contracts have been awarded. But if so, it would be only courteous, after the many inquiries we have made, that information to that effect would be afforded by some member of the cabinet. Will the Minister of Agriculture or the Minister of Marine and Fisheries or the Minister of Railways, or whoever is leading the House at this moment, be good enough to give any information available for that purpose.

Mr. FISHER. I am afraid I cannot gratify the curiosity of the hon. gentleman,

and he will have to content himself for the present with pinning his faith to what he sees in the newspapers or what he hears in different ways. I have no doubt, however, that the First Minister will shortly give him the information he desires and give it in authoritative form.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The First Minister pays attention to what is in the newspapers because he dismissed one of his cabinet some three years ago on newspaper reports. Might I ask what business the government will have up to-morrow ?

Mr. FISHER. One or two government Bills and then go into Supply.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What Bills and what Supply ?

Mr. FISHER. The Minister of Justice will take up one of his Bills and the Bill about Inland Revenue will be taken up. Then we shall take supply for the Interior Department.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the Minister of Marine and Fisheries any information about that belated report of his department.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have it in my hand and with the permission of the House will lay it on the table.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.15 a.m., Tuesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, April 10, 1906.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 102) respecting the Schomberg and Aurora Railway Company. — Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 103) respecting the Quebec and Lake Huron Company.—Mr. Lachance.

Bill (No. 104) to incorporate the Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Railway Company.—Mr. Zimmerman.

Bill (No. 105) to incorporate the Sterling Life Assurance Company.—Mr. Lennox.

Bill (No. 106) respecting applications for patents of Henry Wurts, Jr.—Mr. Belcourt.

Bill (No. 107) respecting the Erie Ontario Power Company.—Mr. German.

C. F. CALDWELL—COAL MINING LANDS.

Mr. J. D. REID. Has the hon. the Minister of the Interior any further information respecting the question I put him the other day ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Mr. C. F. Caldwell has submitted to the Department of the Interior applications from some two hundred and ten of his clients for permission to purchase coal mining lands in the province of Alberta, and he has paid into the department the sum of $1,050 to cover the fee of $5 prescribed by the regulations in connection with each of these applications.

A separate application has been filed in each case, and each of the applications is for the maximum area of coal mining lands which can be reserved for or acquired by an applicant under the regulations, namely, 320 acres.

An acknowledgment has been sent to Mr. Caldwell of the receipt of the fees paid by him, and a separate communication will be sent to him in connection with each of the applications submitted as soon as they have been entered and reported upon. If it is found that the lands are not covered by prior applications, Mr. Caldwell's client will be given thirty days within which to pay the first instalment of the purchase price, (one-quarter) of the lands, and if payment of this amount is not made within the period given, the applications will then be dealt with as having absolutely lapsed.

So long as an applicant for coal mining lands confines his application to 320 acres there is nothing to prevent his submitting any number of applications on behalf of others for a like privilege, provided the prescribed fees are paid and the regulations otherwise complied with. There is nothing in the records or within the knowledge of this department to indicate who Mr. Caldwell's clients are beyond their names.

TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY CONTRACTS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would like to repeat to my right hon. friend, the First Minister, the question I put last night in his absence. We understand that tenders for the building of the eastern division of the Transcontinental Railway were received some four or five weeks ago; also that the commissioners were equally divided in opinion as to which should be accepted, and that the matter has been referred to the cabinet. And if one might trust rumour, it is said that the cabinet also are divided in opinion. But of course we cannot expect any confidence from my right hon. friend regarding that. Have any of the contracts been let, and if not when are we likely to be given information on the subject ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). My hon. friend has not done me justice. I am quite willing to give him all the information in my power.

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

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend will know that in good time.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there much of a lobby ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, that is confined to the other side of the House just now. The facts are these. A report was received from the commissioners last Thursday and the council could not take that matter into consideration until last Saturday. My hon. friend knows well that during the session it is difficult for the council to consider matters of importance except on Saturdays. On the days when the House is sitting, it is almost impossible for us to to take up matters of importance and dispose of them. Naturally, the council dealt with that question the first day and will deal with it again not later than Thursday next, when it will be disposed of, and I shall then be glad to give every information to my hon. friend as well as bring down the papers and lay them on the table.

NATURALIZATION LAWS OF THE EMPIRE.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is the First Minister able to inform me whether any copies are available of the return brought down respecting naturalization ? I moved for an order asking for a memo. from the Department of Justice as to the naturalization laws of the empire. Those laws are collected, with a very exhaustive memo. on the whole subject, in a report to the House of Commons of the United Kingdom. That was brought down in printed shape. Are there any more of these copies available, or will it be necessary to print some part of this for the use of those members interested in the subject ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am quite sure we can supply a few copies yet and will give an answer to-morrow.

INSURANCE COMPANIES BONDS.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. I beg to inquire from the Minister of Inland Revenue regarding the acceptance by his department of the bonds of insurance companies from persons doing business with the government, who had excise establishments and are called upon to furnish security to the government. In this case, I understand, security has been accepted by the government in the shape of bonds of foreign insurance companies. I beg to refer the minister to the interrogation that took place in this House on May 19, 1904, when the Minister of Finance was asked regarding a similar matter, that is, the acceptance by the government at that time of the security bonds of foreign corporations by public officers, and among other answers he gave to the questions put to him, the Minister of Finance replied :

The United States Act does not specially exclude foreign companies, but the effect is as stated.

The effect was pointed out by the minister that so far back as 1894, the American government had excluded from their departments the use of all foreign insurance security bonds and confined themselves strictly to the acceptance of their own companies bonds and declined to accept either British or Canadian securities. The minister went on to state :

After reasonable notice the government will confine its guarantee business to British and Canadian companies.

Later on in the same session, in reply to the member for West Toronto, the late E. F. Clarke, the minister, upon the matter being again called to his attention, stated :

Instructions have been given the various departments that so soon as the existing policies in foreign companies expire they will not be renewed, but the business will then be given to British and Canadian companies. No special date has been fixed because the policies will not expire upon an even date, but when the policies do expire that will be the method adopted.

That was on the 21st of July, 1904. Now, I am informed that the Department of Inland Revenue has sent out circulars to the various collectors at the several ports stating that the bonds of foreign insurance companies of this nature, namely, the United States Fidelity and Guarantee Company, would be accepted. The only other foreign insurance company doing business in Canada is the American Surety Company, whereas, there are some five or six Canadian companies. Now, I have not seen the circulars to which I referred, but I have a letter from the secretary of the Department of Inland Revenue to the same effect.

Ottawa, April 7, 1906.

D. W. Alexander, Esq.,
Manager for Canada,
The London Guarantee and Accident Company, Limited, Toronto, Ontario.

Dear Sir,—Referring to your communication of the 6th instant, I beg to inform you that the United States Fidelity Company is authorized to do business in Canada, and the department cannot prevent any excise establishment from doing business with any company so authorized. The department, however, has not the placing of those bonds, nor has it anything to do with them beyond seeing that proper security is given.

Yours truly,
WM. HIMSWORTH.

Now, surely as the department has the power of either accepting or declining these bonds, I would like to ask the minister if it is the intention to adopt in his department the rule laid down by the Minister of Finance when he said that the acceptance of all security bonds by the government would thereafter be confined to British and

Canadian companies as soon as the policies then current expired. That statement was made in May, 1904, and all these policies must, in the ordinary course of business, have long since expired.

Hon. WILLIAM TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue). If my hon. friend will permit me to answer his question to-morrow I will be able to do so more fully, after investigating the subject to which he refers. I may say that my understanding, so far as I have one on the question, is that all bonds accepted by the department for its officers were from Canadian or British companies. I understood further that it was the policy of the department to have all the bonds given by outside parties to the department, made in Canadian and British companies also. But just how far such orders have been given, and how far they have been carried out, I am at the present moment unable to say. I will be pleased to answer my hon. friend more fully to-morrow.

SUPPLY—SHIPPING INTERESTS OF BRITISH COLUMBIA.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) moved that the House go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. R. G. MACPHERSON (Vancouver City). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I desire to bring the attention of the government and the House to a matter which I consider of first rate importance that is the question of further aid to navigation on the west coast of Vancouver island in the province of British Columbia. It is within the memory of every hon. member of this House that three very sad accidents occurred on the west coast of Vancouver island in the month of December last year and January of the present year. Prior to the advent of the Canadian Pacific Railway in British Columbia the shipping interest of British Columbia was a very small item indeed. Twenty years ago the only shipping plying in the waters adjacent to British Columbia was the Pacific Coast Steamship Company, trading from San Francisco to the ports of Victoria, New Westminster and Puget Sound. Also the Canadian Pacific Navigation Company ran coasters, and there was a trade between the city of Nanaimo and San Francisco carried on by the colliers. The advent of the Canadian Pacific Railway has introduced a new era so far as shipping is concerned. From the city of Vancouver which I have the honour of representing in this House, we have to-day the Canadian Pacific Railway liners, the 'Empress of Indian,' the 'Empress of China' and the 'Empress of Japan'; also the 'Tartar,' the 'Athenian' and the 'Montcalm.' These boats ply to and from Vancouver and Victoria and the orient. Also we have the Union Steamship line of boats which ply between the Australian Commonwealth and the cities of Victoria and Vancouver. I speak of the 'Aorangi,' 'Miowera,' and 'Moana,' any one of which boats are of five or six thousand tons burden. Next month we are to have established the Allan Line of steamers running from New Zealand ports to Victoria and Vancouver; while a new line has developed this last year or year and a half known as the Blue Funnel line, the largest boats plying in the Pacific ocean, leaving the city of Liverpool and passing through the Mediterranean, the Suez Canal, the Indian Ocean, Singapore, the Straits Settlements and oriental ports to Victoria, Vancouver and Puget Sound ports. I may say that any one of these Blue Funnel steamers carries a cargo in and out of the city of Vancouver of some 11,000 tons. I am mentioning these points to justify what I intend to bring to the attention of the government and more especially to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, showing that although very few years have elapsed since the shipping of British Columbia was a very small matter indeed, to-day the shipping of that province and especially of the city I have the honour to represent, is of very considerable extent.

Last year 867 vessels came into the harbour of Vancouver, a total of 679,145 tons registered, carrying 113,485 tons of freight and with crews numbering altogether 39,401. The total number of vessels registered for the harbour of Victoria was 1,183, having a total registered tonnage of 989,298 tons, carrying 12,170 tons of freight and with crews numbering 57,903. The difference between the two ports can be very easily explained. Boats plying to Vancouver are only reported one way while boats plying to Victoria are reported both in and out, making a considerably greater registered tonnage reported in Victoria.

On December 28 last, the British ship 'Pass of Melfort,' carrying 23 officers and men, with the captain and his wife, struck the Amphitrite Rocks, which are a very dangerous reef lying north of Barclay Sound. And I may say that two days before the report came in that the 'Pass of Melfort' had struck upon the rocks, the light-house keeper at Cape Beale had telephoned in to Victoria—and the fact was announced upon the bulletin boards in Victoria and Vancouver—that a large four-masted ship was evidently in distress off Barclay Sound. For quite two days, this vessel with its ill-fated crew, endeavoured to make the Straits of Juan de Fuca only to rush upon the Amphitrite Rocks, adding one more to that reef's grim list of death and disaster. Not one solitary soul was saved of those aboard the 'Pass of Melfort.' She was coming up from South American ports in ballast to load lumber in Puget Sound. On December 15, the 'King David,' one of the King Line, from Glasgow, ran on the rocks a little north of Amphit-

rite Point. However, this wreck was not attended with such terrible disaster as that of the 'Pass of Melfort'; still, no less than six of the men, with the chief officer were drowned, the rest being picked up by the 'Queen City' which plies between the northern part of Vancouver island and Victoria. On January 23 the whole civilized world, certainly the whole of the United States and Canada, was shocked to learn that a large passenger boat had run upon the rocks in Pachena bay, south of Cape Beale, and it was understood that upwards of sixty people were drowned. This was the wreck of the 'Valencia,' belonging to the Pacific Coast Steamship Company and plying from the city of San Francisco to Victoria, Vancouver and Puget Sound points. The vessel was endeavouring to make the Strait of Juan de Fuca when the wreck occurred. I have here, Mr. Speaker, a chart of this west coast. A copy of the same chart was afterwards found on the 'Pass of Melfort,' a copy of the same chart was found in the chart-house of the 'King David' and the same in the 'Valencia—a chart of Vancouver island and adjacent shores of British Columbia, surveyed by Capt. G. H. Richard in the year 1859, so you will understand that a chart nearly fifty years old is the best chart of the coast waters of British Columbia now in existence. And when the 'King David' ran upon the rocks, all that the captain of that vessel had to guide him was a little note superscribed upon the face of this chart, 'shipwrecked mariners will obtain food, shelter and assistance at Cape Beale lighthouse which is a telegraph and signal station.' And all the assistance that shipwrecked mariners could receive at Cape Beale was the opportunity to telegraph to the city of Victoria, 120 miles away. Though they may have thought that they could make Cape Beale in such a storm as passed down our coast from the 25th to the 28th of December, it would be only by the interposition of Providence that they could be saved, for the simple reason that that part of the west coast of Vancouver island lying between Bonilla island on the south to Lennard island on the north is so dangerous as to be known as the graveyard of the Pacific. If I were to tell you the number of disasters that have occurred within that short distance within the last ten or fifteen years, I fear hon. members of this House would refuse to accept the statement without verification. I shall simply mention four of these disasters, but I believe that on the files of the Department of Marine and Fisheries can be found a list of shipwrecks that have occurred in those waters that would appal the people who live upon the Atlantic coast and who are accustomed to speak of Sable island as the graveyard of the Atlantic. And as I have said, the only chart of the west coast of Vancouver island now in existence is one that was compiled in 1859. I wish to bring forward another point in connection with this: At Tatoosh island, on Cape Flattery, there is a light which flashes every thirty seconds. At Carmanah, about twenty miles across the Straits of Juan de Fuca, there is another light which flashes every thirty seconds. Both of these are revolving lights, and the two are almost identical. Either of them can be seen at a distance of about 19¾ miles. But as in the case of the 'Valencia'—and I shall go into that case a little more later on—when a vessel is sailing by dead reckoning through a wall of fog, it is impossible that the rays of light at these two points can penetrate the fog so that those aboard the vessel can see them. If there had been such a light as exists on Lennard island, in the constituency of my hon. friend from Nanaimo (Mr. R. Smith), which was erected only in 1904, and which is of very modern design.

I think there is no question but that the 'Valencia' would have been able to see the light at Cape Beale, which is some 30 odd miles further north than Bonilla point. If you will look at the chart of the entrance to Juan de Fuca strait you will see Tatoosh point, and north of that Carmanah point and a little further north, Cape Beale light. Cape Beale and Carmanah point can be mistaken for one another and Carmanah point and Cape Flattery can be mistaken for one another. The lights are not sufficiently distinctive, although Cape Beale light has a red sector which is visible to the southeast; but a boat which has been buffetted by storm may have been driven a considerable distance out of her way and might not see the red sector pointing southeast by east. It is thought by many that the 'Pass of Melfort' in coming up the west coast in charge of a captain who had never made that trip before mistook Carmanah point for Cape Flattery, and mistook Cape Beale for Carmanah point and, thinking he was making the entrance to Juan de Fuca straits, simply piled his boat on the rocks with the loss of every soul on board.

I wish to press that point very clearly on the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) that the lighthouses which these mariners have to guide them are considered by master mariners, even those who are familiar with the coast, as not being sufficiently distinctive, and in view of that fact some improvements should be made.

The 'Valencia' belonged to the Pacific Coast Steamship Company and on the night of January 23, ran on the Seabird rocks at Pachena bay, just south of Cape Beale lighthouse. The sad story of that wreck is that for 24 hours the 'Valencia' with her ill-fated passengers, were piled upon the rocks and there was no arm long enough and no arm strong enough to save any of those miserable people who went down with the ship, some 126 souls, I am told. I wish to

say, Mr. Speaker, recognizing the full responsibility that rests upon me in making the statement, that unless some radical measures are taken to reduce to a minimum the dangers which exist on the west coast of Vancouver island, unless something is done by our government and by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, it is, in my opinion, only condoning murder. That may seem a strong statement to make and may be a strong statement for me to make, Mr. Speaker, but if anybody wishes to combat that statement let him talk to the widows and orphans who are left and who are sighing

> —for the touch of a vanished hand,
> And the sound of a voice that is still.

I say further that had there been any means by which boats could have been gotten to the steamship 'Valencia', there would not have been the sad tale of loss of life, there would not be the sad hearts in British Columbia who to-day mourn for those who met death in that disaster.

Of course twenty years is not a very long time in the length of a nation. Twenty years ago we had not as many boats plying to our shores as we have to-day, but, Sir, I think sometimes that just because the province of British Columbia is a long piece away from the east our government sometimes may consider that they do not require the same amount of looking after that they have on the Atlantic coast. But I have faith that if our voice is raised in this House pointing out to the Department of Marine and Fisheries these accidents and the need of improvements in these lights, our government will be alive enough to the circumstances to do all they possibly can to make impossible such accidents as have occurred during the last winter.

Speaking entirely for the benefit of my own city of Vancouver, to which some 50 per cent of the traffic through Juan de Fuca straits, which does not go down Puget sound, comes, the similarity of the light on the west coast I wish to point and to suggest to the minister the advisability of approaching the American department with a view to improving the lights at Tatoosh island and Carmanah point. Carmanah point has a revolving white light with white flash 30 seconds and eclipse 30 seconds, a complete revolution in one minute. At Cape Flattery the United States light on Tatoosh island has a fixed white light with a fixed red sector. Cape Beale has a revolving white light 30 seconds with a red sector bearing to the east and south southeast. It is my opinion that the advancement which has been made so far as aids to navigation are concerned, which I myself have seen on this side of the Dominion, should be extended to the west coast, that the present difficulties there should be remedied, or at least the aids placed in those adjacent waters should be so arranged as to make the possibility of mistaking one light for another very remote indeed. I would also suggest to the minister that those automatic whistling buoys and acetylene gas buoys which I am told are very, very powerful, might reasonably be placed immediately outside the danger zone, warning navigators that when they are as close to land as these buoys are placed, they have then to guard themselves very carefully in making the Straits of Juan de Fuca. That is only one point, there is another point which I wish to make and that is the absolute necessity of having placed on the west coast, somewhere on Pachena bay or Barclay sound a splendid life saving boat, manned by a life-saving crew. It was said to be the intention of our late lamented friend Mr. Prefontaine, to have formed the nucleus of a Canadian navy, and I can tell his successor in the Marine Department that there is no better way to carry out that policy than to have built for the Pacific coast a government steamer similar to our department seagoing tugs, which would carry from 20 to 25 men and which would be able to stand up in any gale. When the 'Valencia' was piled on the rocks and for 24 hours those on board remained without succour, had there been a powerful sea-going steamer carrying surf boats every one of the passengers and crew of that ill-fated vessel would have been saved. The placing of such a boat on that coast to engage in the holy vocation of saving human life, would be an act which would reflect credit on the government. I impress upon the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) that if he wishes to have a Canadian navy; if he wishes to develop a hardy race of Canadian sailors, he can do nothing better than to adopt the suggestions I have made, and have built at once a strong sea-going steamer such as I have described. The government could afford to pay the men on that steamer wages sufficient to be an inducement to them to remain in the service, and thus the most practical means would be taken towards developing a hardy race of sailors.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What distance is the scene of this disaster from Vancouver?

Mr. MACPHERSON. It is 120 miles from Victoria and 200 miles from Vancouver. It needs a catastrophe like the wreck of the 'Valencia' to awaken the public mind to dangers which though always present are unseen or unthought of, and I am not imputing blame to any one because of this disaster. But if nothing is done now to grapple with the situation in a far reaching way, then I say culpable neglect can be laid at the door of the government, and I for one would be the first to place the blame where it should lie. Now, in regard to the 'Clallam' disaster which occurred two years ago.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Where did that occur?

Mr. MACPHERSON. It occurred right off Beacon Hill, four miles from Victoria. The 'Clallam' was wrecked two years ago, and the fact is that she went to pieces like a deck of cards. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that if the officers of the Department of Marine and Fisheries in the city of Victoria had done their duty, it is my opinion that the 'Clallam' disaster would never have occurred. When the inspector of hulls passed that floating coffin, for she was nothing else, as being in every way seaworthy, he was in effect condemning to death every man, woman and child who might go to sea in that boat. That is a strong statement to make, but I think it is justified. Right in the open sea, when the tug 'Sea Lion' was able to come alongside and ride out the storm without any difficulty, the 'Clallam' went to pieces, as I have said, like a deck of cards. Will any one dare tell me that the man who passed that boat was doing his duty conscientiously? I refuse to believe it, and nine-tenths of the people of British Columbia will refuse to believe it with me. Accidents will happen just so long as ships are built and winds blow, but it is flying in the face of Providence to say that there is no use adopting safeguards because accidents must occur. I impress on the Minister of Marine (Mr. Brodeur) that so far as he is concerned he should take every possible precaution to ensure that in the future these disasters shall be reduced to the minimum. I ask the minister, in the name of the people of British Columbia, in the name of the city of Vancouver, in the name of the shipping interests of the Pacific coast, in the name of humanity itself, that he shall take cognizance of this serious state of affairs. I submit for his careful consideration the suggestions I have made and which are supported by the opinions of the vast majority of the people of the province of British Columbia.

Mr. RALPH SMITH (Nanaimo). The matter brought before the House by my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson) is one of tremendous importance in the light of what has occurred on the coast of British Columbia. The hon. gentleman has referred to the great increase in the trade of our province and in view of the retarding effect which these marine disasters must have on the growth of that trade, it will be seen that the improvement of the existing conditions is a matter for the very serious consideration of the government. The impression of the people on the Pacific coast is that everything that might have been done by the authorities in Ottawa in the way of providing aids to navigation on the Pacific coast has not been done. I quite understand that in time of extreme popular excitement there is a tendency to blame the government for everything. The government do not create the wind, they do not create the fog, they have not created the natural formations that make the coast exceptionally dangerous, but the government do a very great deal with regard to the security of life in the operation of the marine business. The government ought to be able to regulate the strength and safety of the boats; they ought to control the efficiency of steamships; they are responsible for placing guides where they will be of service to mariners. The supervision of the marine authorities over the operation of the marine business is greater than that over any other business in the country, and is of great importance. Now, many reasons have been given as the causes of these disasters. After the 'Clallam' disaster in 1894 the government had an inquiry made into it. A royal commission has inquired into and has just recently reported upon the facts connected with the serious accident to the 'Valencia.' Having followed these inquiries as closely as it was possible for me to do, I have arrived at an opinion as to the cause of these accidents, and I have arrived also at a conclusion as to the few things which I think could be applied more effectually by the Marine Department in securing the service when boats get into these serious conditions.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Where is the report to be found ? Has it been laid on the table of the House ?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. The report as to the 'Valencia' has just come to hand, I understand, two days ago.

Mr. BRODEUR. It was received two days ago.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I was in a position, living in British Columbia, to follow pretty closely the proceedings of this inquiry at the time, and thus to learn the facts. Not having had the report to hand, which just came to the department a couple of days ago——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has it been published in the press ?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Day after day considerable reports were published in the press of the province of British Columbia.

Mr. BRODEUR. Not with regard to the disaster itself.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Yes, with regard to all the evidence. The official report of the committee is of course confined to the department, but all the evidence and the opinions of seamen as to aids to navigation, and what might be necessary to improve the service, came out in this investigation.

Mr. FOSTER. Did I understand my hon. friend to say that he has had a copy of this report ?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. No, I said I had followed the investigation as the reports of it had appeared in the press of British Columbia, and I had come to a certain conclusion as to the cause of these disasters, and as to what I thought might be done by the government to prevent similar accidents in future.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Has the report itself of this commission of investigation—I am not speaking of the evidence—been published in the press ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I think a part of the report has been published in the press—an interim report made some time ago by the persons in charge of the investigation with regard to the aids to navigation ; but the part of the report concerning the disaster itself and the causes of the disaster was not published. That is my recollection.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Following up the evidence which was presented as to the accident to the 'Clallam' in January, 1904, I think it is important that the facts with regard to that accident should be brought to the attention of this House ; and I think it is especially important that they should be brought to the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. The 'Clallam' had only been in commission six months, and it held a certificate of inspection not only from the American government authority, but from the Canadian authority also. The accident to the 'Clallam,' according to the evidence and the opinions of expert seamen on the Pacific coast, was due entirely to the bad construction of the vessel. Here was a vessel which has been in commission only six months going to wreck in an ordinary storm on that coast. But the important thing which I want to bring to the attention of the minister is the fact that that boat which had only been in commission six months, held a certificate of efficiency from the Canadian Inspector of hulls in British Columbia. A report on that disaster was made by the official who was appointed by the Dominion authorities to inquire into it. Whilst that report was made by an expert official appointed by the government themselves, the cause of that disaster to the 'Clallam' was not taken advantage of by the Marine Department to avert any of the disasters that have followed since. From the report of Mr. Lugrin, the official appointed by the government to investigate the accident to the 'Clallam' and a thoroughly capable and impartial man whose work cannot be too highly commended, I want to read a few sentences which I think it is very important for the Marine Department to hear and to know. These were written in 1904 :

I beg to direct attention especially to this matter of inspection. The 'Clallam' was inspected by Captain Collister, Canadian Inspector of Hulls, after completion and while the vessel was lying at a wharf in Seattle, in the state of Washington. In reply to my question he said that he only made such inspection as was possible without opening up the steamer in any way. He knew very little about the vessel's fastenings, did not know whether her frames extended to the passenger deck, nor how the decks were fastened to the clamps, or to the frames. I examined him in considerable detail as to the construction of the ship, but elicited very little information. In fact, he said specifically that he took a great deal for granted, and said, what seems reasonable enough, that unless a ship is opened up it is impossible to do more than inspect her in a superficial way. If the evidence given by Mr. Shea in regard to the 'Isabel' is to be accepted as true, Captain Collister's inspection of vessels when upon the ways is not thorough. Mr. Shea said that the 'Isabel' having met with an accident, was hauled out upon the ways to be repaired, and although her planks were so open at the butts that he could put his hand in between them, the steamer was given a certificate by Captain Collister.

I want to remind the minister that this same inspector of hulls in British Columbia is in the same position to-day. The report goes on :

This statement was brought out incidentally. Mr. Shea having been called to testify as to the condition of some of the wreck of the 'Clallam,' which came ashore. It is, however, only one of a number of statements that have been more or less publicly made as to the condition of steamers to which Captain Collister has given certificates. I express no opinion on the subject, except to say that in the public interest, as well as in justice to Captain Collister if he is blameless in the matter, a full inquiry ought to be made into the manner in which hulls are inspected at this port.

In regard to the ship's boats and equipment, the evidence on the matter of inspection is very direct, and it shows that not only were the regulations in that behalf not enforced in the case of the 'Clallam,' but they are a dead letter, so far as Captain Collister is concerned, in the inspection of vessels plying between British Columbia ports and ports in the state of Washington and Alaska. Captain Collister takes the position that they are not intended to apply to such vessels. This is an important feature of inspection, and I will deal with it in some detail.

Section 1 of part VIII., being the rules and regulations for the inspection of boats, life-preservers and other life-saving appliances, brought in force by order in council of date August 2, 1892, provides that 'no steamboat with passengers on board shall proceed to sea from any port or place in Canada without having certain boats of a specified size and to be fitted and found in a specified way.' The same provision is by the same section applied to steamboats plying upon certain named lakes and rivers and upon any lake or river 'which is upon any point on the route of such steamboat more than one mile broad.' Captain Collister stated under oath that he did not consider this regulation to apply to steamboats engaged in the British Columbia coasting trade, even although their routes lie outside Van-

couver island on the open ocean and along one of the most dangerous coasts in the world, or to steamboats running to the Queen Charlotte islands, nor to steamboats plying between Victoria and ports on Puget sound, nor to vessels plying between British Columbia and Alaska ports, notwithstanding the fact that such vessels are at three points along their route exposed to the open ocean. He did not say if he considered any regulations applicable to such vessels, and when I asked him why he did not require the provisions of subsection (d) of section 3 in respect to hooks to be complied with in the case of the 'Clallam,' he declined to give any reason. When asked by me why he did not require subsections (b) and (c) to be complied with, he said that he did not think it necessary.

The boats of the 'Clallam' had no sea anchors, no rudders, no sails, no masts, no compasses, no oil or means for distributing the same, no boat hooks, no lanterns, no spare oars and no water-beakers and were defective in other ways. Captain Collister said he did not make any examination to see whether the boats complied with the provisions of section 2. A witness who examined one of the boats said that the cleats for the row-locks were fastened on with one and a half inch wire nails. I asked Captain Collister if this was the case, but he said he did not know, and in reply to my question as to whether such a fastening would be sufficient he declined to express an opinion. The evidence showed that the davits on the 'Clallam' bent under the weight of the boats and passengers. I asked Captain Collister what test he made of the strength of the davits and he replied that he saw the empty boats hauled up.

The character of the boats and the nature of their finding have an important bearing upon this case, for it is highly probable that if the boats had been properly launched and manned and had been equipped as the regulations require they could have ridden out the gale. But be this as it may, I submit that it is imperative in the public interest that all steamboats carrying passengers upon the coast waters of British Columbia, or between ports in this province and ports in the state of Washington or Alaska, exposed as they are to heavy gales and in some cases for many miles to the open ocean should be equipped with every appliance for the safety of life required by the regulations above referred to.

As to what are the causes of these disasters, when we take into consideration the fact that in the case of the 'Clallam' the whole of the evidence indicates that the construction of the boat was faulty and inferior and taking into consideration also the evidence given by the government officials as to the positive neglect, carelessness or ignorance on the part of the inspector of hulls at British Columbia, we cannot fail to conclude that these had a great deal to do with that particular disaster.

Take the case of the 'Valencia', we can judge by the evidence what was, to a great extent, the cause of the accident. And if we can arrive at the cause of these accidents, we shall be in a position to remove them. What we require to do is to find out where the fault lies in order that we may apply the requisite remedy. Take the case of the 'Valencia', belonging to the Pacific Coast Steamship Company, which had been called into commission in consequence of the regular passenger steamer, on her downward trip, losing her propeller. People who had sailed from Nanaimo on that vessel sent information back to their friends giving their experience. They stated that they had gone through a very dangerous passage during which they were likely at any moment to perish. This steamer 'Valencia' was suddenly called into commission, and the evidence at the inquiry showed conclusively that her crew had been recklessly raked up in the streets of San Francisco and put on board without any examination. Witnesses declared on their oath that there was absolutely no discipline among the crew and none shown in the operation of the steamer. The captain himself was only sailing for the second time into a British Columbia port and went, in consequence of his lack of knowledge, nearly fifty miles out of his course. This could be attributed only to recklessness and carelessness and bad seamanship. I do not blame the government for that, but it seems to me that the intelligence or the ignorance of the men called upon to man these boats and operate this business should come under the supervision of this government. In my opinion it is part of the duty of this government to ascertain whether or not British subjects, sailing on vessels, even though these vessels may be American, enjoy adequate protection against accident. My experience on the Pacific coast is this, that the confidence of British subjects is very materially strengthened when they realize either that they are going to sail in a British boat or a boat that has come under the scrutinizing authority and inspection of a British officer. Let me say this—and it can never be questioned for one minute—that public confidence in the minds of the British people on the Pacific coast in American vessels has been absolutely destroyed. This itself only makes it the more imperative that there should be the most scrutinizing examination by Canadian authorities in their inspection of American vessels and of the seamen who man these vessels. We should have supervision over these men. We should insist upon knowing, in the interests of British subjects, who sail on these vessels, that the men in charge are capable and understand their business. That is my opinion of what the government should do. But what do I find? I find that at the time of the 'Clallam' disaster, it was necessary to have a British certificate for the inspection of the vessel and a Canadian certificate. But I find that on May 5, without any regard to the report I have read or the consequences to the 'Clallam,' an order in council was

passed making it possible to accept American certificates as a guarantee of the efficiency of American vessels in a British port. I do not at all agree with that view, however. This order in council was passed in 1905. Let me read the instructions which were issued under it:

I havet to inform you that an order in council, dated the 26th day of April last, was issued, ordering that whereas the Minister of Marine and Fisheries of Canada has received satisfactory assurances that the unexpired certificates of inspection held by Canadian steamboats plying to and from ports in the United States will be accepted by the United States authorities without any further inspection than is necessary to satisfy the United States inspectors that the condition of the steamboats, their boilers, machinery and life-saving equipment is as stated in the Canadian current certificate of inspection; and ordering that unexpired certificates issued by the lawful authorities of the United States of America shall be accepted in Canada as evidence of lawful inspection of United States steamships plying to and from Canada, and that no further inspection shall be required of such steamships beyond that which is necessary to satisfy the Canadian inspectors that the condition of the steamers, their boilers, machinery and life-saving equipment is as stated in the United States current certificate of inspection.

The Canadian inspectors will be supplied with temporary certificates to issue to such steamboats for presentation to the collector of customs at the port from which they clear, in proof of the Canadian inspectors being satisfied as to the condition of the steamships, and the collectors of customs are to treat such vessels as having satisfactorily passed Canadian steamboat inspection.

This regulation came into effect on the 6th instant and is to be observed by the collectors of customs and steamboat inspectors until further instructions are issued on the subject.

Now, I regard that as a very serious matter. I am certain that, as I have stated, the British people have no absolute confidence in the construction of American vessels on the Pacific coast, and they have less confidence in the value of the American inspection, and yet the government has made an arrangement whereby these certificates of inspection can be accepted by Canadian authority. I would recommend to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries not only that we should have a closer and more efficient inspection in Canada, but that we should have our own inspection, and that we should declare to the British subjects who become passengers on American steamers, the condition of those steamers and the condition of the crews who have to manage those steamers and who have the lives of the people in their hands.

Now, I wish to make for the benefit of the minister who has just taken charge of this department a few recommendations that seem to me of very great importance. I know that boards of trade and every kind of so-called authority have presented to this department numerous, extensive, and, in many cases,—according to my opinion,—theoretical recommendations, some of which cannot possibly be carried into effect. The few recommendations that I shall make, I think, can be carried into immediate practical effect:

First, I would recommend the establishment and operation of a wireless telegraph service. The government has a telegraph service from Cape Beale to Victoria. But, in looking over the reports of this service, I find that the line is out of order, about seventy-five per cent of the time. The coast is tremendously rough, broken with deep gulches which make it almost impossible to maintain an efficient service. I find that on the Atlantic coast, the government, three years ago made an investment in the establishment of a wireless telegraph system and has spent money—and very properly—in this service in the interest of the marine on the Atlantic coast. I say I would strongly recommend that the same plan be adopted on the Pacific. I understand that 13 wireless telegraph stations have been established on the Atlantic coast, at a cost of only about $100,000. I understand that also three of the government ships have been equipped with the system at a cost of only about $8,000. I believe that the service is absolutely owned and exclusively operated by the government. Now, while there are companies in British Columbia applying at this time to the government for a franchise to own and operate a wireless telegraph system on the Pacific coast, the efficiency and security of that service depends absolutely upon the government owning it. I strongly commend the government for owning and operating the business, so far as it has gone, on the Atlantic coast, and I would like them to establish and maintain the system on the Pacific coast as well. This in my opinion, would afford an immediate remedy for some of the troubles in marine matters on the Pacific.

The next thing I would recommend, is one that was mentioned by the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson), and that is the improvement of the light on the point on Cape Beale. That point more than any other on the west coast of Vancouver island, stands prominently into the sea. Ships from Alaska, as well as ships from Australia and New Zealand always strike for Cape Beale, and even coastwise steamers from the south; the 'Valencia' was a case in point. Coastwise ships coming from San Francisco and getting out of their course strike for Cape Beale. I would recommend that the very best light and fog alarm that modern science has produced should be placed on this most important point.

Another improvement I would mention, which seems to be very important. I would suggest to the minister the consideration of

applying the principle of compulsory pilotage on passenger steamers. I am not so positive in my opinion as to the application of compulsory pilotage to vessels carrying freight only, but when we remember the 'Clallam's,' whose wreck was a serious disaster, and the 'Valencia,' which was forty-five miles out of her course, and neither of which was in charge of a Canadian pilot, the case in favour of compulsory pilotage seems very strong. As one who came from the old country some years ago, I can speak with some authority when I say that one of the guarantees of the British people coming to this country, so far as marine dangers are concerned, is the fact that vessels on reaching Canadian waters are manned by Canadian pilots, men who understand the local conditions. According to the present regulation, there is a system of compulsory pilotage to this extent—that even if vessels do not call for pilotage they are compelled to pay one-half of the cost of a services of a pilot. Every vessel that carries passengers into a Canadian port should be compelled to call for a Canadian pilot should be compelled to take on the vessel some local authority whose knowledge of the local conditions will give confidence to the passengers aboard. I recommend strongly to the minister the adoption at once of the principle of compulsory pilotage so far as passenger steamers are concerned.

Now, I have completed my statement of this matter. My object has been to bring to the attention of the minister the very serious condition of things on the Pacific coast. I believe the minister will take notice of these matters; and I hope he will effect these improvements not five or ten years hence, but this very season, before we run the risk of further disasters in the winter that is coming.

Mr. WM. SLOAN (Comox-Atlin). I desire to say a few words on the question before the House, and to touch on one or two points which have not been dealt with by previous speakers. We have an extensive coast line in British Columbia, which measured in direct lines from headland to headland, extends 800 miles. But when you consider that the coast line is deeply indented by many bays, inlets, sounds and channels, which form innumerable islands, and when you measure the sinuosities of those various shore lines, you have an enormous area of coast line of some 7,000 miles. The district of Comox-Atlin which I have the honour to represent embraces a very large portion of this coast line of British Columbia. As I have had to travel over many miles of this district, I have become familiar with existing conditions, and have given this question of aids to navigation some little attention. There is one feature which has been neglected to a certain extent, both by this government and by former governments, and which has only been appreciated by this government as late as last year, I refer to the question of a hydrographic survey of the waters of the province of British Columbia. The first work in this connection was done in 1793 and 1794 by Captain George Vancouver. Nothing more was done until the year 1857 when the British Admiralty decided to survey and chart the waters of the British possessions on the Pacific coast, taking as a basis the surveys of Vancouver. This work was prosecuted with less or more vigour by the imperial authorities until British Columbia entered the confederation, when it was discontinued by them, evidently under the assumption that this work would be continued by the Dominion government. Nothing further was done for many years until the work was again resumed by the imperial authorities and is being by them continued to this day. The result of these surveys up to the present time has been that so far as the extreme southern portion of British Columbia is concerned, we have a very fair knowledge of the waters of that portion of the province. But there are still large areas of which our knowledge is inaccurate and incomplete, and many a good ship meets with accident and disaster on sunken rocks and hidden reefs in those waters. These will continue to be a menace and source of danger to our shipping until such time as these waters are surveyed and our knowledge is made accurate and complete. We are approaching in British Columbia a new era of development. The Grand Trunk Pacific will open up the northern portion of British Columbia; we will have in that region the new city of Prince Rupert which we expect will rival the sister cities to the south, and it is very important that the waters in that neighbourhood should receive our immediate attention. I was pleased last session to know that an item of $75,000 received the sanction of parliament, which item was designed for the construction of a vessel for the purpose of hydrographic survey work in British Columbia. That is the first real recognition of the importance of this work of survey by the Dominion government, except any small surveys that have been performed from time to time. Now, I wish to call the attention of the House and the government to the utmost necessity that exists that this work should be undertaken without delay in the interest of the marine of British Columbia.

Another matter in which I think the claims of British Columbia have to a certain extent been overlooked is in respect to the Lighthouse Board of Canada. This board is composed of officials of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, along with Mr. H. A. Allan, of Montreal, who represents the shipping interests generally, and the presidents of the corporations of Pilots of the cities of Quebec and Montreal. The duties of the Lighthouse Board are laid down by order in council of February 20, 1904:

To inquire into and report to the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries upon all questions relating to the selection of lighthouse sites, the construction and maintenance of lighthouses, fog alarms, and all other matters assigned to the minister by section 2 of chapter 70 of the Revised Statutes of Canada.

This board meets in Ottawa from time to time to consider all applications that come before it from the various parts of the Dominion. Now, Sir, I maintain that the province of British Columbia should have a voice in the deliberations of that board. In a new and growing province such as we are, with such a large extent of coast line, I think it is vitally important that our interests should be represented, and I would respectfully urge the minister that this request should receive his favourable consideration. While on my feet allow me to present a plea for greater salaries to our lighthouse keepers in British Columbia. As you are aware, Sir, the regulations require certain qualifications from our lighthouse keepers and rightly so. They are often called upon to meet trying circumstances in time of emergency, and the present rate of wages paid is no inducement for the best men to enter the service. Now, I hope this question of the adjustment of wages for lighthouse keepers will receive the attention of the government, and will be treated on a broad and liberal basis. With special reference to the immediate requirements of the west coast of Vancouver island which have been dealt with by the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson) and the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith) I earnestly hope the government has already adopted or will soon adopt a policy with a view to preventing as far as possible a repetition of the disasters of the past few months. The interim report of the commission which was appointed to inquire into the wrecking of the 'Valencia' and to make a report as to what they consider advisable in the way of aids to navigation and to the saving of life, deals very fully with these requirements. It is prepared by able and practical men, and their recommendations are in every way feasible and practical. While their suggestions cannot ensure the absolute safety of life and shipping, the proposals which have been presented to the government, if carried out in their entirety, will certainly do much to protect the shipping interests and above all the lives of our fellow men.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I cannot find any fault with the manner in which this important question has been brought before the House by my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson) and discussed by the two hon. gentlemen who have followed him. Immediately after I took charge of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, I had occasion to look carefully into the various questions which were raised regarding the protection of marine navigation on the Pacific coast. It was only a few days ago after the lamentable disaster to the 'Valencia', that I was called upon to take charge of that department. There was at the time a great deal of agitation in the west, and consequently I felt it my duty immediately to look into the causes of that disaster. Instructions were given to make a full investigation, and I may tell the House that I received at the end of last week a full report by the commissioners who were appointed to investigate the causes of that disaster.

Mr. FOSTER. Who were the commissioners ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The commissioners were Mr. Godin, Capt. Cox, and Capt. Newcombe. They are competent men against whom nothing can be said. Mr. Godin has been an officer of the department for many years, and is considered a very competent man. I must say the same thing with regard to the two other gentlemen whose names I have just given.

With regard to the 'Valencia' disaster full investigation was made by the American authorities, in Seattle, if I am correctly informed, and it was stated by the American officers who were instructed to investigate that wreck that it was caused entirely through the fault of the captain who had not taken the necessary precautions and had, in the discharge of his duties, failed absolutely to carry out the dictates of good seamanship. Although the report of our officers is not yet before the House I will have no objection to placing it on the table of the House, and I may say that practically the findings or the conclusions of those who have been making the investigation throw almost all the blame on the captain of that ship. He seems to have forgotten one thing which was most essential in the circumstances, he seems to have forgotten that at this time of the year—I understand he was almost a novice in piloting vessels in that part of the country—there are very strong currents which flow northward there. He missed a light at the entrance of Juan de Fuca strait at Tatoosh and went several miles above that and when he saw the light of Cape Beale he thought that it was the light at Carmanah, and went ashore just at that place which has been mentioned by the hon. member. We must not find that the department should be blamed in any respect, because I understand he saw the light of Cape Beale but thought that instead of being the light at Cape Beale, he thought he saw the light on the American shore and that seems to have been the main reason why that accident occurred.

My hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson) has drawn the attention of the House to the very important develop-

ment which has taken place in the last few years in the navigation on the Pacific coast. It is absolutely correct to state that there has been in the last few years an important development and it is important consequently that all necessary precautions should be taken by the department and by this government in order to protect the navigation on that coast just as fully as we protect navigation in other portions of the Dominion. I may say in this connection that it is the intention of the department, as I shall try to show in a few moments, to adopt what might be considered a very aggressive policy in this connection. My hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson) has referred to the chart which was made in 1859. I may say that these old charts were made by the imperial authorities, and as my hon. friend has said the chart to which he has referred is an imperial chart. We took in last year's estimates a certain amount of money to build a boat in order to make our own charts on the coast of the Pacific ocean. Tenders were called for just a few days ago for the construction of that boat. We retained the services of an officer from England, supposed to be a very competent officer who was connected with the surveys there, in order to make a proper design of that boat and to superintend the construction of a boat which would meet all the requirements of the case. It is expected that that boat will be finished by the end of the year but in the meantime I have given instructions for the building of a small launch in order to carry out in the Strait of Georgia, and near the coast, some soundings which it will be necessary to make in view of the proposed chart for that section of the country. I fully realize, as has been said by the member for Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson) and also by the member for Comox (Mr. Sloan) that this is a very important step, and we are going to take the necessary measures to carry out their wishes in that respect. My hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson) has referred to the want of surf boats in that section of the country. I have given orders for the construction of one of these surf boats and I hope it will be in the service within a very short period of time. It was thought we might possibly use some of the boats used on the great lakes here until we had constructed that surf boat on the Pacific, but it was found that the boat could be constructed in a very short period and now it is constructed and I think it will be completed very soon.

With regard to the light at Cape Beale, my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson) claims that that light is bad.

Mr. MACPHERSON. No, the minister misunderstood me; I claimed that the Tatoosh light and the Cape Beale light are too much alike, one on the American and one on the Canadian side, and that the Cape Beale light could easily be mistaken for the Tatoosh light on account of the red sector in both lights.

Mr. BRODEUR. I beg my hon. friend's pardon; I thought he said the Cape Beale light was bad, and I was surprised because the report we have in the department is that this light has generally given satisfaction.

Mr. MACPHERSON. It is not equal to the light of Lennard island north of it.

Mr. BRODEUR. We are trying to improve as much as possible the aids which have to be given to navigation. The Cape Beale light has been established for many years, I think it was established about 15 years ago and I suppose that at that time the improvements which we now have in our aids to navigation were almost unknown and the lights which were then used were not so good as the ones used now. The Lennard island light was established in 1905. We then established a lighthouse and fog alarm. The only two aids which existed for the protection of navigation in that section of the country until a couple of years ago, were the light, not perhaps a very extraordinary light at Cape Beale, and the other light and fog alarm at Carmanah at the entrance to the Juan de Fuca straits which was built in 1891. These were the only two aids to navigation in that part of the country. Since that time here is what we have done: In 1905 we established a lighthouse and fog alarm at Lennard island which, I think, is giving complete satisfaction to all those on that coast. We established last year a whistling buoy at San Juan and also one at Barclay sound. We intend to replace the whistling buoys with gas buoys which are supposed to be very much better even than the buoys we have to-day. In 1906, just a short time ago, we started a new light at Amphitrite where the wreck of the 'Pass of Melfort' took place. We had a wrecking plant in the maritime provinces and one on the St. Lawrence, but there was none on the Pacific coast until recently when we called for tenders and awarded the contract to the lowest tenderer.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is the steamer 'Salvor' owned by the government or by a private owner.

Mr. BRODEUR. The 'Salvor' belongs to a private owner; the wrecking plant belongs to a private individual and we pay him certain compensation just as we do on the Atlantic coast.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What life saving appliances are on board?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think there are any, but I intend to advise that she shall in future be equipped with a surf boat;

Last year Col. Anderson, the chief engineer of the department was sent to British Columbia to report on what further aids to navigation were necessary and his report has been furnished to me and will be laid on the table of the House. My hon. friend (Mr. Ralph Smith) advocates the establishment of a fog alarm at Cape Beale, but Col. Anderson is not quite in accord with that suggestion. His report is dated the 27th of February, 1906, and referring to this point it says :

I am satisfied that a fog alarm at Cape Beale will never be a success. It would be necessary to locate it so far above the sea and so far back from the edge of the water, and there are so many outlying reefs off the point that the air between it and the vessel at sea would never be homogeneous and with air of different densities a sound is refracted so that it will not go out in horizontal lines. Therefore a fog signal so situated must necessarily be a failure.

It becomes a question therefore whether we should advise the erection of a fog alarm at that point.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Does not the Royal Commission recommend a fog alarm at Cape Beale ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I cannot answer that off hand because I have not had time to read over the report of the commission, but I think my hon. friend (Mr. Ralph Smith) is right as to that.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. The minister will find that the marine authorities in British Columbia are particularly strong in recommending the strengthening of the light and the establishment of a fog horn, in contradistinction to the report of Col. Anderson.

Mr. BRODEUR. I should say that Col. Anderson's report contans this further :

If this conclusion of mine be questioned, it would be an easy matter to experiment with sound signals at Cape Beale by sending a few hundred explosive bombs to the station and experimenting with them, carefully noting results. If the bombs are audible freely in every direction my theory would be mistaken and a steam signal would also be audible, in which case one should be built there.

Col. Anderson says further in this report ' that a fog signal could be built some miles below Cape Beale and that it would probably meet the requirements of the coast. When Col. Anderson was there last year, unfortunately an accident happened on the ' Quadra ' on which he was travelling so that he could not land at Cape Beale, but he went along the coast on a ship and he says that though he did not go on the shore itself, he is satisfied that a fog signal cannot be easily established there. Col. Anderson had printed instructions published all along the coast giving instructions to mariners so that if a wreck happened at any point they might know exactly a safe place at which to land. In addition to what we have done in late years in supplying aids to navigation on the Pacific coast we have made arrangements for two lights, one at Quatsino and another at Quiquat. We are now considering the establishment of a first-class fog alarm between Carmanah and Cape Beale and we will have to decide later whether a fog alarm will be placed on Cape Beale or at some distance below. That would have to be decided by the officers of the department ; of course I cannot express an opinion on such a technical matter. We propose also to extend the telegraph service and put up additional lookouts. The telegraph line to-day is so exposed to storms that it is not rendering the service it should, and so we intend to establish wireless stations at different places along the coast which will have communication with some points near Cape Beale where the Pacific cable will land,

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Does the government intend to own and operate the wireless service on the Pacific coast ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The department has not come to any formal decision ; I am simply stating what we intend to do. We intend at all events to establish wireless stations at that place in order to connect with our telegraph system and that being done I expect that there will be no difficulty in having communication at all times with Nanaimo, and Victoria, and the rest of the world. My hon. friend from Vancouver suggested the idea of having a Canadian government vessel manned with a number of men. I understand that the United States government has some vessels of this kind, and the officers of my department are making inquiries to ascertain whether they are a success or not. Colonel Anderson has special charge of that question. My hon. friend from Nanaimo has called the attention of the House to an accident which some years ago happened to the vessel ' Clallam ', and attributed some blame to the inspector of hulls, boilers and machinery at Victoria, as not having done his duty in regard to that vessel. In connection with the inspection of steamboats, we are obliged to adopt some simple arrangements with other countries. The American authorities accept our inspection, and it was felt that we should reciprocate by accepting their inspection. But, in view of the accidents which have happened, especially in view of the fact that the 'Valencia ' disaster was to a large extent due to the fault of the captain and was also to a certain extent due to the nature of the inspection of the boat, I intend to consider seriously whether we should not have some more rigid inspection of American vessels. This is a question of great importance, because it affects to a certain extent our international arrange-

ments with the United States. I may say that this inspector at Victoria, who inspected the 'Clallam', is a very old officer of the department, having been in the service fifteen or twenty years. This is the first time that any complaint has been made to me against him ; but I intend to look into the report with the view of ascertaining whether the accident was due to his having been remiss in his duty. My hon. friend from Nanaimo suggests that we should require Canadian pilots to be put on all vessels plying in Canadian waters. This is a question with which I am not very familiar, so far as the west is concerned, but it seems to me that that suggestion would be somewhat difficult to carry out, because we should have to provide when and where these men should be landed and when and where they should board the vessels.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. They would have to call at certain points on the coast for certain pilots, as is done in England.

Mr. BRODEUR. I know that is done in the east ; but when vessels come from the sea, and also in the gulf of the St. Lawrence, which is wholly Canadian water, we have always allowed foreign pilots to take charge of them. My hon. friend from Comox (Mr. Sloan) has suggested that the government should appoint a representative of the west on the Lighthouse Board. I may say that my hon. friend had already made that suggestion to me some time ago, and I found it so good that I took immediate steps to provide for such a representation from British Columbia on the board. The difficulty is to find the best man for the position. I am obtaining reports from my officers on that question, and as soon as I am able to find the man whom I consider best qualified to discharge those duties on the Lighthouse Board in all matters concerning British Columbia, I shall be glad to give his name. My hon. friend from Comox also referred to the salaries of the lighthouse keepers. Several applications of the same kind have been made to the department since I have been the head of it, and it is a very important question. I found that there was no system for the regulation of the salaries of lighthouse keepers, the salaries having been increased in some cases and in other cases not. I have asked the officers of my department to make a full report, classifying the lighthouses, and giving the particulars in each case, so that we may adopt a minimum and a maximum salary on the same principle that we have applied to all the civil service. I think it would be in the interest of the service that such a system should be adopted. It is true that some accidents seem to be a necessity of navigation. I have in my hands the last report, published in February last, with regard to the accidents which have been reported to Lloyd's, or the International Register of Shipping, and I find that in one month, from the 20th of February to the 19th of March, 1905, no less than 598 accidents happened. I may say that the number of accidents to large vessels on the Pacific coast does not seem to be out of proportion to the number in other parts of the world. But that is not a reason why we should do nothing to lessen them. It is my intention, I can assure my hon. friends from British Columbia to use every effort in this direction. I shall probably visit British Columbia next season in order to become more intimate with that part of the country, and so to be in a better position to judge of its requirements.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the hon. minister use the ' Kestrel ' ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know the names of the boats, but I suppose I shall have to use one of them to visit the coast in order to familiarize myself with the needs of the country, and I can assure my hon. friends from British Columbia that I shall do my best to render justice to all their legitimate requests.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.) Before this question is disposed of, I would like to say a few words. The accident which has been referred to by the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson) was beyond question very deplorable. It resulted in the loss of 126 lives, and for at least twenty-four hours 75 of those persons were on board this steamer while three vessels, for a part of that time, were a little outside at sea unable to give them assistance. One of these vesels was the steamship 'Salvor,' to which reference has already been made. I do not profess to know much about the condition of aids to navigation in British Columbia, but the report of the commission would indicate that there is a good deal of force in some of the remarks of the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson). The reticence displayed about this report seems rather remarkable because I find it was published in the Victoria ' Daily Times'—the organ of the Minister of Inland Revenue—just three weeks ago. One would think that this report might have been sent to Ottawa and laid on the table long before this, and I must confess I do not understand the statement of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) that this report has been in his hands only two days.

Mr. BRODEUR. This report consists of two parts, one of which has regard to the aids of navigation. I authorized the publication of that portion some time ago in order that we might have a full discussion on these aids to navigation before the opening of the season. The other part, which has reference to the disaster, was received only two days ago.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The report published three weeks ago deals not only with the causes of the accident, but with the failure to afford any relief to the survivors for at least forty-eight hours and those survivors met their death afterwards notwithstanding there were three steamers outside. I should think it would have been proper for the Minister of Inland Revenue, even if there was a supplementary report, to have placed the one in his possession on the table and afford the House that information which would be of assistance to all of us for a proper discussion of the very important question brought to our attention by the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson). And it would perhaps have been not out of place for the hon. gentleman, when he proposed to discuss an important matter of this kind, to have had the courtesy to communicate to the House his intention to do so. On this side we are in the habit of communicating our intentions with regard to such matters to a member of the government or to the House itself upon the motion to adjourn on the day before, and if that be good practice on the one side, it should be equally good on the other.

Mr. MACPHERSON. So far as I am concerned, the omission was simply due to lack of knowledge of parliamentary procedure and not intentional. I should have been only too glad to have made my intention known.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. No doubt my hon. friend, I think, will recognize the desirability of acquainting the House with the intention to discuss questions of this importance as otherwise they can be discussed only very imperfectly. Not having had the opportunity of seeing before hand this report, I am not in a position to discuss the matter as fully as I would wish. But even when I mentioned this report I could obtain no information from the hon. minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) or the members from British Columbia as to whether or not it had been published in the press of that province. The only answer seemed to be an evasive one, so that I took the trouble of having two or three of the British Columbia newspapers examined and eventually found that this report, about which so remarkable an amount of reticence has been observed, was published on the 20th March apparently in full, signed by Captain James Gordon, Captain J. G. Cox and Captain James Newcombe. Of course it has been impossible for me even to read the report in full in the brief time at my disposal since I discovered it, but I propose to give one or two extracts for the benefit of the House and the Minister of Marine (Mr. Brodeur).

My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries declares that he has no fault to find with the spirit in which this question has been discussed by the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson). In saying that I do not think he pays any great compliment to the administration of his own department either by himself or by his predecessor, because the very direct charges made by the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson) against the administration of the Marine Department may be briefly classified as follows: That although during the past ten or twenty years the number of steamships plying along the coast of British Columbia has enormously increased, there are no proper charts of that coast today, and persons entrusting their lives to the safety of these steamships are liable any day to meet with disaster and death.

Mr. MACPHERSON. The hon. gentleman, I am sure, does not want to be unfair. I did not say there were imperfect charts.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Then what was the point?

Mr. MACPHERSON. What I said was that the chart which these boats were sailing by was a chart that was compiled in 1859.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are there any better charts?

Mr. MACPHERSON. No.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Was that a good chart?

Mr. MACPHERSON. I am not questioning that nor did I question it, but I said that a better hydrographic survey should be made at once.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know yet what my hon. friend means. I understood him to say that this was a chart made in 1859, and that there was necessity for more perfect service and better charts. Otherwise I do not at all understand the pertinency of his remarks with regard to the chart. If he did not mean to say that the charts were imperfect, his remarks were irrelevant. I accept his statement as to his intention, but if his remarks did not convey the intention to which I have just alluded, they should not have been introduced into this debate. In the next place he finds that the lights are not only imperfect, but confusing. Not satisfied with stating that they are imperfect, he states that there are two lights near together, which so much resemble each other not only in their general character, but in the period of their flash, that they are almost sure to confuse any master mariner who is seeking to determine his position by means of them. He went on further to say that to continue the conditions which have existed in the past on the coast of British Columbia amounted practically to condonation of murder. It seems to me that if we heard remarks of

that kind applied in criticism of the government from any hon. gentleman on this side we would hear something about extravagance and undue censure, and possibly certain Liberal journals in the country would give free vent to criticism. I have not heard language in condemnation of this government out of the mouth of any hon. gentleman on this side during any session I ever sat in this House which equals in force and violence the criticism pronounced on the administration of this department by the hon. member from Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson).

'Neglect amounting to condonation of murder.' And yet the Minister of Marine and Fisheries professes himself as thoroughly satisfied with the spirit with which the hon. member from Vancouver has discussed this question. Well, if the hon. gentleman is satisfied to find the department over which he presides and the officers of that department charged with conduct equal to condonation of murder, all I have to say is that the hon. gentleman is very easily satisfied, and that we can hardly hope for much from his administration of the department in the future. Either the hon. gentleman to whom I have referred or the hon. gentleman for Nanaimo (Mr. R. Smith) said that some of the officials of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, for whose conduct the minister is responsible in this House were just as guilty with respect to this loss of human life as if they had taken a loaded rifle and destroyed the victims of one of these disasters. Is the Minister of Marine and Fisheries satisfied to have the conduct of officials for whom he is responsible in this House characterized in that way? And is he thoroughly satisfied with the spirit of the address of the hon. member for Vancouver who characterizes in this violent, and I hope, extravagant, manner the administration of the department and the conduct of its officials? That is a matter which the hon. minister will have to settle with his supporters.

But I have one or two remarks to make about the report of this commission, and with respect to the notice that this department has had, not this or last year, but for many years past, with regard to the need of life-saving appliances on the coast of British Columbia. The hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. R. Smith) describes that coast as one of peculiar danger. I do not think he will find himself supported by the report of the commission in that regard. For I find that that question was put to the commissioners at the close of the investigation, and they said, in effect, that the coast of British Columbia, like all cosats has its peculiar dangers, but it is not more dangerous, if properly safeguarded by aids to navigation and appliances to secure the safety of life, than any other coast. I do not think the hon. member for Nanaimo was quite fair in characterizing the great Pacific coast of this Dominion as especially and peculiarly dangerous.

Let us see what took place with regard to these seventy-five people who remained for about forty-eight hours clinging to this wreck,—what measures were taken for their relief and what success those measures met with. The report is very voluminous; in quoting, I shall endeavour to be as brief as possible. Three steamers were sent out for the purpose of rescuing the unfortunate seventy-five people who clung to that wreck for forty-eight hours. One of them was a small steamer called the 'Czar' belonging to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, which was ordered to be sent to the wreck by the superintendent of the Pacific coast branch of that company's steamship service. Another steamer was the 'Queen' belonging to the company to which the lost vessel also belonged. Another was the 'Salvor,' a steamer either owned or chartered—chartered, I believe—by this government to assist, in case of wreck, in the preservation of property and the saving of life. The report describes the efforts made by these three vessels as follows:

> The three vessels named arrived off the scene of the wreck on the morning of the 24th.

The vessel, was wrecked, I believe, on the night of the 22nd, or early in the morning of the 23rd.

> Great difficulty was experienced in finding the stranded vessel owing to the fact that her hull being wholly submerged and her house-works being swept away only a small portion of her remained above the water, and also owing to the heavy sea that was running and the occurrence of heavy rain squalls. When the wreck had been made out the people on board the 'Queen' saw that there were people on the wreck. The 'Czar' went nearest to the wreck of any of the ships at the scene, but being a much smaller boat and lower in the water than the 'Queen,' those on board were not able to make out that there was any life on the wreck, and so reported to the 'Salvor.' The 'Queen' did not report either to the 'Czar' or to the 'Salvor' that there was life on the wreck. As a matter of fact there were upwards of seventy-five people on the wreck at that time.

So, here were three boats, one of which discovered that there was life on the wreck, and two others that did not make that discovery for the reasons mentioned. The one that did make the discovery did not report to the other two.

> Believing that there was no living people on the wreck, those persons in charge of the 'Salvor' and the 'Czar' deemed it advisable to proceed with all speed to Bamfield, the nearest harbour, and there organize for the relief of any of the survivors of the 'Valencia' who might have reached the shore. This was done with satisfactory results, although the people to whom aid could be extended were few. The 'Queen' remained off the scene of the wreck for a short time, not more than half an hour after

the 'Salvor' had left or until the 'City of Topeka,' a steamship owned by the Pacific Coast Steamship Company, arrived from Seattle with the company's manager on board who directed, the 'Queen' to return to Victoria which she immediately did. The 'City of Topeka' remained at the scene and picked up a life raft from the 'Valencia' with eighteen people on it.

This circumstance shows most distinctly that there was an opportunity to proceed from the 'Valencia' and from the ledges on which she was wrecked to the open sea. The 'Salvor,' be it remembered, was chartered by this government to save life and property. Had she had proper boats aboard, all these seventy-five people whose death has been deplored in such eloquent terms by the hon. member for Vancouver, might have been saved. That is the position in which the government finds itself according to the statements contained in the report of this commission about which so discreet a silence has been maintained by hon. gentlemen on the other side.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. If the hon. member (Mr. R. L. Borden) would excuse me, I would remind him that the report of the commission, says that nothing could have been done from the sea.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I will come to that in a moment, and will deal with the question whether the commission says that or not. But I would like to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. Smith), who is so prompt to excuse the government in this matter, if a life raft for the 'Valencia' was able to reach the open sea and be picked up by the 'City of Topeka,' what was there to prevent a proper and efficient life boat going from the 'Salvor' to rescue the people on the 'Valencia ?'

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I can only refer the hon. gentleman to the authority upon which he relies, the report of the commission, which states that it was considered impossible.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not care what any authority says. I say the fact speaks for itself. One boat, or rather a mere life raft, was able to go from the 'Valencia,' where she was wrecked on this ledge, out to sea and was there picked up. Is my hon. friend from Nanaimo (Mr. R. Smith) courageous enough, rash enough, to say that a proper boat from this steamer the 'Salvor' could not have made the same journey to and from the scene of this wreck? Why, the idea is preposterous, and if reports from the province of British Columbia are correct, my hon. friend from Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith) has taken the whole responsibility for this condition of the 'Salvor'. I understand that he took that responsibility in a speech delivered by him in the city of Victoria, which I will quote in a little while. I can therefore understand his earnestness in protesting that these 75 unfortunates who saw out at sea three steamers, had no right to expect them to come to their assistance and so had to remain there hour after hour and day after day, waiting and hoping for the aid that never came. A more outrageous condition, a more scandalous state of affairs could not be imagined. Think of the agony of these people, with steamers only a few miles out at sea, steamers which should have been equipped with the means of saving their lives; think of the agony of these people at seeing these steamers depart one by one without making any attempt whatever to save them. And the hon. gentleman is content to stand up in this House and declare his belief that although a life raft was able to go from the 'Valencia' to the place where these steamers had been cruising, he is satisfied to excuse this government by declaring that it would have been absolutely impossible for the 'Salvor,' even if properly equipped, to save the lives of those people.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I made no such claim. What I did say was that the commission to whose report the hon. gentleman is attaching so much importance, declares that it was impossible to do anything to save them. Why does the hon. gentleman read only that part of it ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I will read the whole of it. Then the hon. gentleman's position is that he relies upon a statement of this commission which he does not at all believe in. It means that or it means nothing. I am not concerned with the report of any commission. If I find that commission reporting that this was impossible, and stating at the same time a fact that shows it was thoroughly possible, I do not propose to stultify myself by saying that it was impossible that these people could be saved. I will proceed with the report of this commission.

The 'Topeka' did not see the wreck, nor did she lower her boats to search for persons who might have been carried out to sea on wreckage. The court is of the opinion that had any attempt been made to reach the wreck from the sea, it would have been wholly useless, in part owing to the kind of boats carried by those steamers——

'Owing to the kind of boats carried by those steamers'. Why, I may ask, was this steamer not equipped with the proper kind of boats to go through that surf and rescue those people ?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. Which steamer does the hon. gentleman refer to ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The 'Salvor' chartered by this government.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. It was no part of the contract with the 'Salvor' that she should proceed to life saving.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is to say, because this government did not provide by contract for a proper boat for the saving of these lives, this government is wholly justified in their attitude. That is the position of the hon. gentleman, as I understand it. Well, it is not necessary to comment upon it, his statement speaks for itself.

—it would have been wholly useless, in part owing to the kind of boats carried by those steamers, but chiefly because of the heavy sea that was running and forming what appeared from the sea to be a continuous line of impassable breakers outside of the wreck. Logan and Daykin, who observed the conditions from the shore, said that the breakers did not form a continuous line——

'Stated that the breakers did not form a continuous line'.

—but two lines overlapping each other, with a comparatively smooth place between them, through which the rafts got away from the ship, but this place was not discernible from the ship, and Logan and Daykin expressed it as their opinion that such boats carried by coasting steamers could not have reached the wreck.

Now, that is the portion of report which the hon. gentleman desired me to read, and which, he declared, shows that it would have been absolutely impossible to save the lives of these men, even if the 'Salvor' had been equipped with proper life saving appliances, and had been provided with boats which reasonable precaution would have provided if the government and the Department of Marine had been attending to their duty.

The court desires to express its deep sympathy with those who have suffered loss through the death of relatives or friends through the disaster.

If the court, instead of expressing that sympathy, had seen fit to give us information which is not to be found in the report as to how near these three steamers to which I have alluded approached that wreck I think we might have placed more reliance in the wisdom of the court and in its capacity to conduct an investigation of this kind. There is not one word in this report from beginning to end which, I can find, to show how near the 'Salvor', or the 'Czar', or the 'Queen' was able to approach this wreck. I venture to think that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries might find it advisable to direct a further inquiry in that regard.

Now I find that this steamship 'Salvor' has been subsidized by the government of this country to the extent, I believe, of $10,000 a year. It is called the British Columbia Salvage Company. It is a statement made in the public press, of which I have no knowledge, but I am submitting this to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and I am saying what I am now about to say for the purpose of information, and in order that a statement of the actual facts may be placed before the House by him, either on this occasion or on some future occasion. This steamship has been chartered by this government, at least has been subsidized by this government, to the extent of $10,000 a year for the safety of life and for the salvage of property as well.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is a wrecking plant.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, it is a wrecking plant. Does the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, after the repeated notices which I understand his department has received from the province of British Columbia, does he excuse himself in respect of this disaster by saying that although the department found it necessary to make provision for saving property, they found it unnecessary and undesirable to make any provision for saving life in cases of a wreck of this kind ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I may say that the contract made with this wrecking plant in British Columbia was the same contract which was made by a former Conservative government for Nova Scotia.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not care whether a Conservative government or a Liberal government made it, I say that out of the mouth of his own friends he has been condemned, because they tell us that the traffic on that coast has been increasing by leaps and bounds during the last ten or twenty years. Further than that, I tell him that the Board of Trade in British Columbia, that his own officers in British Columbia, have urged upon this government over and over again, if statements made in the public press are true, that appliances for the safety of life should be provided. I do not know whether that is true or not. I have placed upon the order paper a motion for all communications of that kind, and we shall see by and by whether or not the officers of the hon. gentleman's department on the Pacific coast, and these Boards of Trade have made these representations to the government, and whether or not these representations have been absolutely neglected, as they appear to have been. But I would like to quote to the House the statement made by the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith) on this subject. I do not know whether the report of his remarks is correct, I take them as I find them in the public press. The words of the hon. gentleman speaking, at the A.O.U.W. Hall on Wednesday—I do not know the date—were :

I take the full responsibility for that 'Salvor' contract. I have no doubt you all believe me honest. The assumption seems to prevail among many that this subsidy towards this

service is intended for life-saving. That is an erroneous opinion. Infected by the disaster, people have received the false conception that this service was intended for the saving of life.

The hon. gentleman seems to think that it is absolutely unheard of that the government, on a coast which he himself pronounced especially dangerous, should undertake the task of providing appliances for saving life, although in his opinion they were bound to do so for the saving of property, and he continues :

It's a salvage service, to save property, and incidentally save life.

Life is a mere incident to property. Look after the property in the first instance and as a mere incident to that, in a mere casual way, you may be able to save some human lives now and then.

It is not part of its service to save life, actually.

Whatever that may happen to mean. The press comment upon this rather forcibly in one or two places. Might I be permitted to read some of the quotations ?

Who should we hold culpable for ignoring the numerous representations that were made about the protection of life on this coast, and were sent to Ottawa by the agent of marine and fisheries in Victoria and by the Board of Trade ? When the people asked for bread, who gave them a stone ? When lives were always at stake, who provided facilities for saving wrecks only ?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. What paper is that in ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not know the paper.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. That is the 'Colonist,' the Conservative paper in Victoria.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, I have read the report of the commission from the Liberal paper and I am now quoting in turn from the Conservative paper. Both of them seem to condemn the hon. gentleman with about the same vigour.

I am not reading this for the purpose of any partisan comment, I am reading it for the statements of fact which it contains, and one of these statements of fact which I have just read is that numerous representations as to the necessity of protecting life on that coast were sent to Ottawa by the agent of marine and fisheries in Victoria, and by the board of trade. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman who has interrupted me so frequently whether he knows anything of these and whether that statement is correct ?

Mr. RALPH SMITH. What statement ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The statement that numerous representations have been sent by the agent of marine and fisheries and by the board of trade as to the necessity of appliances for the saving of life on that coast.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. I think perhaps as far as the board of trade is concerned that is true; I could not say what the report of the agent of marine and fisheries is because that is a private matter.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If these representations were made by the board of trade do they not seem to have been well founded ? Think of the loss of a steamer loaded with freight and carrying a large number of passengers on a dangerous coast such as has been described, and tell me why in the name of all that is human should you provide means for saving that property and provide no reasonable means for saving those lives ? I do not understand the point of view of the hon. gentleman who seems so anxious to justify the view of the government although he has been elected to this parliament as a perfectly independent member, free entirely from all party ties.

Mr. RALPH SMITH. What is the hon. gentleman's conception of an independent member ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Well, it is the exact opposite of any characteristic I have ever seen the hon. gentleman display.

I should like to continue with a few more statements of fact contained in this article. I do not know whether or not the statements of fact are correct, but they are not statements over which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. L. P. Brodeur) should go to sleep and he seems a little inclined to somnolence just at this moment.

Immediately after the loss of the 'Pass of Melfort' on the west coast of Vancouver island with all hands,——

I do not know at what date that took place; perhaps the minister could inform me when the 'Pass of Melfort' was lost ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have not the date before me.

Mr. MACPHERSON. December 26, 1905.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (reading) :

Immediately after the loss of the 'Pass of Melfort' on the west coast of Vancouver island, with all hands, the board of trade once more took up the question with the government of life-saving appliances on that coast and pointed out that a whaling company had been formed and were operating at Sechart, and had the steamer 'Orion' engaged in the business ; that this steamer kept steam up constantly, and that her crew were always on board. The board of trade requested that an arrangement be made with this company by which their steamer could be called upon at any time for the saving of life and property ; also that telegraphic communication be established between coast points and the whaling station. The board went fully into the question of the great loss of life on the west coast and referred the

minister to the records of his own department. A copy of this letter was sent to all the members and senators from the province. Mr. Ralph Smith acknowledged the receipt of the letter and stated that the board 'must be aware that the government had entered into a contract with the British Columbia Salvage Company, and that a subsidy of $10,000 a year had been provided for that purpose.'

That seems to deal with life-saving appliances and the answer of the hon. gentleman to the letter seems to indicate that at that time at least he expected that this steamer the 'Salvor,' would be equipped with everything necessary for the saving of life which might be endangered by wrecks on that coast.

In this way the governmen have left the matter, they have taken no action up to the present time. The discussion to-day will not be without profit to the House and the country if it induces the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to give his immediate attention to this question and to provide on the coast of British Columbia those reasonable and necessary means for saving life which, if provided at the proper time, would have resulted in the safety instead of the death of 126 human beings. I understand that although the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is technically responsible for the administration of his department under his predecessors we must not hold him personally and humanly responsible for that administration in the past. I do not wish to impute that to the hon. gentleman who has only been a few months in his department. I believe he will give vigour and industry to the administration of that department and I join with my friends from British Columbia in urging upon him the necessity of undertaking this work at once, because, however valuable and necessary may be the appliances he has provided for the safety of property, I am sure that he and his colleagues on the treasury benches will realize and recognize that ten thousand times more valuable and necessary are the appliances which should be immediately provided for the purpose of saving human life on that coast.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue). The hon. members for Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson), Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith), at Comox (Mr. Sloan) have advanced many and cogent reasons in favour of improving the aids to navigation on the Pacific coast by the erection of lighthouses, fog alarms, beacons, buoys, wireless telegraphs, and other modern appliances. This is a question of very great importance to the province of British Columbia, and its importance is fully realized by this government which in recent years has taken active steps towards improving the navigation of the Pacific coast. The hon. the leader of the opposition in his address, thought it well to depart from the arguments adduced by the members from British Columbia, and to attempt to fasten upon the government responsibility for the wreck of the steamship 'Valencia' and the lamentable loss of life which followed. It does seem to me to be an unfortunate thing that the leader of a great political party should attempt to make political capital out of such a misfortune. One would think it too small a thing for a gentleman in his high position to attempt to saddle upon the government of the country responsibility for loss of life in a marine casuality of this kind. I am sorry to say that the leader of the Conservative party seems to be attempting to build up a political platform upon calamities and misfortunes. It is only the other day that political capital was sought to be made out of the falling of a tower, and this afternoon we had a similar attempt with regard to a disaster which happened at the other side of the continent and for which possibly no one was directly responsible except the unfortunate captain who went down with his ship. So I say, the leader of the Conservative party seems to be attempting to form his political platform out of a couple of misfortunes such as the falling of a tower in Ottawa and the loss of a steamship on the Pacific coast.

Mr. BARR. It is a misfortune for you.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. It is a misfortune for the opposition that such tactics should be resorted to. What are the facts in respect to the loss of the steamship 'Valencia'? She was an American mail steamer registered in San Francisco, officered by Americans and on her voyage from San Francisco she ran north some 700 miles in a fog. She passed the American lights at Tatoosh, and at Cape Flattery without seeing them, the fog being so dense. She passed Carmanah light on the shores of Vancouver island and stranded within six miles of the Cape Beale light without seeing any lights whatever. The captain simply sailed forty or fifty miles too far north and instead of getting into the Straits of Fuca he ran on the shores of Vancouver island. There was an extremely heavy sea and his ship landed among the breakers and in among the rocky ledges only a few hundred yards from the Vancouver island coast. As soon as information arrived in Victoria that the accident had happened, three ships, the 'Salvor,' the 'Czar' a powerful tug, and the 'Queen' of the same line as the 'Valencia,' hastened to the rescue. These ships got outside of where the 'Valencia' was stranded and the evidence given at the investigation which is backed up by the

opinions of the captains on board all these vessels is, that it was absolutely impossible for any aid to be rendered to the stranded 'Valencia' by the three steamers I have named. My hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) read some portions of the evidence—

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not read any portion of the evidence.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I beg his pardon; he read from the report which is founded on the evidence, and I should like to quote some few extracts from that report. It says :

The accident to the 'Valencia' happened on the 23rd, information was conveyed to Victoria on the 23rd at half past two p.m., and the salvage steamer 'Salvor' hastened to the rescue. The 'Czar' and the 'Queen' also were ordered to the scene. These three vessels arrived at the scene of the wreck on the morning of the 24th. Great difficulty was experienced in finding the stranded vessel owing to the fact that her hull being wholly submerged and her house work being swept away, only a small portion of her remained above water.

It appeared in evidence that it was very difficult indeed to distinguish the remains of the 'Valencia' through the fog and through the blinding rain.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The report says so.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The report continues.

And also owing to the heavy sea that was running and the occurrence of heavy rain squalls. When the wreck had been made out, the people on board the 'Queen' saw that there were people on the wreck. The 'Czar' went nearer to the wreck than any of the ships at the scene, but being a much smaller boat and lower in the water than the 'Queen,' those on board her were not able to make out that there was any life on the wreck, and so reported to the 'Salvor.' The 'Queen' did not report either to the 'Czar' or to the 'Salvor' that there was life on the wreck, although it is in evidence that some one called out to the 'Czar' that there was ; but this was not heard on the 'Czar.' As a matter of fact there were upwards of seventy-five people on the wreck at the time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is the hon. gentleman reading the evidence or the report ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I am reading the report.

As a matter of fact there were upwards of seventy-five people on the wreck at that time. Believing that there were no living people on the wreck, those persons in charge of the 'Salvor' and 'Czar' deemed it advisable to proceed with all speed to Bamfield, the nearest harbour and there organize for the relief of any of the survivors of the 'Valencia' who might have reached the shore. This was done with satisfactory results, although the people to whom aid could be extended were few. The 'Queen' remained off the scene of the wreck for a short time, not more than half an hour after the 'Salvor' had left, or until the 'City of Topeka,' a steamship owned by the Pacific Coast Steamship Company, arrived from Seattle with the company's manager on board, who directed the 'Queen' to return to Victoria, which she accordingly did. The 'City of Topeka' remained at the scene and picked up a life raft from the 'Valencia' with eighteen people on it. The 'Topeka' did not see the wreck, nor did she lower her boats to search for persons who might have been carried out to sea on wreckage.

And this is an important statement and is the crux of the whole thing.

The court is of opinion that had any attempt been made to reach the wreckage from sea, it would have been wholly useless, in part owing to the kind of boats carried by those steamers but chiefly because of the heavy sea that was running and forming what appeared from the sea to be a continuous line of impassable breakers outside of the wreck. Logan and Daykin, who observed the conditions from the shore, said that the breakers did not form a continuous line, but two lines overlapping each other, with a comparatively smooth place between them, through which the rafts got away from the ship, but this place was not discernible from the ship and Logan and Daykin expressed it as their opinion that such boats carried by coasting steamers could not have reached the wreck.

Daykin is the keeper of Carmanah lighthouse. Logan is a resident of Alberni district. The two men had made their way through the woods, across the mountains and along the shore to a point opposite to where the wreck was, some hundred yards distant. I have read the whole reference in the report to the attempted rescue of the passengers and crew of the wrecked vessel, and I call the attention of the House expressly to the opinion of these nautical men that it would have been absolutely impossible to have rescued any of these people from the direction of the sea. The commission was composed of three marine men, Captain James Gaudin, for many years the agent of the Department of Marine and Fisheries in British Columbia, Captain Cox and Captain Newcombe, of the government steamer 'Kestrel.' The opinion of these men ought, I think, to be taken before that of my hon. friend, who said that these men should have ventured closer to the ship and should have attempted to rescue the people who, it was afterwards shown, were aboard the 'Valencia,' although at that time it was unknown to the people on the 'Salvor' and the 'Czar' that any of the crew or passengers were on board of that ship.

Now, it seems to me that the attempt of my hon. friend to fasten on the government the responsibility for the loss of life that occurred will be absolutely unsuccessful. It is only a few weeks since I had to return to the Pacific coast and face the electors of the city of Victoria, and the only question

discussed at that election was the 'Valencia' disaster. Our Conservative friends forgot altogether the questions which they sometimes discuss in this House. They never once refered to the Autonomy Bills nor to the question of trade or the tariff, but they tried—because my election was only a few weeks after this unfortunate calamity—to work up public opinion on this question in the hope of defeating me. What was the result? In the city of Victoria, where all the facts are known, where the nature of the coast line is known, where the efforts of this government to provide greater facilities to navigation are known, my friends of the Conservative party were unsuccessful in inducing even one voter to hold this government responsible in any respect for this melancholy disaster.

Now, we all realize the necessity for more aids to navigation on the Pacific coast. As one of the hon. members from British Columbia said, our coast line is several thousand miles in extent, and this particular part of the coast, Carmanah lighthouse westward, and northward, is exceedingly dangerous. It would be absolutely impossible, I am advised by the experts of the department, to maintain a life-saving station at any point between Carmanah and Cape Beale, this is the stretch of coast where most of these unfortunate disasters have taken place. The coast is abrupt, mountainous almost down to the water's edge, is densely wooded, is cut into here and there by mountain streams and gorges, and it would be absolutely impossible to maintain at any point along that coast a life-saving station. But I understand that it is the policy of the department to place life-saving stations at Bamfield Creek, from which point life-boats might proceed to sea. It might also be well to have life stations at Carmanah, but along this coast line, all the way from Carmanah to Barclay Sound, there is no point where life-boats could be launched. This matter has been engaging my personal attention for some weeks, and I have been in communication with the officers of the department, even before my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had attained that position, with the view of trying to solve the difficulty. The officers of the department have had the matter under consideration and have been making an inspection with the view of establishing a certain number of wireless telegraphic stations, arranging to have constructed a road along the coast line in order that life-saving appliances could proceed from point to point as might be found necessary. The problem is an extremely difficult one. We cannot do in a hurry all that we expect to do, but I am quite certain that the necessities of the case will be met, and that every possible security that can be given to life and property, and every possible appliance that can be provided for the saving of life in the case of marine disasters will be provided by the government at a very early date.

I do not know that I have any thing further to say. We all regret this lamentable disaster. I do not think my hon. friend can make any political capital out of it; I am quite sure he cannot. His party failed in the city of Victoria, where every man, woman and child know all about the loss of the 'Valencia,' and I am quite sure he will fail in this House in any such attempt as completely as did his friends in the city of Victoria, where the one and only thing they had to talk about in the recent election, when the Conservative party was defeated by about 700, was the unfortunate loss of the steamer 'Valencia,' only about one hundred miles from the city in which I live.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Might I call the attention of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the circumstance that the Victoria 'Daily Times', from which I quoted this afternoon, declares that

> A supplementary report recommending various aids to navigation, life saving appliances and arrangements was read at the last sitting of the commissioners this morning. This report was published in the 'Times' some weeks ago.

Therefore, instead of having been delayed, it evidently was published in advance, and everything was available on the 20th March.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. That portion of the the report to which my hon. friend refers consists of recommendations of the commission regarding improvements which were made at my request.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am only referring to the date of course.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. At my request they furnished me with suggestions as to what improvements could be made and my object was to get those suggestions before the public as early as possible. I received that supplementary report from the commissioners at Victoria and read it at a public meeting, and it was published in the newspapers. That interim report is the conclusion of this report. It simply refers to the proposed improvements and was published before the report was finally prepared.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not criticising anything but simply calling attention to the fact that everything was complete by the 20th March, and I understood this afternoon from the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) that the report only came to his hand only a few days ago.

Mr. BRODEUR. I meant the final report.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I may be under some misapprehension, but the report from

which the Minister of Inland Revenue has just read, was published in the Victoria 'Times' on the 20th March, and the same issue of the paper states that the supplementary report had been published in its columns some weeks previously. I think therefore it should have been available long before this.

Mr. BRODEUR. That the whole report should have been published before it reached the department.

Mr. J. B. KENNEDY (New Westminster). I had not intended, Mr. Speaker, to take any part in the debate, but having heard some very curious assertions, I should like to add my testimony to that of my hon. colleague from Vancouver (Mr. Macpherson) as to the necessity and importance for better protection and lighting of the entrance to the Straits of Fuca. As my hon. friend has told the House, practically all the shipping of British Columbia—certainly all the shipping of the southern part—and all the shipping from Puget Sound has to reach the open sea through the Straits of Fuca, and it is very important that the entrance, although wide and easily found in daylight should be well lighted at night. Thanks to the efforts of the government, the entrance is comparatively safe now, but it can be made safer. Improvements are always in order, and we are anxious to see still further improvements made in the lighting of those straits. Every one understands that one side is on American territory and the other on Vancouver island. The Americans have their side as well lighted as ours—I do not think any better. I have not gone through it for some years, but the first time I came through was in a storm in the middle of the night, and we made the entrance quite easily. That was a good many years ago, and no doubt it is much better lighted since then.

In giving statistics regarding the shipping which leaves Vancouver, my hon. friend did not mention another shipping point. I do not propose to trouble the House with any statistics at all, but I would like the House to know that there is another shipping point, with a deep water harbour, the only fresh water harbour in British Columbia—the Fraser river, about sixteen or eighteen miles from the mouth of which is the city of New Westminster. Thanks to the efforts of the government within the past few years in dredging some of the worst places in the river, the largest vessels can go to the city of New Westminster and load with perfect safety. Last week a vessel drawing twenty-two and a half feet of water and loaded with one and a quarter million feet of lumber left New Westminster and went over the worst bar with several feet of water to spare.

But that is not what I rose to draw attention to. In discussing that terrible disaster which befell the 'Valencia', some statements have been made reflecting very severely on the government. Well, I am not here to defend the government. That is not necessary. But there were some very strange assertions made. I understood the hon. the leader of the opposition to say that there was nothing to hinder those boats which were lying outside from reaching that vessel when a light raft could get away from her and find a channel out.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not say that.

Mr. KENNEDY. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. Being a little deaf, I do not always hear what is going on and consequently must have misunderstood what the hon. gentleman said.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I said that if the 'Salvor' had been equipped with a proper boat which could go through the surf, as she should have been, that boat would have been able to reach the wreck because a raft had come from the wreck.

Mr. KENNEDY. That is if she had been equipped with proper life-boats.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY. That is all right. I understood my hon. friend to say that there was nothing to hinder a boat reaching the vessel. Any one who has ever been on a deep water tug and tried to get a line to another vessel in a heavy sea would easily understand how difficult it was to reach that ship when the wind was blowing heavily against it and rocks all around. There have been all sorts of reasons given why the vessel was lost, and we are very apt to lose sight of the real reason why so many wrecks take place. The real reason is the inordinate greed and thirst for making money which characterizes so many of our shipping companies as well as other companies. The man in charge of that vessel could very easily, by losing the night's run, have saved his ship, but the officers of these steamers are under such orders from the owners that they very often take chances which their better judgment would lead them to refuse. Just fancy a man with a large number of human beings under his care running a rocky shore looking for an entrance. The only entrance was from the east. Just imagine his looking for that entrance and losing his reckoning and then, although he knew he was out of his reckoning, rather than lose time by going out to deep water and waiting for daylight, trying to find his way in, and in consequence wrecking his ship and causing much loss of life. The same thing happened years ago when the steamer 'Islander, belonging to the Canadian Navigation Company, now controlled by the Cana-

dian Pacific Railway, was lost. The captain of that vessel, in trying to make a record run, was running almost at full speed in a fog when he knew there were ice-bergs all around, and consequently lost his vessel. Therefore, I say that people in trying to find scapegoats for these disasters very often do not blame those deserving of censure, but instead blame the government or some other authority that had nothing to do with it.

THE YUKON CONCESSIONS.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I want to refer very briefly to a matter which has come to light through the press, and this time, as often at other times, through the medium of the Yukon press. There are in three or four of the numbers of the Dawson 'Daily News' a sort of serial running composed of various letters and comments thereon. These letters have seen the light on account of a law suit which has gone on there and here between certain concessionaries in a dispute which has arisen among themselves. And in that correspondence, these gentlemen, and a member of the House, and a department of the government, each play a part. I have no fault to find with gentlemen taking hold of a concession that they think they can make a good thing out of it—it is their own affair and they are not to be blamed for taking hold of it. But there are some parts of this transaction which seem a little peculiar, and which, I think, might with advantage be commented upon in the House.

It is the Department of the Interior that, in this case, as in so many others, furnishes food for thought. It is over that department, in this case, as in so many others, that the shadow of suspicion draws closer and closer towards the department itself and the central figure of the department. It is in the management of that immense part of our domain which fell into the hands of the ex-Minister of the Interior that this suspicion has had birth, has developed and is, I suppose, now coming somewhere near its denouement.

Mr. BUREAU. Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. I infer from the plaintive expression that I hear from the other side that that word is not clear enough to my hon. friend, and perhaps I should ask his pardon for using it. I will refer him to the Minister of the Interior for a translation of the word, for I can hardly translate it myself. It appears, however, that, in 1899, two business men of the city of Ottawa obtained from the government a valuable concession in the Yukon. These were excellent business men, and in every way reputable and worthy citizens of this city—Messrs. Bronson and Ray. Associated with them was Mr. Joseph Tyrrell, at one time an officer of the government connected with geographical and topographical exploration of the Northwest. It seems to have been the intention of these gentlemen—as appears from the correspondence which was published—to pay the rents and fees of the lawyers, and, outside of that, to spend as little as possible in developing and working the concession. It seems to have been in the carrying out of that policy that they got into trouble. For, about the year 1902, as appears from the correspondence, these gentlemen were rudely startled by a notice from the Department of the Interior that the time for the operation of the concession would not be extended, and that it was the intention of the department to terminate the concession a short time after the notice. This notice impelled to action. Two courses were open to these gentlemen in order to keep their concession. One was the simple, plain and businesslike course of expending a proper amount of money upon the concession in order to do the work which was made necessary by the regulations. That would appear to the ordinary person to be the best, quickest and most proper method to follow. But it had not been the policy of these concessionnaries up to that time, nor did it appear to be the policy that they thought best to adopt. They looked around to see what other course they could follow. They seem to have had an impression—and here is where the first reason for thoughtfulness comes in—that it was possible to retain the concession by some other method than that of putting on the machinery and doing the work necessary to fulfil the conditions attached to the granting of the concession. They seem to have had an impression that it was possible to bring influence to bear upon the minister to have him make it unnecessary for them to actually develop the concession in 1902 that had been running from 1899. And so, as it appears from the correspondence, instead of putting on their machinery and working their concession so as to make it impossible for it to be taken away from them, they sought the other method of bringing influence to bear upon the minister. Assuming that affairs were in a normal condition, one would suppose that the first idea that would occur to two business men like Messrs. Bronson and Ray, would be that if they as business men were handling a business proposition and had to deal with a business minister, the natural and the quickest way to settle the whole matter would be to go to that business minister with their business proposition, talk it over with him and present their reasons. Then, if the reasons were sound and sufficient, the business minister would give his agreement and consent, and everything would be all right. Why was it that two business men like Messrs. Bronson and Ray did not think that was the natural as well as the best way of making

their approach to the minister ? I have said that this affords food for thought. I think it does. I cannot conceive of their taking any other course unless they were under the impression that it was possible, under the government as it was constituted, and taking into account their experience with that government, to bring a sinister influence to bear upon that government and upon the minister who was chiefly involved and so get an extension of a concession which they could not get for business reasons, however good or reasonable those reasons might be.

Now that in the first place is not very complimentary to the government, and was not very complimentary to the minister. But they did not think that they themselves were the proper persons to go and see the minister. They cast around for some saviour other than themselves. The course of the correspondence shows how this gradually developed. Perhaps it would be better to read the correspondence in part, so as to show the various steps which were taken. There seemed to be a series of letters written along about the latter part of June or the 1st of July, some of which are shown in the exhibit as being brought out during the trial. One of the first of these letters is directed to J. B. Tyrrell, who at that time was in Dawson City, and it goes on in this way :

Dear Mr. Tyrrell.— Mr. Ray brought into me yesterday a notice received by him and Mr. Bronson from the Department of the Interior, in which the department notifies them that the extension of time granted to them of an indefinite time to do the work on the Bonanza hydraulic concession, has been withdrawn, and that the lease in question will be cancelled because of a lease executed by you on the 30th of March, 1901, in the name of E. H. Bronson and C. C. Ray to S. J. Thurber on the McKay fraction being a part of this concession. Both Mr. Ray and Mr. Bronson are very much exercised over the matter, and they have asked me to try and straighten it out with the minister, which I am trying to do.

Then follows some writing which is not important to the subject immediately in hand. The writer goes on to say :

I am also instructed by them to request that you will be good enough to forward at once to me a letter which I can show to the minister, and if necessary have filed with him, giving the best explanation possible why this lease was entered into, and containing such details as will enable me to get over the difficulty created by its execution. Please do so. You might also write me a letter for myself, in which you will give me such explanations as you think will enable me in the matter. . . You are no doubt aware that Mr. Ross is very much opposed to these concessions, and that he has set himself to the task of abolishing as many of them as he can.

This letter is signed N. A. Belcourt. Now you will notice that Mr. Belcourt, in writing to Mr. Tyrrell, asks him to send two letters. One is to be a letter of the kind which will help Mr. Belcourt with the minister; the other is to be a letter natural, as it would seem, an explanation of affairs exactly as they were. Then Mr. C. C. Ray writes to Mr. Tyrrell some time later, about half a month or so. Writing to Mr. Tyrrell he says :

Dear Sir,—Your letters of May 11 and 12 were answered as far as possible by my wire and Mr. Belcourt's letters. It looked as if we would have no concession to work. Mr. Ross and the minister seemed determined that it should go. If we hold it we can thank our solicitor, who is moving heaven and earth to save it. . . . I hope the proposed arrangement with Belcourt and McDougall will meet with your approval, it seemed the only thing to do if we are to save the concession, and if we cannot save it, there is nothing lost by giving them an interest.

Here is a hint at a modification of the terms under which Messrs. Ray, Bronson and Tyrrell went into this arrangement, and the share which each was to have in the development of the concession. Some other arrangement is hinted at in this letter of Mr. Ray, an arrangement with Messrs. Belcourt & McDougall, and the statement is made that they hope Mr. Tyrrell will acquiesce in that arrangement, as it is the only possible way, seemingly to them, by which the concession can be retained. Well, there comes another letter also written by Mr. Tyrrell, in July, 1902:

Referring to your letter of May 20, wherein you made some suggestions as to the future working of our concession, I write to say that certain events have transpired which seem to render necessary another arrangement which will take the place of the one you suggested. A short time ago we received a letter from the minister in which he stated to us that our extension of time for working had been cancelled ; that he could not give us any additional ground for dumping purposes for the reason that we had granted a lease for a portion of our territory contrary to the conditions of the grant to us, and that therefore the concession would be cancelled and notice to that effect posted on the ground. . . . We saw at once that prompt action must be taken if we were to save the concession, and after talking the matter over decided to interest Messrs. Belcourt & McDougall with us in order to secure their assistance, both in arranging to retain the concession, and also, later on, in connection with the working or sale of it as the case might be, if we succeeded in holding it. Mr. Belcourt will draw up a memorandum covering the organization of the company we decided to organize in case the chute fell through, and also providing for an allotment of a certain proportion of the stock to them. It may be necessary to sell them their proportionate interest before the company is organized, and we would then all join in the sale to the company for the allotment of stock as proposed. You will notice from Mr. Belcourt's memorandum that the firm of Belcourt & McDougall, Mr. Ray and Mr. Bronson each are to receive $100,000 of paid up stock in the company.

Up to this time it was a concession owned by three. When this trouble arose a saviour was sought for, and the saviour could only be gained, as it seems, by making a new distribution of the deal, putting it into the form of a joint stock company with a million dollars of capital, putting $500,000 of this in the treasury for development purposes, and dividing the other $500,000 amongst the three concessionnaires, and as it appears by these letters, also a portion to Messrs. McDougall & Belcourt.

The House will understand that Mr. McDougall is the Yukon end of the firm of Belcourt & McDougall ; that is I believe he is the partner of Mr. Belcourt here. This also should be read :

The understanding with Messrs. Belcourt & McDougall is that they give their professional services free and that you do the same, and that Mr. Ray and Mr. Bronson will do anything that may lie in their power and that they may be able to do here at Ottawa during the session.

Another series of letters appears shortly afterwards, mostly duplicating in sense those that I have already read, one from Mr. Belcourt to Mr. Tyrrell reiterating just about what was stated in the preceding letter of Mr. Belcourt to Mr. Tyrrell which I have already read. One comes from Mr. Tyrrell to Mr. Ray:

Dear Mr. Ray,—About ten days ago I was greatly surprised to see a notice in the papers saying that the Bronson & Ray concession was to be thrown open and a little later I received letter from Mr. Belcourt saying that the department was taking action on account of the lease to one Thurber. . . . I went at once to see Mr. Ross——

Who I believe was then commissioner in the Yukon.

—and he told me what he had been doing and will do all in his power to have the ground thrown open. I therefore wired you :

The Thurber lease can be bought for less than $1,000. What do you advise me to do ? The government——

That is the local government of the Yukon.

—is decidedly hostile to you unless you are able to commence work at once.

That bears out what I said in the beginning, that one way to have secured this lease without doubt was simply to have gone on and commenced work and put their money and machinery into it and develop the proposition according to the terms and conditions on which it was granted. Mr. Tyrrell goes on:

It is certainly their intention to take advantage of any technical quibble to annul the lease, and if possible it will be cancelled on 29th of September, in spite of any vague promises that may be made in the meantime.

Trusting that you will be able to arrange things satisfactorily in Ottawa,

Yours sincerely,

J. B. TYRRELL.

Again Tyrrell writes to Ray on July 21 and says:

I do not believe for a moment that they can save the concession as well as we can, by merely promising that we will go on and work.

That seems to be the opinion of Mr. Tyrrell on the ground, that one way and the only way to save the concession is to go on and do the necessary work on it. That is on July 21, 1902, and these negotiations through Mr. Belcourt are going on with the minister and with the department here. The minister, through his deputy, appears after awhile to have telegraphed to Mr. Beaudette in Dawson asking him whether any work had been done on this concession, and here is the reply :

Sir,—In answer to your telegram of the 6th instant re work done on the Bronson & Ray concession, I have the honour to report that no work has been done nor any preparatory work to commence operations has been started, nor any machinery placed thereon.

Your obedient servant,

A. J. BEAUDETTE.

That is on November 11 when all this trouble started and was brought to the head of the department between the 1st of June and July. Previous to that Mr. Tyrrell had said: There is one way by which this can be saved—go on and do your work. Another method was sought for and on November 11, months thereafter, the minister telegraphed for information and is informed by Beaudette that no work has been done, that there is no sign even of preparatory work being carried on necessary to the other work, and that no machinery has been placed upon the concession. But a better way was, as it appears, actually found, and on January 7 a letter started from Ottawa to Mr. Tyrrell signed by C. C. Ray, the president:

Dear Mr. Tyrrell,—After several inevitable delays we were able yesterday to have a meeting of the board of directors. . . . Now that the irritation against the concession is allayed here, and I think that the head representative of the government in Dawson, who, amongst ourselves, is to be Mr. Congdon, if you are careful in not infringing on any provisions of the lease as to granting lays, payment of annual rent and doing the required work annually, &c., I hope and feel that our troubles have come to an end.

That is a happy finale to this second method which was taken to prevent the concession from lapsing as against the other method of which I spoke at first.

There is not much more of importance in the letters so far as I have them in this paper, except for an expression or two in the evidence which was taken during the lawsuit. A question was asked :

Q. The work had been in default from the time of the granting of the concession up till 1902 ?

A. I do not consider that it was. We were exempted by the minister from doing it.

Q. Was this exemption granted after the default had been made ?

A. No, I do not think so. It was granted early—I think very soon after the concession was secured, the exemption was granted.

Q. When you were in Dawson did you have any negotiations with Mr. Louis Williams as to water ?

An answer was given to the effect that there had been negotiations, and the end of the sentence is a follows:

We also had some conversation with Mr. Congdon, the commissioner, and he thought that he could recommend the minister at Ottawa to allow some such arrangement, if we could make it, to be carried out without violating our lease.

An account which comes out in the shape of a letter between some of the parties shows that in the period between 1899 and 1902 there had been a total expenditure of about $6,800 on that concession, but of that total expenditure more than one-half had been on rental and on legal fees and all these expenses of lawyers and the like of that, and that $3,000, about, was put in the item of drafts to Mr. Tyrrell who was in Dawson. The outside estimate that that statement of financial expenditures will allow you to put on the expenditure on the concession from 1899 to 1902 is not more than $3,000. Then it went on until November 11, 1902, and to January, 1903, without the evidence showing that any further expenditure had been put upon it; but what has been done between 1903 and now I do not know. It may be that further evidence that is to come out will show whether or not any expenditure has been made from that time to this. But in January, 1903, the minister had been pacified here and everything was at rest owing to the good services of Mr. Belcourt who took the matter up for them.

Now, as a comment upon this I have not very much to say; I will leave that to gentlemen who are to come after me in the course of this discussion. But there are two or three things that I will say. One is, to ask a question : Why Mr. Ray and Mr. Bronson two good business men with a business proposition did not go straight to the department and the minister and look after their concession ? Were they not as good business men as Mr. Belcourt ? had they not just as good standing with the government, and the community, and the ministry as Mr. Belcourt ? Were there any legitimate reasons that could be urged before the minister and the department in a business way, that Messrs. Ray and Bronson as business men could not urge upon the ministry just as well as could a third party? What influence did they expect that Mr. Belcourt would bring to bear, if no influence was to be brought to bear which was not an open and legitimate influence ? There must have been somewhere in the minds of these gentlemen a feeling which had grown into them from their observation of things and their experience of things, that the safest way for them to do was to influence the ministry in some other way than a mere open business way, and by some other means than through the medium of two most excellent and most reputable business men.

Now, the next thing that comes up is this, and it is the second comment I wish to make. In the case of a member of parliament elected by his constituency to represent them in parliament—no matter though he be a lawyer who can in his profession offer his services to any cause or any person who will pay him fair remuneration—is it the best plan, the safest plan, the wisest plan, the plan most conducive to pure public life and good public administration, that he should in such a case as this interpose himself between the government and the parties concerned in an attempt by influence to get for these parties what they by the urging of business reasons do not seem to think they could get for themselves ? More than that, does it tend to the best and highest type of public life that a member of parliament shall make an arrangement with men in the exact predicament that these men were, by which it is made obligatory that if they want to be gotten out of a tight place they have to rearrange their concession and put it into a different shape and give him $100,000 out of $500,000 of stock for his services in the matter? If that is allowable in this parliament—if it is good for one it is good for the other—what is to prevent every member in this parliament selling his services to every seeker for favours from the government and turning the High Court of parliament into a mere debauch ; nothing more and nothing less. There is no reason why if one man does it another man shall not do it. And just let us sit down for a moment and think out for ourselves, what would be the condition of public life and public administration if every member of parliament held himself for sale in that way. It has been said—is there truth in it or not—that there are numberless instances where people coming to this Ottawa having business to transact with ministers find it difficult to get the ear or the time of the minister, and after many fruitless efforts some man in the 'know' says to them : Why don't you employ so and so ; he will take your case, he will find an opportunity of getting an audience with the ministers and he will get for you much better than you can get for yourself what there is to be got out of the ministry. Is that taking place in this city of Ottawa; it is an occurrence that takes place so often

that it becomes a matter of common remark not only by people in Canada but by people from other countries coming to Canada who have to do business with the ministers. The man who makes an arrangement of that kind and goes to the minister to urge reasons in private which the first parties themselves do not seem able to do though they be competent business men, establishes if he is successful, an unholy partnership between himself and the minister in which neither can ever afterwards have the same respect for the other that he had before such a transaction took place. And it is very easy to fall down from that into co-partnership between the minister and the advocate which loses sight of the public interest in the mutual advancement of private interests. Am I too strong in these strictures? Ask the history of that best and greatest and oldest of all parliaments, the parliament of Great Britain? There you do not find that such a thing is tolerated in a single instance. A lawyer may do this work before he becomes a member of parliament in England, but when he becomes a member of parliament, then under the rigid scrutiny of strong public opinion he is not allowed to do what I have described as having been done here. The reflection of that sentiment has at last dawned upon gentlemen opposite. One of their best members, their Minister of Justic has to-day on the Order Paper of parliament a Bill that will make it absolutely impossible for lawyers in this House any longer to practice before its committee and make a source of gain out of the position that they have been given by their constituents for other far different and I am bound to say far better purposes.

So that if you take the consensus of opinion in the best parliament in the world and what has been its guiding motive and impelling impulse, you find that my argument is strengthened; and things which are done here, if done by a British member of parliament and in connection with the British ministry and the British House of Commons, would find short shrift, for the man who had been so bold as to carry them out. Mr. Speaker, this parliament is not simply now approaching—it has already approached, to the very verge of what is decency and seemliness in regard to the administration of public affairs, when a minister of the Crown seems to see no wrong, seems to have no feeling that it is not quite fit and up to the mark, to confess in this House that he is a shareholder and virtually the president of a company—if not the president actually, a president in esse—confesses with the utmost show of innocence that he instructs his first officer to patronize a company in which he himself is a stockholder, and out of the sale of whose property he benefits by every thousand gallons of the stuff that is sold—acknowledges that in parliament at this age and at this time, and does not seem to think that anything has been done which it is not quite the best and most proper thing for a minister to do. Aye, Sir, and men who have shared, and who as members of parliament would not like to come right out and show themselves as being partners, in contracts and other arrangements with the government, do it in another way, by becoming members of companies and corporations—not may be sleeping partners in them, but pretty close to sleeping partners. They get contracts from the government; worse than that, they get large sums of money expended with them without any tender or contract at all. Under the cover of a company, the strong man, a member of parliament, gets the patronage; the business man who has the other share in it, does the work, and before the public seems to be the man in the transaction. There are members of parliament to-day, not one nor two, but more, who are silent partners in companies and corporations that are to-day taking hundreds of thousands of dollars of public money without a shred of public tender or of contract based upon public tender.

Now, these are just the outside instances, and a few of them, which are public indications of that disease which is prevalent in this parliament, and which this parliament ought to rid itself of just as quickly as possible. I make no further comment to-night, Mr. Speaker, on this episode. It will be followed up later in other respects in this parliament; and as one member of the opposition, I believe in the members of the opposition standing straight and true to that line. Whatever gentlemen on the opposite side may do—and we wish them to co-operate with us—we at least will do our level best to induce a better, stronger and healthier sentiment in the administration of public affairs than we find to-day. In some cases it is an absolute challenge and defiance of the proprieties; in other cases it is a covert avoidance of doing the thing, but yet having it done in the name of son, or nephew or the silent partner in a concern, but getting at the public treasury and at the public expenditure of money. Something that was said the other day with reference to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company bears on the same thing that we are discussing to-night. It seems to be difficult for some people to understand that it is not the proper thing for a member of parliament, by the force of his political position, urged upon his minister or minsters, to get hold of valuable public franchises, and then to work and operate them to his advantage and the advantage of his friends.

As I began, so I end. This unfortunate Department of the Interior is the one that we are discussing to-night, as we have discussed it so often before. It is most especially the one over which the darkest shades in these transactions have gradually and

from time to time lowered. What have we to-day, Sir, just as another sample ? We have a Deputy Minister of the Interior, brought from the west under a minister who came from the west, and whose course lay through golden paths whilst he administered a department at $7,000 a year of annual salary—brought from the west, active, at work ; and all at once it dawns on parliament that that deputy minister spent some of the best years of his service, supposedly in the department, in concocting and completing a mighty contract to unknown people ; and when it is all fixed, and fixed, it is thought, so that it cannot for ten years be disturbed, that deputy minister steps out of office without reason given or assigned, though it was often asked, and to-day he blossoms out as the agent of that unknown company which has secured a ten years' contract with this government involving a million dollars. And we could place many other cases side by side with that. Mr. Speaker, that is all I have to say with reference to this matter at the present time.

Hon. N. A. BELCOURT (Ottawa). Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) should have deemed it proper to bring this matter to the attention of the House and to connect me with it in the manner he has done, is of course a matter for which he alone is responsible. I have nothing to say as to his bringing it up. It might, however, have occurred to him, as I am sure it has occurred to most of the members of this House, that when these newspaper articles came to his notice, it would have been a matter of common courtesy on his part to have shown me the articles and to have asked me if there was not some explanation I could have given of them that would have put a different complexion on the whole matter. One would have thought that gentlemen who have sat in this House for a number of years, who could claim the privilege of being old colleagues, would be entitled to a courtesy of that kind. However, that the hon. gentleman did not choose to extend that courtesy to me is another matter of which he is the sole and only judge.

I do, however, object to the manner in which the hon. gentleman has brought this matter before the House. Every one who has regard for the dignity of the House has a perfect right to call its attention to any matter which he deems affects its dignity or honour ; but when a matter of this kind is brought up, there is but one manly way of doing it, and that is by making a charge and demanding an investigation. If the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) thinks that I am guilty of any wrong-doing, if he thinks that I have violated the independence of parliament, if he thinks that I have been guilty of conduct unbecoming a gentleman, or have in any way infringed on the honour and dignity of the House, he has a well recognized constitutional remedy, and that is to make a charge and demand an investigation. If he has not chosen to do so, we can all draw our own conclusions. If the hon. gentleman thought that discretion was the better part of valour and did not venture to make any charge, it is quite evident he is convinced he could not prove any charge. If I were content to rely upon what is clearly my strict right, I would treat with silent contempt the insinuations contained in the newspapers to which the hon. gentleman referred, and which he repeated here to-night. However, I am not disposed to do that. However unfounded, however vague and indefinite these charges may be, I am not willing to stand under any aspersion cast on my honour or reputation by any person or coming from any quarter or channel, however such aspersion may be made, without giving it an absolute and unqualified denial. I am willing, charge or no charge, investigation or no investigation, to tell the House here and now, the whole truth about this matter. I have no desire to conceal anything for the simple reason that I have no reason to be ashamed of any part or share I have had in this matter. There is absolutely nothing in it of which any man with a most punctilious sense of honour could have any reason to repent. What I am about to offer to the House, I do not offer in the shape of any excuse or apology. There is obsolutely no reason why I should. But I have in my hands a statement made by two of the most honourable citizens of Ottawa, the Hon. E. H. Bronson and Mr. C. C. Ray, who volunteered to make it, and who are gentlemen against whose honour and veracity I have never heard any one say a single word. This is a simple statement of the facts which I shall read and then leave the matter in the hands of the House :

The hydraulic concession known as the Bronson and Ray concession was obtained in the summer of 1898 by the undersigned. Mr. Belcourt and his partner had nothing whatever to do in obtaining from the department the said concession. And it was not until two years later that the firm of Belcourt & McDougall, having law offices at Dawson and Ottawa, were retained as solicitors for the concessionnaires.

In 1902 the concessionnaires, being indebted to the said firm in a large sum for professional services, proposed to and it was agreed with them that in consideration of the said indebtedness and of the undertaking on their part to give in the future gratuitously their professional services whenever required at Dawson and at Ottawa in connection with the operations of the company or the negotiations for a sale of the concession and to be responsible for their proportionate share of all expenditures on or in connection with said concession, they would receive 10-100 of the stock of a company to be incorporated by said firm and

ourselves to take over, operate or sell the concession.

The company was incorporated and it took over the concession in 1902; the firm of Belcourt & McDougall then became and are now entiled to 10-100 of the shares of this company, though no certificate for said shares has as yet been issued to them.

The firm of Belcourt & McDougall have contributed of their own moneys over $6,000 in the expenditures made on or in connection with the said concession, besides giving gratuitously their professional services, which, if charged for, we are told, would amount to considerably over $6,000 additional.

The agreement between the company and the said firm was merely a matter of business and the interest assigned to them made only in payment of their past and future professional services and in consideration of their joint liability for all expenditures.

The firm of Belcourt & McDougall could not in our opinion dispose of their interest in this connection or company so as to realize the amount invested by them.

The company has never been relieved of any of the duties and obligation imposed by the lease or by the regulations governing such leases.

It has received no favour, exemption or privilege of any kind either at Ottawa or in the Yukon.

On the contrary it has been constantly hampered, hindered and embarrassed in its operations and attempts to work the property by officers of the government at Ottawa and in the Yukon by others.

The company has been refused and prevented from acquiring proper dumping ground without which no extension operations could be carried on.

It was refused a grant of the only water available for hydraulic work on the concession and this water was granted by the gold commissioner to a subsequent applicant.

The property was, by the officers of the government, allowed to be trespassed upon, worked by outsiders and stripped of its timber.

The concessionnaires and the company were required by the ex-Minister of the Interior and the present head of that department under the regulations covering hydraulic leases to expend from time to time between $25,000 and $30,000 and to incur liabilities for about the same amount when it must have been known by the minister and his officers, as the concessionnaires and every one at all acquainted with this concession knew that such expenditures would be absolutely useless and profitless and as the fact is now well and generally known in the territory and by the officers of the government.

Any statement, expressed or implied, that anything improper was contemplated by the agreement between the company and the said firm of solicitors or any member thereof or that any attempt has been made by any member of said firm or shareholder or officer of said company or by any one in their behalf, directly or indirectly, to exert any improper influence upon any minister or officer of the government at Ottawa or in the Yukon, or that the company has been granted any favour, exemption or privilege is wholly without foundation, reckless and malicious.

The company has fully and strictly complied with the terms of its lease and the regulations governing the same and should the Minister of the Interior decide to cancel the lease in question the company will be compelled to seek redress from the courts of justice against what would constitute a grievous wrong.

C. C. RAY.
E. H. BRONSON.

Ottawa, April 2, 1906.

What does this statement mean? It means absolutely the reverse of what the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has asserted. It is a complete and flat contradiction of the insinuations to which he has given expression. It is an absolute contradiction of the insinuation that because an interest was given me and my partner in Dawson, Mr. MacDougall, we secured from the government something to which the concessionnaires were not entitled. As a matter of fact it was while we had an interest in the concession that the then Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) withdrew the exemption which had existed previously. For two or three years the concessionnaires had been relieved from doing any hydraulic work on that concession. But in 1902, when the new company was formed, the Minister of the Interior of that day took away that concession and compelled the concessionnaires to go on and do assessment work yearly. As a result they had to expend $20,000 to $30,000 doing work from which they did not get one penny in return. The minister himself, the officers of the department at Ottawa, the officers in Yukon knew that every cent spent by the company in that connection was absolutely thrown into the sea. Yet, because of objections made to the concession, and made unjustly, the minister compelled the concessionnaires to incur this expense. The hon. gentleman says that since that time no work has been done. If he had taken the trouble to look into the files, he would have seen that the officers reported that the work was done.

Mr. FOSTER. I said that up to November 11, the report of Mr. Beaudette was that no work had been done, and that up to January 3, 1903, the same state of things existed.

Mr. BELCOURT. Certainly he made that statement. It was late in the summer of 1902 when the exemption which these concessionnaires previously enjoyed, of not doing the annual assessment work, was taken away. The work could not be begun for the next year until the spring. So, in the month of January, 1903, Mr. Beaudette, of course, reported that no work had been done. But, if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) will take the trouble to go to the department he will find that for 1902-3 the work was done to the complete satisfaction of the officers of the department. And he will find there annual certificates showing that the work as stated in the declaration has been

done annually. I say that my connection with the concession was not for the purpose of exercising any kind of influence upon the minister. I and my partner in Dawson had been acting as solicitors for these gentlemen. We had nothing to do with obtaining the concession; in fact, did not know that the concession had been granted until two or three years after it was granted. We were asked to do professional work for these gentlemen. Work was done representing a large sum of money. Mr. McDougall and myself agreed to look after the interests of this concern in Dawson and in Ottawa. We agreed to give our professional services gratuitously. We agreed for ten per cent of this stock, which is now valueless and which we had little reason then to think would have any great value, to forego the large bill of costs we had against these people and to give our services gratuitously in future, both at Dawson and at Ottawa. We have given these services gratuitously since, I must say that it is a most unjust and unjustifiable insinuation for any one to make or repeat in this House that there has been anything improper in the transaction. I am not surprised however, at the attack made here to-day. I must say that, a short time ago, it was intimated to me that unless I made myself the means of bringing about a settlement of this suit against the company by Mr. Tyrrell, in which he claims about $42,000, these letters would be used in the way they have been and an attack would be made upon me. in the press and in this House. And I was strongly urged by Mr. McDougall, in Dawson, because of the annoyance he knew it would cause me, to try and get a settlement and have Mr. Tyrrell paid his claim.

Mr. FOSTER. As that implies something perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Belcourt) will allow me to make a statement. I have not seen Mr. Tyrrell, nor has Mr. Tyrrell seen me. No words have passed between Mr. Tyrrell and me; no letter, no communication has passed between Mr. Tyrrell and me.

Mr. BELCOURT. I did not mean to imply that the intimation came from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster). I simply meant that that intimation was made to me by Mr. McDougall himself, that it had been intimated there that unless Mr. Tyrrell was paid this $42,000 this charge would be brought against me, and he urged me to settle the matter because he felt that it would be a considerable annoyance to me to have a discussion of this sort. My reply was that I would have nothing to do with any settlement, and that from that time I would have nothing to do with the case. The case went on. On March 7 it was concluded, and on March 9 this attack upon me was commenced. I declined to have anything to do with any settlement, because I thought that it would be submitting to intimidation and to a species of blackmail. And I repeat I have nothing to be ashamed of or to apologize for as I acted strictly within the bonds of propriety as a professional man and as a member of this House. I did not attempt to bring any undue influence to bear upon the minister, as is shown by the fact that no favour was granted to these people, but, on the contrary, as they say, they have been hampered and hindred at every turn. We know why the officers of the department acted in that way. Everybody knows that these concessions in the Yukon have been the subject of constant attack. The attack made to-day in which I happen to be included, is not so much directed against me but against the concession; it is a case of throwing mud at the concession, in order, that possibly the government may be led to cancel it. I am not the party—I suppose I am not of sufficient importance—who is really attacked, it is the concession they are trying to get at. It is true they are doing it over my head, and they try to besmirch me because that is a part of the attack upon the concession itself. The attack was premeditated, for, as I have said, it was intimated to me that it was to be made; but I declined to have anything to do with the conditions sought to be imposed in order that the attack might be warded off. I must say that I do not attach very much importance to the Yukon 'Daily News,' I do not think it a responsible paper. Nor do I attach very great importance to the Yukon 'World.' But, perhaps the House would like to know the opinion of the Yukon with reference to the paper from which my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) quoted so profusely and of the gentleman who wrote these articles. So, with your permission I will read part of an article which appeared in the Yukon 'World' of March 11 :

The same old concession story in the same way.

The Dawson 'Daily News' is indeed unfortunate in the manner which it has of treating the public questions in which large corporations are interested.

It will be remembered that some years ago the Dawson 'News' was fighting the Bronson and Ray concession.

As a matter of fact, everybody there was fighting everything in the way of a concession.

At that time the editor is said to have attempted to get the concession to give him something in payment for his silence.

That is the editor of the 'Daily News' whose writings have been the inspiration of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster).

Well, that time is past, and that particular incident is closed. But once again the 'News' starts at the Bronson and Ray concession. This time it anounces that it has certain in-

formation, that it is going to publish certain information that will be so harmful to the concession that it will result in its cancellation.

The 'News' can do business as it pleases. but so long as the 'Yukon World' is under its present management there never will be an article appear in it telling how it intends—in the near future—to publish something that will hurt some great and wealthy corporation—if nothing happens in the meantime. Such a course is open to extreme misconstruction. If the people pursuing such a course are in earnest, they are wretched bunglers and bad managers. To be the publisher of such a threat, to the ordinary man, looks like a plain 'hold-up.'

But, whether or not, it is ineffective. There is no source of information open to the 'News' that the 'World' cannot reach. The 'World' will see that the 'News' is kept to its promise. and if anything occurs to 'interrupt' the publication of these statements that are going to ruin (according to the 'News') this million dollar company, the 'World' will raise such a clamour that the 'News' will stand itself revealed for what it is to the whole country.

Another thing. When the opposition men of this territory were fighting this concession the 'News' stood aside. When there were real wrongs to right the miners got no assistance from the 'News.' It was only when shouting was quite harmless to the concession that the 'News' indulged in it. Now, after McInnes is in Ottawa and is making certain recommendations about the concession, after Mr. Oliver. Minister of the Interior, has visited this country and said, in plain language, that he intends to take up the fight and tells what it is going to do. Then whatever the government finally does, the 'News' will claim the public credit.

One word to the local men who have the conduct of the concession affairs, so far as Dawson is concerned. These men are clever business men and probably know as well as the 'World.' that the Dawson 'News' is not trying the case. has no influence in the matter, that whatever side the 'News' takes is regarded as being the sensational side, is regarded as being the opinion of the agitators who have always held the country back, of the men who had they been allowed to have their way in the past, would have made this country an unpeopled wilderness.

And so on. Now, though the hon. gentleman contented himself with making insinuations and innuendoes, which, I say, were absolutely unjustified and unjustifiable, and which I would have been strictly within my right to treat with the silence they deserve, still, I thought I owed it to the House and to my own sense of honour and to my own reputation to offer to the House the statements that I have made. I venture to think that any man who is unprejudiced, who is fair minded, and who will look at this matter in a proper light, will acquit me of any improper doing or improper intention, and will acquit me of having in any way violated the independence of parliament or of having done any act of which a gentleman should be ashamed. As I have said, I have not spoken as offering any apology or excuse. I consider that I have absolutely nothing to be ashamed of, nothing to regret, nothing for which I am called upon to offer any excuse or apology. I leave it to the fair-mindedness of every man in this House and outside to say if I have not disposed completely, not by my statement alone but by the statement of gentlemen whose words cannot be disputed, of the unjustifiable attack made upon me to-night.

Mr. ALFRED THOMPSON (Yukon Territory). I do not intend to discuss this question, namely, the Bronson and Ray concession, from the standpoint of the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Belcourt). A reference to that gentleman has been made in the Dawson press, and every member of this House can read the Dawson press for himself and draw from it any inference he wishes. But that is not the line I intend to take. With the permission of this House, I will briefly discuss this Bronson and Ray concession from the standpoint of its history. Now, the question of concessions in the Yukon is a live one, always has been and always will be a live question until the last one is wiped off the map. Of all the concessions there made, which have been cancelled and of all the concessions still remaining of which there are many, the most iniquitous is the one known as the Bronson and Ray. Now, the Bronson and Ray concession and many others were investigated by a commission appointed by parliament in the year 1903, under the great seal of Canada, and composed of Judge Britton and Mr. Benjamin Bell. The result of their investigation can be found in sessional papers No. 142, a return to the House of Commons. Judge Britton presided over that investigation in the city of Dawson, and investigated these various concessions. He found that this concession was lease No. 5, comprising a tract of land commencing 2½ miles from the mouth of Bonanza creek and extending up that stream for a like distance, issued in favour of the Hon. E. H. Bronson and C. C. Ray, and known as the Bronson and Ray concession. Now, Mr. Speaker, in order to enlighten the House on the question of concessions in the Yukon, let me say that when the government originally granted these concessions, it was with the idea that they should be worked in a hydraulic manner and that they should cover ground which could not be worked in any other way. That is the argument the concessionnaires used to obtain their concessions from the government and that is the ground upon which the concessions were granted. I ask the House to bear that in mind. I now quote from Judge Britton's report page 21, on the Bronson and Ray concession.

> Lease No. 5 comprising a tract of land commencing about 2½ miles from the mouth of Bonanza creek and extending up that stream for a like distance, issued in favour of the Hon. E. H. Bronson and C. C. Ray, and known as the Bronson and Ray concession.

That was on May 6, 1899, this is April 10, 1906, and Mr. Speaker, during all those seven long years these absentee landlords living here in Ottawa, never turned a sod on that concession. Will my hon. friend from Ottawa or any other hon. gentleman rise in this House and attempt to defend these concessionnaires on the ground that they have complied with the law ? If any hon. gentleman will do that, I will challenge every statement he makes in connection with it.

Mr. BELCOURT. Will the hon. gentleman deny that the officers of the government in Dawson have reported yearly that the work required by the regulations had been performed on those concessions ?

Mr. THOMPSON. I do not deny that statement, but I will quote from Judge Britton's report to prove that they did not do the work. My hon. friend confuses the names of Bronson and Ray with the company which was formed after 1902. The men who are behind this concession and always have been behind it, are these two Ottawa men, Bronson and Ray.

Mr. BELCOURT. Will my hon. friend say before the company was formed there was not an exemption granted of the assessment work ?

Mr. THOMPSON. Exactly.

Mr. BELCOURT. Now let us have the facts—I do not want to embarrass my hon. friend. Is it not true that since then the company has done the assessment work yearly ?

Mr. THOMPSON. The company may have done the assessment work yearly since that time, but before that time the assessment work was not done, not sufficient work was done to hold the ground.

Mr. BELCOURT. Was it not during that time that the concessionnaires were exempted from doing assessment work ? It is not true that the concessionnaires were exempted for a number of years from doing assessment work ?

Mr. THOMPSON. It does not make any difference to me, wuether they were exempted or not, the facts remain that they were not doing the work. But that is not the question. These vast areas of land in the richest section of country that God ever made, were not intended by this government to be held simply on the payment of a rental, they were intended to be worked, and that is where the people of the Yukon have their complaint this concession has not been worked.

On the 3rd of November, 1899, a lease of the location is surveyed, containing the usual provisions, was issued in favour of Bronson and Ray.

They got the lease. Now on March 15, 1900, the lessees were granted an extension of time within which to comply with the conditions. They did not expend this money, they did not do that work, but they were granted an extension of time.

Mr. BELCOURT. There is a statement there that they were exempted, that was found by the judge himself.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, Mr. Speaker, every foot of land in that country was valuable, and when we had people there from all over the world who were looking for placer ground, and this land was locked up in that Bronson and Ray concession, and it is yet locked up in that concession. Now Judge Britton discusses the extension of time :

A condition of all hydraulic leases is that 'the lessee shall have sufficient hydraulic or other machinery in operation on the demised premises within one year from the date of lease to permit beginning active operations for the efficient working of the rights and privileges granted, and that such operations shall be begun within one year' and then that $5,000 shall be expended in each year.

Now, Sir, I am still reading Judge Britton's report, and I will refer the House now to his summing up, which I think will be a sufficient answer to the remarks of my hon. friend.

The expenditure incurred in the construction or acquirement of a flume, ditch, or pipe-line to convey water to a location has by general practice been accepted as expenditure 'in mining operations in, about and upon the location' as required by section 4 of the lease, and such flume, ditch or pipe-line also constitutes the machinery which the lessee is required, under the same section, to place upon his location.

Now listen to this :

I think that any machinery or appliances which a lessee may have placed upon his location, so long as it is sufficient for the 'efficient working of the rights and privileges granted'—

He goes far afield, and allows every means possible of fulfilling these terms.

Must be accepted as compliance with the terms of the lease.

No sufficient hydraulic or other machinery was placed upon the demised premises in the Bronson and Ray concession within the year, nor is there yet such reasonably sufficient hydraulic or other machinery there as required for efficient working or for active operations.

It cannot be said that the conditions of the lease have been complied with.

There may have been waiver of the conditions other than the condition as to representation work which was waived to 2nd June, 1902, as above stated. Any such waiver would require to be evidenced by writing under the authority of the Minister of the Interior, and no such waiver was shown.

Now, Sir, that is the concession that my hon. friend has defended. It is absolutely

impossible of defence, Mr. Speaker, in the eyes of those who know the circumstances. It is difficult for me to come here from a constituency 5,000 miles away and tell this House about gold mining in that country, or present to the minds of hon. gentlemen in this House the picture that is presented to the eye of any man who goes up Bonanza Creek where this concession is. I will tell you that an analogy is not to be found, so far as I know, on the continent of America. You have to go to the island of Ireland before you find an analogy to the conditions that exist on the two and a half miles of the Bronson & Ray concession. We have all heard of the absentee landlord of Ireland who has bought or inherited an estate and who allowed it to run to wreck and ruin, who has allowed the buildings to fall and has perhaps permitted the growth of a new forest as a hunting ground. That is practically the condition there, there is nothing on the Bronson & Ray concession but a silent solitude due to the machinations of these gentlemen in Ottawa, although I am glad to learn that in future the government are going to compel them to work the property or throw it up. That is, in brief, the history of the Bronson & Ray concession.

You would have thought to hear the hon. member from Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) talk that it is a small concession in the bottom of the creek, some thing that does not interfere with the rights of men. I submit that is not a fact, it covers 2½ miles of the richest portion of Bonanza, one of the richest creeks on this continent or in the world, and surrounding it, above it, below it, on the right, on the left, on all sides of it, are men who have been working and earning a living for years and are doing so to-day and yet the 2½ miles of the Bronson & Ray concession are lying idle because these concessionaires have not developed it. That is the picture of the Bronson & Ray concession, and what is the result? We in the Yukon have beside us one of the most powerful mining nations in the world, the United States, in their territory of Alaska, and because this concession is locked up our miners have had to leave the country and go to the United States to get land to work, while these men, for seven long years have controlled 2½ miles our people have had to go across the border, and yet my hon. friend defends it. I say it is absolutely indefensible. He says the timber is stripped. The timber! Not content with the gold they want the timber as well. I suppose they will even want the hay; there is not a ton on the 2½ acres. He says: We do not work because there is no dumping ground. Is the progress of the Yukon to be stopped because they discovered after obtaining this concession that there was no dumping ground? That is something which, if these gentlemen were bona fide, should have been discovered before the lease was granted. It was only years after the concession was granted, years after the agitation against this was started, that they discovered this subterfuge, that they had not a dumping ground. I say that is no defence. So far as the people of the Yukon are concerned, this is not a political question. It is absolutely above the plane of party politics and no gentleman has ever appeared on any political platform of any shade of politics who has not had in his platform a plank against concessions. I say it is not a party question, it is a question which concerns the people of the Yukon, and until the concession is cancelled the agitation will never cease. My hon. friend may defend this, but I know what is the fact; I have gone over the Bronson & Ray concession time and again; I have seen the industry above, below and around it, and I have seen the blankness, the dreariness, the wilderness covering the Bronson & Ray concession.

This, as I say, is no new question with us, it is an old one. At the last session of parliament I had the honour of addressing this House on the question of the Yukon and attempting to show how necessary it was for a responsible minister of the cabinet to visit that far-off territory. I am glad to inform the House that during the past season the present Minister of the Interior, Hon. Mr. Oliver, went to that country, and, Sir, he, a disinterested observer—I shall not say a disinterested observer, but a stranger to the country—went over this country and saw exactly how this concession had been managed and what they had done, and I am glad to tell you now that these concessionnaires are dancing a different jig to what they did a few years ago. My hon. friend is bringing them down to the ring bolt, and that is why they are squirming; that is why they are kicking; that is why they are putting up this defence; they know that they are—no I shall not, I was going to use a Yukon phrase, but I shall not—they know that their days are limited. I am very glad to inform the House and to have been able to inform the people of the territory which I have the honour to represent in this House—the Yukon—that these concessionnaires are now being brought to task and that unless they fulfil absolutely the letter as well as the spirit of the law, I am advised that their vast leases will be cancelled. I am glad to be able to have this opportunity to present my views and those of the people I represent, and at the same time to refute a few of the arguments advanced by my hon. friend.

Mr. A. A. STOCKTON (St. John City and County). Mr. Speaker, I have listened with considerable interest to the arraignment made by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and I feel that the principle involved is of such magnitude that the members of this House should not allow it to pass in silence. My hon. friend from Ot-

tawa (Mr. Belcourt) says that he had nothing to do with obtaining this concession. I do not wish to, and shall, I hope, in the observations I make say any thing that may be personally offensive to my hon. friend for the city of Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt). A higher principle is involved in connection with this case which I shall refer to before I am through. My hon. friend said that he had nothing to do with obtaining this concession. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) did not say or charge that my hon. friend (Mr. Belcourt) had any thing to do with obtaining the concession, but he did charge that he had something to do with retaining the concession after it had been forfeited under the terms on which the lease had been granted.

Mr. BELCOURT. Will my hon. friend permit me to ask him where he finds evidence that the concession was forfeited?

Mr. STOCKTON. Well, I will refer to the report—

Mr. BELCOURT. It never was.

Mr. STOCKTON. —of Judge Britton before I am through. I do not wish to be unfair to my hon. friend. At all events there was considerable stir in the Department of the Interior with respect to the cancelling of this lease. My hon. friend was called in to prescribe so that the lease should not be cancelled, and as I understand it, in consequence of the hon. gentleman having been called in the lease was not cancelled. Is not that a correct statement of the facts ?

Mr. BELCOURT. No.

Mr. STOCKTON. Will my hon. friend state what the facts are ?

Mr. BELCOURT. The facts are these : The concession was granted in 1898 and shortly after that, because there was no dumping ground and no water the concessionnaries asked to be relieved of the annual work. The minister granted permission. In 1902 the minister withdrew the exemption and gave notice to these people that they must go on and do the work. The concession never was cancelled ; there was a threat it would be cancelled if they did not do the work but having done the work the concession was not cancelled.

Mr. STOCKTON. In other words, the situation had become so acute that Messrs. Bronson and Ray could not attend to the matter themselves and they had to call in the member for the city of Ottawa.

Mr. BELCOURT. He had been called in long before ; I had been acting as their solicitor.

Mr. STOCKTON. He did not appear on the scene before, at all events so far as this correspondence is concerned. I do not know how long before it was that my hon. friend (Mr. Belcourt) was called in ; I am speaking on the strength of the correspondence that is before the House.

Mr. BELCOURT. Will my hon. friend permit me.

Mr. STOCKTON. Certainly.

Mr. BELCOURT. I was the solicitor of these gentlemen in various matters, long before this concession was obtained, and in this matter, they applied to me as their legal adviser in this city as they did in many other matters before and since.

Mr. STOCKTON. My hon. friend now says he was the solicitor of Messrs. Bronson and Ray, but I do not understand that he was the solicitor of Bronson and Ray with respect to the securing of this lease.

Mr. BELCOURT. I was not.

Mr. STOCKTON. Certainly not. He was the general solicitor of Bronson and Ray, but outside of him altogether they acquired that concession.

Mr. BELCOURT. That is so.

Mr. STOCKTON. And then, in consequence of certain arrangements with the department they were not called upon to comply with certain terms of the lease or certain terms of the regulations of the department, and the Minister of the Interior in whose department this was called upon them to comply with the terms of the lease after the 2nd June under the report of Judge Britton. Then it was that the matter became acute and they applied not to the Minister of the Interior, but they applied to my hon. friend who was the member of parliament representing the city of Ottawa, and they applied to him as appears from the correspondence because of his influence with the minister—not because of his professional relationship with Messrs. Bronson and Ray, but because of his influence with the minister as a member of parliament. That was a reason why the hon. member for Ottawa was called in. The hon. gentleman now says that he took this means of collecting a professional bill.

Mr. BELCOURT. I did not take that means ; I said it was offered to me in payment.

Mr. STOCKTON. Then I will put it in that way : That these gentlemen, I suppose who are quite able to pay their professional bills in the ordinary way, offered to pay the professional bill of the hon. member for Ottawa in the way of giving him an interest in this concession. Is not that what I am to understand now ? Then, in consequence of that, Messrs. Bronson and Ray dropped out as a part of the transaction and a company is formed of which my hon. friend becomes a prominent member, and in consequence of that the hon. gentleman

and his partner get what is equal to a $200,000 interest in a company stocked to the extent of $1,000,000. I think that is not incorrect.

Mr. BELCOURT. That is incorrect also.

Mr. STOCKTON. In what respect.

Mr. BELCOURT. It is not $200,000 at all. It was 10 per cent of the whole capitalization of the company which was $1,000,000.

Mr. STOCKTON. I apologize to my hon. friend for the mistake I have made. I understood my hon. friend to say that he and his partner together were to get $100,000 of stock, and that there were to be $500,000 of stock in the treasury, and he as a member of the company would be entitled to the benefit of his share of that $500,000 treasury stock when it was paid in. Therefore he would have his $100,000 in addition to the treasury stock that was paid in. It would appear therefor that for a professional bill of $4,000 or $5,000 he gets what is equal to at least $100,000 and the possibility of another $100,000 in case it should pan out as my hon. friend (Mr. Belcourt) expected it would.

Mr. BELCOURT. Will my hon. friend allow me to make him an offer ?

Mr. STOCKTON. Certainly.

Mr. BELCOURT. If he will pay that bill of $4,000 or $5,000 he can have all these shares right away.

Mr. STOCKTON. I can tell my hon. friend (Mr. Belcourt) that had I offered him $40,000 or $50,000 at that time he would not take it. It has not panned out just exactly as my hon. friend thought it would. But Sir, that is no reason why we should condone the offence. His judgment then was that it was a creek, and I think it is on Bonanza. The truth is that it panned out just a little differently from what my hon. friend thought it would, but the facts are there all the same. Just let me refer to this report of Judge Brittons', at page 32 he says :

> On the 13th of March, 1900, the lessees were granted an extension of time within which to comply with the provisions of their lease as regards the annual expenditure of $5,000 in mining operations thereon, as certain placer mining claims within the location prevented them from operating to advantage. This extension of time to comply with the provisions of the lease was terminated on the 2nd day of June, 1902. On the 11th of November, 1902, the government mining engineer reported that no work had been done on this location, nor had any preparatory work to commence operations been started, nor had any machinery been placed on the tract leased. On the 26th of June, 1903, the department refused to accept the rental of this location and a cheque for $388.50, which was tendered in payment for the same, was returned to the agents of the lessees.

Up to that time, practically Bronson and Ray were out of the transaction, and in consequence of the appearance of my hon. friend (Mr. Belcourt) upon the scene the lease was not cancelled. Then the report goes on :

> Under the provisions of the lease an expenditure of $5,000 in mining operations should have been incurred between the 2nd of June, 1902, the date upon which the extension of time terminated, and the 2nd of June, 1903.

Was that $5,000 paid, up to the 2nd of June, 1903 ? Have the terms been fully complied with since ? My hon. friend from the Yukon (Mr. Thompson) says no.

Mr. BELCOURT. I did not understand him to say 'no.' He said he would not deny that.

Mr. STOCKTON. Deny what ?

Mr. BELCOURT. That the assessment work had been done since.

Mr. STOCKTON. Does my hon. friend (Mr. Belcourt) say that all the assessment work has been done and that $5,000 a year has been paid.

Mr. BELCOURT. I have said it half a dozen times to-night.

Mr. STOCKTON. From that time to the present.

Mr. BELCOURT. Yes from that time to the present.

Mr. STOCKTON. Well now, my hon. friend (Mr. Thompson) spoke with reference to this property remaining there without having been worked ; that it is a scandal to the people of the Yukon, and that while it is under the control of these lessees it is preventing the legitimate honest miners of that country going in there and developing that property, and that it is being held to-day merely for speculative purposes by men who have no interest and no residence in that country. But, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to refer particularly to that branch of the case. I hope I have said nothing that is at all offensive to my hon. friend from the city of Ottawa ?

Mr. BELCOURT. Except for deliberate misrepresentation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. STOCKTON. No, no, don't mind the point of order ; my hon. friend and I will deal with the question between ourselves. At the beginning of his speech the hon. gentleman referred to the preservation of the dignity of this House. I reciprocate that sentiment and I trust that in this discussion we shall maintain on both sides the dignity of the traditions of this House, and that we shall not forget that we are both

members of parliament discussing a question which vitally affects the decency of the public life of this country. But Mr. Speaker, let me ask this question: has a lawyer—a man of the profession to which I have the honour to belong—has he the right to use means in his official position as a member of this parliament to obtain the payment of a professional bill which if he were not a member of parliament he would not have the right to use.

That is a question that vitally affects every member of this House. Now, the duty of a member of parliament, as I understand it, is higher than his mere duty as a professional man or a lawyer. As a professional man or as a lawyer he represents his own personal interest, and the interests of his clients; as a member of parliament he acts here representing the people who send him here as a trustee for the electors, not only of the constituency which sent him here, but of the whole Dominon of Canada, and no professional man upon the floor of this House has a right to use his position as a member of parliament to advance his position as a professional man or a lawyer. Therefore, I say there is a vital and important principle bound up in this question which is before the House to-night. I am not throwing any aspersions upon my hon. friend the member for the city of Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt); I should be very sorry to do so; and I hope my hon. friend will not think that I am doing so. But I have heard—it is more than rumour around the corridors of this House—that members of my profession are using their positions as members of parliament to advance their pecuniary interest. If that be so, Sir, I say it is degrading to the public life of this country, and it is unfair to the profession to which I happen to belong. I appeal to the First Minister as to whether it is a right thing for professional men who are members of this House to practice their profession before committees of this parliament or to use their influence on the floor of this House to induce legislation one way or the other, or in the departments of government. This is not a new matter. This matter has been discussed in the mother of parliaments across the ocean; and away back as far as 1695 this was approved by the imperial parliament:

> That the offer of any money or other advantage to any member of parliament for promoting any matter whatever impending or to be transacted in parliament is a high crime and misdemeanour and subversive of the English constitution.

And further as late as 1858 this was approved of by the officers of the Crown in England and by the parliament of the mother country to this extent:

> Is the House prepared for such an incorporation of professional and legislative duty on the part of its legal members as those gentlemen who have been retained by private individuals in the one capacity, should they take advantage of the other to further their clients' claims?

And it was unanimously decided in the negative. I appeal to my right hon. friend the distinguished gentleman who leads this House; I ask him, would he think that it would be right for me as a member of parliament to accept a retainer from any gentleman in Canada to promote a Bill before this House or to induce the government or any member of the government to do a certain thing that might be done because of my influence as a member of parliament? I say, Sir, it would be wrong. I do not throw any aspersions upon my hon. friend from the city of Ottawa. I believe that the sooner we grapple with this question and the sooner it is understood that the members of my profession on the floor of this House should cease attending to such professional matters here the higher will be the standard of public life in this parliament and in this country. My hon. friend has made an explanation. My hon. friend, no doubt innocently, may have dropped into this transaction; but I think we ought to bring this matter to the test of the country's interest so that every professional man, whether he sits to the right or the left of the Speaker, will understand that from this time forth we cannot use our position as members of parliament to further our interests as members of the legal profession. Therefore, I hope that this discussion will do good, and that from this time forth there will be no cause of complaint in this respect. I hope I have said nothing to hurt the feelings of my hon. friend from the city of Ottawa. I have as high a regard for the noble profession to which we both belong as my hon. friend or as any other member on the floor of this House. It is because of my high regard for the legal profession, for the position of a member of parliament, for the necessity of keeping the two positions apart, for the decency of public life, for the independence of parliament, and for the independence of the legal profession, that I am standing here to-night pleading, not only for the profession of which I am a member, but for the position of a member of parliament, that no member of this House should use his influence with a minister of the Crown or with the government for the purpose of obtaining concessions which he might not otherwise be able to obtain because he happens to be a supporter of the government of the day.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, it is my misfortune that when this question arose at eight o'clock I was not present in this House, having had an engagement elsewhere which I could not give up. Therefore, I come at some disadvantage to the

question which is now before the House. Indeed, I do not think I would have risen at all but for the appeal that has been made to me by my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Stockton) upon sentiments which I altogether reciprocate. The principles of the British constitution in this respect are well known; the rules are well known also; but it is possible that the rules are being forgotten in this House and in other Houses. At all events, I do not think that it would conduce to any good result if either one side or the other in this House were to attempt to throw stones at its opponents, as to which has been delinquent in this respect. I am happy to remind the House at once that my hon. friend, in the remarks which he has made, has not been personal. He stated over and over again that he did not want to say anything offensive to the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt). He laid down principles with which I think we all agree. There have been rumours in this House and out of it that members of this parliament who belonged to the legal profession have taken advantage of their position as members of parliament to prosecute claims of clients. I do not know whether these rumours are true or not; but whether they are or not, I think we can agree that the reputation of the Canadian parliament ought to be, like that of the wife of Cæsar, above suspicion; and it is for this reason that the Minister of Justice, upon a suggestion thrown out by the hon. leader of the opposition last session, has introduced a Bill, which is now before one of the committees of this House, for the purpose of dealing with this very question. Perhaps it may be difficult to draw the line exactly where the rights of a member of parliament cease and the rights of a lawyer commence; but I agree with my hon. friend that this is a matter to which we should address ourselves, and as to which we should have a well understood rule, promulgated either by statute or by a resolution of this House, which would be a standard for the guidance of every member, and to which, if it were afterwards violated, every member would have the right to call the attention of parliament.

Coming now to the question at issue, I have only to repeat that I am sorry I did not hear the speech of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) who introduced it. I could only gather from what I heard since I entered the House what was the nature of his accusation. If I understood aright, it was that the hydraulic concessions, as they are known, made in the Yukon, instead of being a benefit, have been rather an incubus and ought to be dispensed with and disapproved. Sir, we must remember what were the conditions of the Yukon when it was first brought to our attention. In 1897, when the gold discoveries were made, that country was far removed from all centres of civilization. It was five thousand miles away from this city, as my hon. friend from the Yukon stated a moment ago. We knew little of the conditions, but we learned in a few months that whilst gold was plentiful there, water was very scarce. We knew also, after a few months experience, that without water it was almost impossible to prosecute the work of digging for gold. There were two kinds of miners out there. There was the individual miner, the placer miner, who with his pick and shovel and cradle got what metals he could at his hand. It was evident that this method of mining could not go very far. It was evident that if the operations were left to the placer miner, with his pick and shovel and cradle, he could at best but skim the surface of the earth and could not extract one-tenth of the wealth that was in it. Therefore the government came to the conclusion to give hydraulic concessions, that is to say, concessions made to some capitalists who would undertake to put in hydraulic plant and get water so that the mines could be worked by this approved method. This policy was followed for some years, and I think it was wisely conceived; and every one will admit that if it had ben carried out as it was conceived, it would have been very much to the advantage of the Yukon. I can appeal to the testimony of the hon. member for Yukon. There have been concessions and concessions and there are concessionnaries and concessionnaries. There are some concessionnaries who have complied with the conditions of their contract, who have put up hydraulic plant, and whose efforts have advanced the development of the country. But unfortunately there are others, by far a large majority, who obtained concessions and neglected to comply with the conditions of their contract. They may have done something, they may have complied with the letter of the contract, but they failed altogether to do the essential thing and that was to put up hydraulic plant whereby water could be collected and the gold in the ground brought to the surface. This thing has been going on some years. Two or three years ago we had complaints in this House and consequently thought it would be well to investigate the situation. We appointed a commission presided over by Judge Britton. I recollect very well that the action we took was very much criticised by gentlemen opposite. Now, however, they are bound to recognize that it was a wise and most profitable one and that commission did its work very satisfactorily. Its report is signed only by Judge Britton, as the other commissioner died before the work was completed. That report is before the House, and I think it gives an accurate statement of the conditions in that part of our country. After having had this report in our hands for some time, and digested it,

a change took place in the Department of the Interior. Mr. Sifton, the former Minister of the Interior, resigned and the present minister (Mr. Oliver) was called to the office. He thought that the first thing he should do was to go himself to the Yukon and familiarize himself, by seeing and hearing, with what was wanted by the people of that section. He spent a few weeks there last summer and visited it again last fall and gave a good deal of his attention to putting into execution the ideas derived from his short visits, and perhaps I might say to the House what is the policy he has communicated to me on the subject. It is this—that at present the best thing to do is to give as fair a chance as possible to the individual miner. As I have said some of the concessionnaries did their work nobly and put up most expensive plant to collect and distribute the water. These ought to have the protection of the government. But I understand from my colleague that it is his idea that all the concessions, in which the concessionnaries have not put up the plant it was their duty to erect, ought to be cancelled at the earliest possible moment. This is the position of the question at this moment, and this is the policy the government intends to carry out so as to give to the Yukon the relief the people there are seeking and to which they are entitled.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). I am rather surprised that the right hon. the First Minister did not ask his hon. colleague, the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), to state fully and frankly what is the policy of the government with regard to members who indulge in what he has called an abuse of their position, because the Minister of Customs has sat in his place and heard every word of the discussion and consequently is in a position to give a decision on the facts as he has heard them. It is not the fault of the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) if he has indulged in this practice, if it is a wrong one. It is the fault of the government because this government has encouraged this practice for the last ten years. The right hon. gentleman talked about rumours, but did he not hear five or six years ago members on this side charging a member on that side with being the open and paid advocate for his voice in this House. What was the answer ? It was a salvo of applause all along the government benches and headed off by the ministers themselves as if that were the proper thing to be done. Time and again have such accusations been made in this House and the government did nothing. The right hon. gentleman says that this side should not throw a stone. Well, the Conservative party were in power eighteen years, and never can the premier or any member of his cabinet instance a case during the Conservative administration such as has come before us to-night. Talk about rumours, why, there have been flat-footed charges, and the members against whom the charges were made said flatly that it was none of the business of members on this side to inquire into their conduct. The hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) says : Why not make a charge against me ? Why, no member in this House can prefer a charge against him if the facts are all true. Because they do not constitute a breach of the independence of parliament at all.

He has not been in the employ of the government or received any fee from the government. That would have been a breach of the Independence of Parliament Act. But this as we allege, is one of these cases of 'grafting' or whatever you like to call it, that have been going on in this country for the last ten years and that have been participated in not only by ordinary members of this House but by ministers of the Crown and men high in authority. And, so long as the government will encourage members to participate in these transactions as it has done for a number of years past, so long will the practices go on. It is true, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) has framed a Bill on this subject, but I think there never would have been such a Bill from the minister if a Bill had not been threatened by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). I am not going to quarrel with the hon. member for Ottawa particularly, because he has been indulging in a practice approved by the ministers. The facts are plain and patent. He has submitted a statement signed by Messrs. Bronson and Ray, who, everybody will agree with him, are men of reputation in the city. But I think they have put a face on this transaction which the letters filed in court will hardly put upon it. Their statement, as I understand, is that the firm of Belcourt and McDougall, of which the hon. member (Mr. Belcourt) is a member, in consideration of certain legal services to be by them performed, and which they did perform, should receive $100,000 worth of the stock of the company. That is correct, I believe—I want to agree with the hon. member as to the facts. The letters refer to this matter. Writing to Mr. Ray, Mr. Tyrrell, one of the parties says :

> With regard to the interest held by Belcourt & McDougall, I do not resent their receiving the stock agreed upon in a business like way, but I do object to their receiving without some definite agreement as to what services are to be rendered in return for it.

This letter is dated February 9, 1904, and is written from Dawson.. Now take some of the other letters. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Belcourt) has stated here that he did not deny doing business for these gentlemen, but indicated that his firm had been called in in the most ordinary way to deal with the department in this regard. But see

how this is borne out by the letters. Here is a letter from the hon. gentleman :

Both Mr. Ray and Mr. Bronson are very much exercised over this matter and they have asked me to try and straighten it out with the minister, which I am trying to do.

And here is a letter dated July 2, 1902, from Mr. Ray to Mr. Tyrrell :

If we hold this concession, we can thank our solicitor who is moving heaven and earth to save it. I hope the proposed arrangement with Belcourt & McDougall will meet with your approval. It seemed the only thing to do if we were to save the concession, and if we cannot save it there is nothing lost by giving them an interest.

Does that sound like a member of a company writing to another about some ordinary work of their regular solicitors ? It is a most extraordinary letter. It indictates the conclusion arrived at between these members of the company that something desperate had to be done. Now, this letter of July 2, written to Mr. Tyrrell by Mr. Ray says also :

We saw at once that prompt action must be taken if we were to save the concession. After talking the matter over we decided to interest Messrs. Belcourt and McDougall with us in order to secure their assistance, both in arranging to obtain the concession and also later on, in connection with the working or sale of it, as the case might be, if we succeeded in holding it.

Is that an ordinary business letter of a client about dealings with his solicitors ? It seems to be most extraordinary business between a keen, shrewd, careful business man and a member of parliament, who he thought, had vast influence with the department. That is it pure and simple. And what more do we find in this letter of Mr. Ray to Mr. Tyrrell. He speaks of what is to be done :

The understanding with Belcourt and McDougall is that they give their professional services free, and that you do the same, and that Mr. Ray and Mr. Bronson will do anything in their power that they may be able to do here in Ottawa during the session.

There is not a word there about past services; the services referred to are to be rendered in the future. If it is a question of past services I will refer to that file that is on record in the news letters of the 'News' which shows, in one of the letters, that one of the partners of Belcourt and McDougall was a creditor of this concern for the sum of $600, that being all their indebtedness. Now, I want the House to mark very carefully this letter written by Mr. Ray :

You will notice from Belcourt's memorandum that the firm of Belcourt & McDougall, Mr. Ray and Mr. Bronson, are to receive each $100,000 paid up stock of the company.

There is another point made by Mr. Ray in this letter dated July 2, 1902, as to the remuneration that Messrs. Belcourt and McDougall are to receive. There is a letter written the same day by the senior member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) to Mr. Tyrrell, in which he points out that ' Mr. Bronson and Mr. Ray are each to receive $150,000 and yourself $100,000 in shares.' But search the letter from one end to the other, and you do do not find any indication that a single cent is to go to the firm of Belcourt and McDougall. Why did he suppress the fact that they were to have $100,000 in stock ? Was it not that he did not want Mr. Tyrrell to come some day with a document in the hon. gentleman's own handwriting that he was to receive that stock ? Is not that a fair inference ?

Mr. BELCOURT. The original letter states the amount, and the omission of it is a suppression in the printing of it. If the hon. gentleman reads the other letters he will see it so distinctly stated.

Mr. BENNETT. I see that in a letter from Mr. Ray it is stated specifically that the interest of Belcourt and McDougall is to be $100,000. But the letter signed N. A. Belcourt to Mr. Tyrrell is utterly silent on that point.

Mr. BELCOURT. I tell the hon. gentleman that must have been omitted in the ' News ' office.

Mr. BENNETT. I cannot help that. If it is so let us have the original letter or the copy in the letter-book. But some confirmation of the fact that the letter in the newspaper may be right is the statement of the hon. senior member for Ottawa that $500,000 of stock is to remain in the treasury, for if the original letter says that $100,000 is to go to Belcourt and McDougall there would not be $500,000 of stock left in the treasury. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Belcourt) has taken the ground, as I have understood him, that there is nothing wrong about a member of parliament being interested in pressing claims in this House. He has taken that ground before, and when he did so his position was not reprobated by any minister, in fact, it was applauded by both ministers and back-benchers alike. But, Sir, we have more evidence in this matter. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Belcourt) thought the transaction was a perfectly open one, if there was nothing wrong in himself and his partner receiving $100,000 of stock, I ask him why his stock had to be placed in the name of Thomas Ahearn, of Ottawa ?

Mr. BELCOURT. The answer to that is the answer that I have had to make to the ' News ' article—it is a deliberate falsehood.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BENNETT. Some hon. gentlemen on the other side applaud. I think that like the editor of the ' Globe ', they would applaud everything done by this government.

Mr. SPROULE. I rise to a point of order. I wish to ask if that statement is parliamentary, if it is permissible to say that a statement made by a member of the House is a deliberate falsehood.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that statement should be withdrawn, it is not parliamentary.

Mr. BELCOURT. I will withdraw the word 'deliberate,' compelled to bow to your ruling.

Mr. BENNETT. I take no objection to it. As I understand the hon. gentleman says that the newspaper report is correct.

Mr. BELCOURT. I say there was never a share of mine or of Mr. McDougall put to Mr. Ahearn's name at all. I have no certificate of a single share to-day, nor has Mr. McDougall. We have never received one single share of the $100,000 that was promised us.

Mr. BENNETT. I will read the newspaper report, it is filed as an exhibit in the court at Dawson City :

Ottawa, October 6, 1902.

Re Bonanza Creek Hydraulic Concession.

My Dear Frank :—We had last week several interviews with Mr. J. W. Tyrrell concerning his brother's interest in this company and matters have been satsfactorily arranged all round. To-day we had a meeting of the shareholders and directors. The meeting of the shareholders elected the following directors of the company : C. C. Ray, E. H. Bronson, L. Crannell, T. Ahearn and J. W. Tyrrell.

Now search the files through, and the name of Ahearn is not mentioned until that letter appeared.

Mr. BELCOURT. Let me tell the whole facts. Under the Joint Stock Companies' Act, five persons are required to apply to obtain letters patent, and the five names that the hon. gentleman has just read were the five gentlemen who applied for letters patent. They were the provisional directors and, as stated there, every one of these gentlemen subscribed for one share each.

Mr. BENNETT. That is a fair statement. Everybody knows that under the laws of the province of Ontario there must be five, and here there are five, and the public will ask why the member for Ottawa was not one of the five.

Mr. BELCOURT. The member for Ottawa was acting as solicitor, with his partner, in the application. That is the reason.

Mr. BENNETT. The member for Ottawa knows as well as I do, that that did not debar him at all.

Mr. BELCOURT. The hon. gentleman, and those who have preceded him have spent their wind trying to show that it is improper for solicitors to practice in the departments, and when they find a solicitor who keeps his name out of an application for letters patent, he says there is no reason why he should keep his name out.

Mr. BENNETT. We will read a little further :

One-half the stock, namely, half a million dollars, the balance of the stock and the other half to be allotted as follows : $100,000 each to Messrs. Ray and Bronson, $100,000 to Tyrrell, and $100,000 to Ahearn representing you and myself.

Is not that an answer ? How unfortunate it is not to have a good memory.

An hon. MEMBER. Who is that letter signed by ?

Mr. BELCOURT. I again repeat that is not so, that is a false statement.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, if the hon. gentleman denies that he never wrote the letter, that there is no such exhibit on the files, then the 'Weekly News' of Dawson, is mistaken.

Mr. BELCOURT. I never wrote that that $100,000 in stock had been assigned to Ahearn or anybody else for Belcourt and McDougall. That is what I deny.

Mr. BENNETT. (reading).

$100,000 to Ahearn, representing you and myself.

That was part of the allotment of the stock. Later on, he says :

We feel that the concession is a valuable one.

Mr. BELCOURT. I wish to add to my statement, that up to the present moment, there has not been one single share of stock issued to McDougall or to me, or allotted to McDougall or to me, jointly or in any other way. I have no stock in that company issued or allotted to me yet.

Mr. BENNETT. These letters are spread abroad in the newspapers. In that letter of his own, he states to his business partner and his law partner :

$100,000 of stock is to be allotted to Ahearn representing you and myself.

Now, I expect that to-morrow the 'Globe' newspaper will allege that the hon. member for North Toronto, and myself, and the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Stockton), are slandering hon. gentlemen opposite. Well, hon. gentlemen opposite, as long as they are mixed up in deals of this kind, must expect to have it laid bare. I think the hon. member for St. John——

Mr. BELCOURT. I think you had better leave the member for St. John out of that. Confine it to yourself and the member for North Toronto.

Mr. BENNETT. Here are the facts of the case as they are disclosed, a case that has

been notorious for months past. The case has been known to hon. gentlemen opposite, and I wish to say here that although the hon. gentleman has been applauded by some of those sitting behind him, he is not applauded by them all. I believe that among a majority of the members on the government side of the House, there is a feeling of dissatisfaction and disgust at this pillaging of the public chest, and a feeling that as members of parliament in discharging a public trust, they should rise above petty speculations. I say that feeling is shared by a majority of hon. gentlemen on that side of the House. The feeling of disgust for actions of this kind is not at all confined to this side of the House. The opposition can well afford to stand the jibes of those hon. gentlemen opposite who applauded to the echo such acts as this, and I assume that they are only sorry that they have not similar fields to graze in. Now, I have been assailed for having brought under view the other day the actions of a number of gentlemen, another case in which a member for Ottawa was concerned, and what was the result? Yesterday, a whole column of the 'Globe' newspaper was hurled at my devoted head. Well, I can thank the 'Globe' for that excellent adverisement. So far as its personal abuse of myself is concerned, I am not at all annoyed by it, I would not expect anything else. The editor of the 'Globe' is a smug faced hypocrite, and I would not expect anything else from him. I have looked up the record of that man, and what is it? Prior to the last general election what happened in the city of Toronto? The Ross government, tottering to its fall, thought it would be well to call from the east and the west, from the north and the south, their friends and adherents together. They met in the city of Toronto to consider that black page, the record of crime that had been committed on behalf of that government to keep it in power. What happened? A reverend gentleman from Sault Ste. Marie got up and denounced the actions of those who were supporting the government, and who were bound to secure its return at all costs and hazards. A promient gentleman from the city of Toronto, a Mr. R. C. Steele, a well-known citizen, made use of these strong words:

> There have been things done in the name of Liberals that are a disgrace to Canada.

The whole convention was being stampeded by the respectable element, and it looked as if they might pass a vote of censure on the Ross government. What had to be done? Why, the editor of the 'Globe' had to obtrude himself, he was called upon, in desperation, in order to encourage them on, and that worthy individual made a speech that, for the moment, saved the situation. What were the words he used?

> He was prepared to look the ugliest page of the Liberal record in the face, and do all he could to return Ross with a larger majority than money could buy.

That pious and devoted man could not leave out the last suggestion about the power of money to buy. Well, Sir, when I look at the man who stands up before a crowd, when he finds that the voice of the respectable and honest men are decrying dishonesty and corruption in Canada, and when he declares that it is his boast that he can look the ugliest page of the Liberal record in the face, I am quite willing to take any slanders, slurs and mud from such a quarter as that. It will not do for the 'Globe' newspaper to endeavour to palliate such affairs as this and I suppose they will come to the rescue of the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt).

Mr. BELCOURT. Oh, not necessarily at all.

Mr. BENNETT. My hon. friend perhaps thinks his is a minor offence and for that reason they will not come to the rescue. I can tell hon. gentlemen on that side that no matter how ugly is the crime that pious editor of the 'Globe' will come to your rescue so long as it is done in the interest of the Liberal party. The Liberal party cannot afford to have the assurance of the support of the 'Globe' newspaper because if they do they will have the same fate overtake them as overtook the Ross government in Ontario; but so long as abuses of the kind shown here to-day—and I say it is an abuse—so long as it is held out to the people of Canada and they are led to believe that if you have a bad claim, if you have a claim that is unjust, if you have a claim that will not stand the glare and light of day, that all that is necessary is to go to a prominent member of this House, get him to interest himself with a minister of the Crown, pay him a handsome fee and you will have your prayer answered, so long as that sort of thing goes on in this country, while I have a seat in this House, no matter who the member may be, I will denounce such action on every occasion and in every place I can possibly denounce it.

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

> Excise—salaries of officers, &c., to provide for increases depending upon the result of excise examinations, $300,574.75.

Hon. WILLIAM TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue). This sum will show an increase for the twelve months of about $14,877. It consists altogether of statutory increases to officers of the department.

Mr. J. D. REID. Under the Civil Service Act, excise officers are supposed to pass the Civil Service examination and no appointments are supposed to be made unless the

applicants have passed that examination. We have an excise office in Prescott and I notice that under the minister's predecessor appointments were made of gentlemen who had not passed the examination. These were there previous to the examination, have been there ever since and will likely be there for all time to come unless some action is taken by the department. The same condition, I notice, prevails in Vancouver, Winnipeg, St. John and other places where we have more than one deputy collector and where there are temporary excisemen. In my constituency capable young men have gone to the trouble of passing the Civil Service examination and yet influence has been brought to bear by which men who have not passed and could not pass the examination and never intended to are appointed as temporary excise men. That, I think, is most unfair and unjust and I would like to know the policy of the present minister and what action is to be taken as regards those gentlemen who have been appointed as temporary excisemen.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The policy of the department is that no appointments are made without examination. It is sometimes necessary to appoint men temporarily on the distinct understanding that at the first opportunity they will pass the examination. Some times they fail to pass and further time is given them. It is my intention to continue the past policy of the department in that respect. Some men who were put on six months ago and who have failed to pass the examination have been retired from the service and others who are able to pass the examination have replaced them.

Mr. J. D. REID. I know for a fact that men who are well qualified to fill positions, men who have passed the civil service examination and who are supporters of the government too, are without positions because they have not sufficient influence, while men who are not qualified have been appointed. In my constituency there are men who have not passed the examination filling positions, and the time has gone by when they ever could pass the examination.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I understand my hon. friend to say he would approve of their dismissal. Can he give me their names?

Mr. J. D. REID. I approve of the dismissal of any man who is not qualified to fill his office. These men are supposed to pass an examination and not having passed it they are not qualified. I say that the government should appoint in their stead men who are qualified and who have passed the examination. The law is violated not only in my constituency, but elsewhere, by the subterfuge in order to ride over the law of appointing deputy collectors who are discharging the duties of excisemen. These officers have not passed the examination and cannot do so. Does the minister think that is right?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The hon. gentleman is not right in saying that we are overriding the law; the deputy collectors are appointed under the law.

Mr. J. D. REID. I have heard it explained by other Ministers of Inland Revenue that in order to perform the duties of an exciseman at a distillery the officer must pass the civil service examination, and that a deputy collector can only be appointed to such an office temporarily until an exciseman is appointed.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I am informed that such an officer is not put in a distillery, although he may do exciseman's work.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is not a brewery the same as a distillery in that respect?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. No.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is a third-class grade deputy collector who has not passed the examination qualified to act as exciseman in charge of a brewery?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I am informed that a man can by practical experience secure the necessary knowledge to do that work.

Mr. J. D. REID. Then what is the use of the civil service examination when you appoint men who have not passed it and who have nothing but political influence to recommend them.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The Civil Service Act says that deputy collectors and preventive officers in the Inland Revenue Department may be appointed without examination and without reference to the rules of promotion.

Mr. J. D. REID. Is a deputy collector of the third class, the lowest grade, qualified to act as exciseman?

Mr. BRODEUR. There are no third-class deputy collectors; there are deputy collectors class A and class B.

Mr. J. D. REID. I quite understand that the present Minister of Inland Revenue can have but very little experience in the department, but I would ask the ex-minister (Mr. Brodeur) who has had considerable experience and who so ably managed that department, too, I may add; I would ask him if a class B deputy collector has the necessary qualifications to take charge of a brewery?

Mr. BRODEUR. With regard to the question of examinations, I have no objection to state what my views are. There are two sorts of deputy collectors—those called collectors, class A, and those called collectors, class B. These two classes are required by the Civil Service Act to pass an examination. My hon. friend says that the other officers at a port are required by the law to pass an

examination. I may say that with regard to that he is absolutely mistaken ; there is no such provision in the Civil Service Act.

Mr. J. D. REID. Does not the law require a person to pass an examination as an excise officer in charge of a brewery or a distillery?

Mr. BRODEUR. I must call my hon. friend's attention to the statement he made that we had appointed some fifty collectors in class B without requiring them to pass an examination. I think he is mistaken in that. I am quite sure that I never appointed any man to the position of deputy collector class B, giving him the position of an exciseman, without requiring him to pass an examination. I have always taken the stand that such an officer should pass an examination 'though we have the right under the law to appoint deputy collectors, class B, without requiring them to pass an examination' ; because I thought it would be unfair to the other officers performing the same functions who had passed examinations in order to get their promotions and increases of salary if the same rule were not applied to all. In that respect I agree with my hon. friend, and I was rather surprised to hear him state that I had appointed at Prescott an officer as deputy collector, class B, who had not passed an examination. If my hon. friend will supply me with the name of the officers in question, I will go into the matter more fully.

Mr. J. D. REID. As I understand the Civil Service Act, a man who has been appointed deputy collector under class B cannot take the position of an exciseman in charge of a distillery or a brewery without passing an examination. I may, however, inform the hon. minister that in the town of Prescott there is a deputy collector of class B filling the position of an exciseman in charge of a brewery who has not passed an examination ; and that has been the case for some time.

Mr. BRODEUR. Not in my time. The appointment was not made in my time.

Mr. J. D. REID. I am not saying that the appointment was made in the hon. minister's time, but it continued during his time, and he assumed the responsibility of what his predecessor had done. If that can be done, it is unfair to those who have to pass the examination. The Civil Service Act has been violated in every inland revenue district in this province. The hon. minister knows that there are several others acting as temporary excisemen who were appointed when he was in charge of the department without having passed the examination, although there were some first class men in the county, good Liberals too, who had passed the examination, who wanted the position, and who could have filled it with credit to themselves and to the department. But for some reason or other he appointed men who had not passed the examination, and who never will pass it. I would like the minister to say whether that is fair or right to the men who have qualified themselves for the position, and who, though supporters of the government, have been thus turned down. So far as the Civil Service Act is concerned, in my county it is violated in the grossest way and it was done while the former minister of Marine and Fisheries were in charge of the Inland Revenue Department so that he has to assume the responsibility.

Mr. DANIEL. There is one point to which I would call the attention of the hon. minister and that is the great decrease of over $450,000 in the amount of excise revenue. I notice that the Auditor General called attention to it and asked for an explanation. The reply he got was that there had been a less quantity of excisable goods entered for consumption than during the preceding year. That reply however did not satisfy him and he asked for a return of the inspections from the different offices. To that I cannot see that he ever got an answer. He instanced the port of Montreal, where one third of the whole excise revenue is collected, as not having been inspected for five years. I see that there are other places which have been inspected, some at two years intervals and some at one year and some twice in the year, while in Montreal there has been no inspection for five years.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The explanation of the falling off of the revenue is very simple and will be found in a letter from the secretary of the department, who was then acting deputy minister, Mr. Himsworth. The decrease was in the month of February only. For the entire year there was a marked increase just as there has been since the close of the last fiscal year.

Mr. MONK. The statement made that the revenue office in Montreal has not been inspected for five years seems almost incredible. Is there no rule requiring a regular inspection of the office ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I understand that there are no regular intervals for inspection. The inspections are made at irregular intervals and sometimes very frequently. We have no other irregularity in any branch of the service in our department. I am advised that the Montreal district is such a large one that the inspector has great difficulty covering the territory and making inspections as frequently as might be expected. Inspections are made by the collectors and deputy collectors who report.

Mr. MONK. It is often outside that if a committee of four or five good business men went throught the departments they would find many things to correct. It

strikes me that a lack of inspection of such an office as the Montreal office for five years indicates a very slack method of doing business.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It indicates great confidence in Montreal.

Mr. MONK. I do not know that such confidence is absolutely justified. And in any case that is no excuse. I wish to renew the protest made every year since ten years as regards the Civil Service. Every year we hear that the Act is not observed. Men are appointed who have never passed the examination and who are never required to pass one. I have just heard the Minister of Indand Revenue declare in the most matter of fact way that in his own department men have been appointed and after an indefinite time have been called upon to pass the examination and were found utterly incapable to pass it. Our Civil Service system is becoming demoralized. In the United States since the beginning of the rule of President Cleveland, against great odds, they have improved their Civil Service, they have placed the Civil Service in a position where they could fulfil their duties and given them assurance that they would not be removed on a change of government. They have also provided that applicants must qualify for the Civil Service. As I have had occasion to say in this House before, the progress made in the United States has been admirable. We have been going backward and are still going backward, so that in large centres like Montreal and Toronto, young aspirants speak of the Civil Service examinations as a useless form because even though they qualify, people who have not passed the Civil Service examination are put in over their heads. This evening we are called upon to vote an increase of $14,000 depending upon what ? Upon the result of an excise examination. And we have had the admission by the minister, and by his predecessor, that appointments have been made without requiring the formality of compliance with the Civil Service law. I think that my hon. friend who has just come into the occupancy of the position of Minister of Inland Revenue might well, before we vote this money, announce to us what his policy is in regard to this most important point. Will he continue the system followed by his predecessor and other members of the government and name men for positions who have not complied with the law and kept them there until they have complied with the law, or will he adhere to the law and try in some way to improve our Civil Service system as has been done in the United States ?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The policy of the department as I have stated, is not to appoint parties until they have passed the examination. Of course, appointments of men to temporary positions are some times made, even though the parties have not passed the examination ; but, in these instances the condition is that the parties shall pass the examination at the first available opportunity. I mention the case—and I think it is rather to the credit of the department than to its discredit—that when a temporary employee has failed to pass the examination he has been retired from the service. It is the policy of the department, where men are put on temporarily without passing the examination, to require that they shall pass the examination, when they can be appointed permanently. As to this increase of $14,000 in the estimates, of course, that covers not merely the nine months for which these estimates are voted but the whole twelve months of 1906-7. The increase is due to the statutory increases of the employees of the department. These increases are inevitable. Very few increases are made in class B the only class of employees who under the law have not been required to pass the examination. That policy will be pursued in the future. I can tell my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) that my predecessor was trying to enforce still more strictly the rule of Civil Service examinations and that few were appointed even to class B, for which examinations are not required, except persons who had passed the examination. I shall be very pleased to continue in the footsteps of my predecessor in that regard, and if I can improve upon what he has done, I shall certainly do it.

Mr. MONK. I have heard that stereotyped declaration of policy from almost every head of the departments in this House, ever since I first became a member of the House.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I never heard it.

Mr. MONK. I am somewhat disappointed to find the hon. gentleman (Mr. Templeman) adopt not only the declaration itself but even the form of it. I do not wish to take up the time of the committee. I may simply point out that my hon. friend has declared that, having entered upon the conduct of the department he intends violating the law in the future as it has been violated in the past, and that there is no prospect whatever of our getting from my hon. friend any step in the direction of the reform of the Civil Service.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I do not know what words of mine justify the hon. gentleman in saying that I have declared that I would go on in violation of the law.

Mr. MONK. The hon. gentleman says that he will do his best, having appointed people who are not qualified, to induce them to take the qualifying examination. He will have great difficulty in carrying out that policy, for these parties will submit to the operation of the law only if they lack suffi-

cient influence to enable them to avoid compliance with it. We shall have no reform in this respect, until we have a man with the character of Mr. Cleveland, who will undertake seriously the work of reforming the Civil Service.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) knows that a person is not appointed to the Civil Service until he is appointed permanently. To be appointed permanently they must pass the Civil Service examination. True, we have certain hired men, certain temporary employees, who are not in the Civil Service and who have not passed the examination. But the policy of the department as I have said, is to encourage these to pass the examination, and I expect to continue the policy of my predecessor in that line. It is a good policy. We violate no law in what we do.

Mr. MONK. Those of us who have been in this House before my hon. friend (Mr. Templeman) entered it will recall having heard that argument used very often. My hon. friend knows the French proverb, 'Rien ne dure comme le promissire.' The hon. gentleman's justification consists in saying: We do not appoint these men permanently, for the law forbids; we appoint them temporarily. That is an observance of the letter of the law, but a violation of its spirit. Though my hon. friend has not been long in the department, he has contracted the habits of his predecessor, and now we have his statement that he will continue the same methods.

Mr. BLAIN. How many of such temporary employees are there in the employ of the government?

Mr. MONK. Fifty per cent.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I am advised that there are about 60 out of 400.

Mr. BLAIN. What length of time have these officers been in the employ of the government without passing the examination?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. For two or three years there might be a few longer, but they will average a couple of years.

Mr. DANIEL. I would like to recall the minister's attention to a statement he made just now, that the falling off in the revenue was only in the month of February, and that on the whole year's operations there had been a material increase. Now, if he will look at page (K—25) where the excise revenue is given for the whole year, he will see that it shows a falling off of $371,428. I do not see how the minister can reconcile this statement in the Auditor General's Report with the statement he made just now.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. According to the information now given me, I will have to revise my statement. The excise revenue for 1902-3 was $11,900,000 in round numbers, for 1903-4, $12,893,000; for 1904-5, $12,521,000. That shows a considerable increase in 1903-4 over 1902-3, but it shows a decrease of three or four hundred thousand dollars between 1904-5 and 1903-4. My information is that the revenue is increasing very rapidly since the close of the last financial year, and we expect that during the current financial year it will be greater than ever before.

Mr. DANIEL. I do not know where the minister gets his figures, they are not such as I find in this printed report laid on the table of the House where the excise revenue for 1903-4 is given as $12,890,382. The excise revenue for 1904-5 is given as $12,518,954, showing a decrease of $371,422. Those are the figures that are laid before parliament as being correct, and I presume they are.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. That is the revenue as published in the Blue-book of the department.

Mr. SPROULE. I have the Blue-book, and it does not agree with that statement. If you take the Sessional Paper No. 12, you will find that the excise for 1901 was $10,423,865; for 1902, $11,257,485; for 1903, $12,190,123; 1904, $13,126,596; 1905, $12,769,691.

Mr. BRODEUR. What is the hon. gentleman quoting from?

Mr. SPROULE. From the Inland Revenue Report for 1905, where the deputy minister reports to the minister, on page IX., showing the accrued revenue for the years ending June 30 from 1901 to 1905; and at the bottom of that page the decrease in the last fiscal year is given as $398,140.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. My hon. friend will see that it is reported by the deputy minister that the figures he has read show the accrued revenue for the years named. The figures I have given are the actual revenue collected.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the difference between accrued and actual revenue?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. One is due and the other is collected. The absolute collections during the year are the figures I have given.

Mr. BLAIN. What amount is due and uncollected, and what are the reasons?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. It may happen that at the close of the financial year revenue has accrued that is not paid in until the following financial year, and that would make a discrepancy in the figures.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the minister give it as his opinion that these figures in the Auditor General's Report are merely the figures of the revenue due and money that has not been paid? I would hardly expect that from the Auditor General's Report. I

think it would be more likely to give the exact money paid out and the exact money paid in.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. If the hon. gentleman will look at page nine of the report of the department for 1905, he will see that the accrued revenue was $12,745,191 for the last financial year. He will observe further that this sum of $198,082.84 is a refund deducted therefrom, giving the actual revenue as I have read, $12,521,108. That reconciles the two statements.

Mr. DANIEL. The refunds and drawbacks are deducted in the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Could the minister state if more commodious and suitable premises will be erected in Montreal than the homely premises we now have? Surely the great commercial metropolis is entitled to a better building. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) I think promised that something would be done before this session. The present building is really a disgrace to the great commercial metropolis.

Mr. BRODEUR. Last year a sum of money was voted to construct a new building or make an extension of the existing building, the idea of the department being to have an extension of the building on the square called Place Royale. The Public Works Department wrote to the civic authorities of Montreal and only this morning, after several months, a letter was received from Montreal asking for a sketch of the building which we intended to erect there.

Mr. MONK. If the government had pressed this matter after obtaining the vote and had not waited until they received a communication from the city, the remarks of the member for St. Lawrence division would have had a result before this.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend is not absolutely fair in stating that the matter has not been pressed. The Minister of Public Works wrote and at my request wrote again to the city of Montreal. The matter was referred there to the roads committee and afterwards to another committee and I received a newspaper clipping this morning stating that the question was before a committee and they decided to ask from the Minister of Public Works or myself some more information. I had this morning a letter from the city clerk asking for information which I have asked the Public Works Department to supply.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend will find that the real cause of delay is that a group of real estate owners around Place Royale do not want that vacant space to be deeded by the city to the government. That is what has retarded the progress and if the government now undertakes to press the matter as it should the matter will be settled in a very short time.

Stamps for imported and Canadian tobacco, $26,000.

Mr. MONK. In the Department of Inland Revenue, at least under my hon. friend's predecessor, when a reform was suggested and pressed it was generally carried out before the man who had suggested it had been able to derive any kudos from it.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I may get the kudos.

Mr. MONK. I remember on one occasion there was a tobacco combine and I gave my hon. friend (Mr. Brodeur) the usual notice that two or three days afterwards I would bring the matter before the House. On the day appointed, before I had time to rise, he introduced a law to correct the abuse which I intended to point out to the House. I do not know if my hon. friend intends following the same system, but I would like to call his attention to another abuse and possibly before I move for its correction my hon. friend (Mr. Templeman) will follow the example of the previous minister and correct it himself. I refer to the stamps on Canadian tobacco. We in Quebec and those interested in tobacco production in Ontario have joined in representing repeatedly to the government that amongst other means of encouraging the culture, production and consumption of Canadian tobacco one of the principal means would be the abolition of distinction in the colour of the stamps. That has been urged by all the representative bodies interested in tobacco culture in Quebec. It has been urged from all the districts of Canada where tobacco culture exists to any extent. A need for the change exists today just as much as it did two years ago and I would ask the minister if the policy of the government is to abolish that distinction in colour of stamps. My hon. friend is aware that there are different coloured stamps for the imported, the mixed and the pure Canadian tobacco. Time and again the government has been asked to abolish that distinction. I think the demand is a reasonable one. My hon. friend (Mr. Brodeur) knows the reasons which were given in the memorandum presented to the government on that subject. I do not want to go into that question just now but I think we are entitled to know from the minister, before we vote this amount, if the policy of the government is to abolish that distinction in colour and if any measure will be introduced to that effect this session.

Mr. BRODEUR. If I may be permitted to answer my hon. friend ((Mr. Monk) I may say this question has come up several times before the Tariff Commission. In

Montreal representations were made by some persons that the different colours in the stamps should be abolished, while one section of the cigar manufacturers asked that the colours remain as they are. In Hamilton, London and Toronto, strong arguments were made against any change, while in Windsor representations to the contrary were urged upon us. You will see there is a difference of opinion. In order to change the colour of the stamps a change of tariff would have to follow and the tariff question has been postponed until next session.

Mr. MONK. Why is it necessary to change the tariff in order to change the stamps ?

Mr. BRODEUR. There is a different duty applying to each class of tobacco and a different stamp has to be used in consequence. Tobacco manufactured from foreign leaf has a blue stamp, tobacco manufactured from native leaf has a black stamp, tobacco manufactured from mixed foreign and Canadian leaf has a pink stamp, and all Canadian tobacco a green stamp. Each of these classes pays a different duty. If a man who manufactures from foreign leaf has a right to use a green stamp, he might defraud the department by paying the lower duty. When the tariff question comes up it will be considered whether the duty should be changed and whether the colour of the stamps should be retained.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. The cigar manufacturers in Hamilton look on this as a very grave matter indeed, and the cigar makers also take the view that if the colour of the stamp is changed it would mean a reduction in the price of high class cigars, so that the manufacturers in order to compensate themselves for that loss would have to reduce the wages of the tradesman. The cigar makers object to this most strenuously, and the government must give the question most careful consideration before any change is made.

Mr. MONK. The government have been considering the question for many years and it looks to me as if the answer given by the minister (Mr. Brodeur) is simply an attempt to shelve the matter. There is no doubt that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Brodeur) has been misinformed by the officers who have told him that a change in the colour of the stamp depends upon a change in the tariff. He will find that it is quite possible for the government to change the colour of the stamp without in any way altering the tariff. It is impossible to see how a change in the tariff would make any difference in regard to these duties which are purely excise. The hon. gentleman from Hamilton (Mr. Zimmerman represents the views of those interested in the importation of foreign leaf, whose object is to depreciate by every possible means the native product. I do not think there are any cigars now made, out of purely Canadian leaf ; efforts were made in the province of Quebec to engage in that industry, but I do not think it is carried on now. The producers of the native leaf simply ask that there be no distinction in the colour of the stamp, so that their product may be judged on its merits alone. The government is lending itself to the depreciation of native Canadian tobacco by maintaining this unfair distinction in the colours of the stamps. Are we to understand from the hon. minister (Mr. Brodeur) that this long deferred matter will be decided next session ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The matter will be dealt with when the tariff resolutions are brought down. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Monk) says there will be no danger to revenue if only one colour be used in the stamps. But suppose tobacco manufactured in Montreal were sent to a warehouse in the west, how could it be ascertained there what tax would be paid on this tobacco ?

Mr. MONK. If the leaf was imported and manufactured in bond, the stamps are only affixed after the excise duty is paid.

Mr. BRODEUR. And as the law stands to-day, our only means of ascertaining that tobacco has paid the proper duty is by the variety in the colours of the stamps.

Mr. MONK. We deny that.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk) will be a cabinet minister one of these days ; he may be Minister of Inland Revenue, and he could not administer his department if the colour distinction were removed. It would be absolutely impossible that any fraud could be committed. That is the reason the department has adopted the different coloured stamps. It is in the interest of the revenue.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend says that the difference of colour must be maintained because otherwise the government could not see that the duties were paid.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am advised that so long as the different grades of duty are kept as they are to-day, it would result most seriously to the revenue to change them.

Mr. SPROULE. Would it not be as well to put the name on ?

Mr. BRODEUR. That would not do, because for a tobacco which is made of foreign leaf they could use Canadian leaf. I have studied the question very seriously, and the fact that my hon. friend is taking the opposite argument to that of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, shows how difficult it is to administer the excise department in the condition in which the duties are placed to-day.

Mr. MONK. I think my hon. friend from East Grey is right. I am perfectly sure

that if you submitted the question to those interested, they would say that they prefer a uniform colour, and that the tobacco should be marked whether it is native or imported.

Mr. BRODEUR. No farmer in Jacques Cartier or Montcalm would accept the suggestion of my hon. friend to put the word 'Canadian' on his tobacco.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. minister says they could put the wrong label on the tobacco. Might they not change the colour in the same way—putting on the Canadian tobacco the stamp that ought to be on the foreign ?

Mr. BRODEUR. There is a difference in the license also. There are four different licenses issued.

Excise—to enable the department to supply methylated spirits to manufacturers, $43.000.

Mr. SPROULE. How is that bought now—by tender and contract ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, public tenders were called for last year by advertisement, and as a result the contract price was reduced by 11c. a gallon.

Mr. SPROULE. Has one individual got the whole contract ?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, A. D. Gaul, of Montreal.

Mr. BLAIN. What is the price ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I think it is $1.29.

Mr. SPROULE. How many tenders were received ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I think four or five.

Mr. SPROULE. What became of the firm near Orillia, that was manufacturing this ?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is still manufacturing. The wood alcohol is one of the numerous by-products. There are also charcoal, acetate of lime and acetic acid.

Some resolutions reported.

REPORTS PRESENTED.

Report of the Experimental Farms for the year ending November 30, 1905, and report of the Minister of Agriculture for the year ending November 30, 1905.—Hon. Sydney Fisher.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 12.25 a.m. Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, April 11, 1906.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 108) respecting the Kettle River Valley Railway Company.—Mr. D. Ross.

COLLECTION OF LABOUR STATISTICS.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 109) to repeal the Act to provide for the collection and publishing of labour statistics. He said : The Act referred to has been on the statute-book for some time. It ought to have been repealed when the law creating the Department of Labour was enacted. The commission for the codification of the statutes pointed out that this law was no longer necessary. Therefore, I ask leave to introduce this Bill to repeal it.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM (East Elgin). I am not sure that I understood the minister's explanation. Is the idea to abolish the collection of statistics by the different representatives throughout the country ?

Mr. FISHER. No. The law it is proposed to repeal was one which authorized the Department of Agriculture to collect labour statistics. This work was never undertaken by the department. The Act creating the Department of Labour places this work of collecting and publishing statistics under that department.

Mr. INGRAM. The Act to be repealed was passed under the old government ?

Mr. FISHER. Yes. But it was never acted upon, and has remained a dead letter.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). The object of this Bill is simply to prevent two departments being charged with the same duty.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

CHANNEL IN SAND HILLS NEAR CASCUMPEC.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked :

1. How much money has been spent up to date on the closing of the channel in the sand hills, near Cascumpec, Prince Edward Island ?
2. By whom was money for said work received, and by whom expended ?
3. What are the names of the foremen employed, the rate of wages paid to them, and the total sum ?
4. What rate of wages was paid to men employed ?
5. Has work proved of advantage, and what is report of engineers with regard to utility of said work ?
6. Has any portion of work been carried away ?
7. What is intended to be done in future ?

Hon. CHAS. S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works) :

1. $2,977.51.
2. Expended under the supervision of the resident engineer, and paid through E. H. Mitchell, paymaster at Charlottetown.

3. John Kinch, $2.50 per day, 90 days, $225 ; Wm. O'Meara, $2.50 per day, 17 days, $117.50.

4. From $1.50 to $1 per day.

5. It is doubtful that any permanent results can be obtained unless very extensive works are built.

6. Yes.

7. The matter is under consideration.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY—CLAIM OF MR. J. HANEY.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked :

1. How was the claim of Mr. J. Haney, contractor of the Hillsboro' bridge, against the Prince Edward Island Railway, for yard room at Charlottetown, contracted ?

2. Who ordered the closing of the switches against him, and why ?

3. How much did the matter cost ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. By reason of the detention of Mr. Haney's plant on the north side of harbour where his work was completed, which detention prevented him from taking plant across the harbour and continuing work on the south side of harbour.

2. Superintendent Sharp, of the Prince Edward Island Railway. Permission to transfer the plant was refused on the ground that the Murray Harbour branch had not been taken off the contractor's hands, he having objected to consent being given Mr. Haney to use it until the work was taken over, and on the ground that there was not sufficient room in the yard at Charlottetown to warrant the transfer of the plant to the yard.

3. $1,200.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY—TRAIN SERVICE.

Mr. LEFURGEY asked :

1. Has any report been received re the earnings of the trains between Summerside and Tignish, Prince Edward Island ?

2. Who furnished same, and on what basis were they calculated ?

3. What were the earnings on this section, and the earnings on the section between Charlottetown and Souris ?

4. How many trains were maintained per day over said western section, and how many over said eastern section during the past winter ?

5. On what principle was the maintenance upheld ?

6. How many, if any, trainmen were dismissed or laid off by the withdrawal of second western train ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. Figures in form are not kept to give a comparison of earnings of different sections on this railway.

Mr. HYMAN.

4. Between Summerside and Tignish, one train each way daily ; between Summerside and Charlottetown, two trains each way daily ; between Charlottetown and Souris, one train each way daily, and a tri-weekly one ; between Mount Stewart and Georgetown, one train each way daily, and a special mail train between Charlottetown and Souris while the winter steamers are running, and which is paid for by Post Office Department.

5. Business principles involved in operation of railway.

6. Six men were laid off.

MR. C. L. SMITH, POSTMASTER, WOODSTOCK, N.B.

Mr. GANONG—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

When was C. L. Smith appointed postmaster of Woodstock, N.B., and what is his salary ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Postmaster General). Mr. C. L. Smith was appointed postmaster at Woodstock, N.B., on the 19th August, 1899. His salary, allowances and commission on box rents amounted to $2,654.39 for the year 1904-5.

SOUTH AFRICAN WAR—COST OF CONTINGENTS.

Mr. WORTHINGTON asked:

1. Was the outfitting of the Canadian contingents for South Africa with clothing, arms, horses, and all necessary supplies, paid for by the Imperial government or by the Canadian government ?

2. If paid by the Imperial government, what was the total amount so paid ?

3. What were the total amounts paid for clothing, arms, horses and supplies, respectively ?

4. Did the Canadian government act as purchasing agents for the Imperial government ?

5. Was any commission paid by the Imperial government ? If so, what percentage, and what was the total amount of the commission so paid ?

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

1. The 1st and 2nd Canadian contingents were fitted out by and at the expense of the Canadian government. The cost of fitting out the contingents known as the Strathcona's Horse was borne by Lord Strathcona, and of the South African Constabulary and the 3rd and 4th contingents by the imperial government.

2 and 3. The total amounts paid for clothing, arms, horses and all necessary supplies respectively by the Canadian government for the 1st and 2nd contingents were: Pay, $445,000; transport, ocean, $670,000; transport, land, $110,000; clothing and equipment, $500,000; horses, $131,000; enlisting and sundry expenses, $119,000; total, $1,975,000. For details see Auditor General's Report, 1899-1900, pages (Q—115-130), and 1900-1901, pages (Q—107-130).

4. The Canadian government did not act as purchasing agents, but in the case of Strathcona's Horse, the South African Constabulary, and the 3rd and 4th contingents the Department of Militia and Defence assisted Lord Strathcona, the Colonial Office and the War Office respectively in making contracts for supplies purchased in Canada.

5. No Canadian funds were used and no commission was asked or received.

AMERICAN SILVER.

Mr. BLAIN asked:

What amount of American silver has been collected by the Canadian banks under the agreement with the government ?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The amount of American silver collected by the Canadian banks under agreement with the Canadian government is $93,768.

NEWMARKET AND HOLLAND RIVER—PROPOSED CANAL.

Mr. LENNOX asked:

1. Has the survey of the proposed canal from Newmarket, to connect with the waters of Holland river, been completed ?
2. Has the department obtained an estimate of the cost of the proposed work, or of a portion of the work, and of what part ?
3. What is the estimated cost ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. Yes.
2. Yes, from Cook's Bay to Newmarket; the balance not yet finished.
3. It is considered not to be in the public interest to publish the estimated cost at the present time.

PISQUID ROAD, P. E. I., MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN—by Mr. A. Martin—asked:

1. Did the Postmaster General receive a petition for daily mail service to Pisquid Road, lot 47, Prince Edward Island ?
2. If so, what action does the government intend to take in the matter ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Postmaster General):

1. In January, 1903, a petition was received asking for the establishment of a daily mail service between Avondale post office (late Pisquid Road) and Vernon river.
2. The total annual revenue of the Avondale post office at that time was $11.05, in view of which circumstance a semi-weekly service was considered sufficient for the needs of the office.

WEIR LICENSES, CHARLOTTE COUNTY.

Mr. GANONG asked:

1. Have any weir licenses been granted in the county of Charlotte, N.B., since January 1, 1906 ?
2. If so, to whom, at what date, and on whose recommendation ?

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

1. No.
2. Answered by No. 1.

ST. ANICET WHARF.

Mr. WALSH asked:

1. When was the wharf at St. Anicet, county of Huntingdon, last repaired, and what was the cost ?
2. Has the government received any revenue since the repairs ? If so, what amount was received yearly ?
3. What is the present condition of the wharf?
4. Does the government intend to make any repairs during the coming season ?
5. Who is in charge of the wharf and what is his remuneration ?

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

1. In the year 1898-1899 at a cost of $1,432.75.
2. In the year 1898-1899 the sum of $74.63 was received. No revenue has been received since that date.
3. No report has been received as to the condition of the wharf.
4. An examination of the wharf will have to be made first.
5. The wharfinger, Mr. S. Dupuis, is in charge of the wharf, and his remuneration is 25 per cent of the wharfage dues collected by him.

COST OF STEAMER 'MAISONNEUVE.'

Mr. NORTHRUP asked :

1. Where was the steamer 'Maisonneuve' employed in the year 1904 ?
2. On what service ?
3. During which months was she so employed, and where each month ?
4. What is the number of her officers and crew, respectively ?
5. What did she cost originally, and how much has been spent on her since ?
6. How much was spent on her in the year ending June 30, 1905, for : total expenditure, wages, repairs, coal, provisions, improvements, and decorations ?

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

1. In River St. Lawrence.
2. Hydrographic survey; inspection and with Governor General.
3. All the season as above.
4. One captain, one engineer, one steward, one fireman and one deck hand—5.
5. Original cost, $8,500: total cost, including maintenance, $11,215.23.
6. Wages, $1,679.58; repairs, $703.87; fuel, $103,78; provisions, $430.56; improvements, $1,037.40 (steering gear and ventilator); decorations, furniture, $63; washing, $17.11. Total, $4,035.30.

MAIL SERVICE, MOUNT VERNON, PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked :

1. Did the Post Office Department receive a petition from the inhabitants of Mount Vernon, Prince Edward Island, asking for a better mail service ?

2. If so, what does the government propose to do with regard to it ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Postmaster General). A petition has been received asking the establishment of a daily mail service to the Mount Vernon post office, and is now under consideration.

POST OFFICE AT CLINTON.

Mr. GUNN asked :

What was the total cost of the building and furnishing of the post office recently erected in the town of Clinton ?

Hon. CHAS. S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works). $18,658.05, exclusive of site.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS AT SEAFORTH.

Mr. GUNN asked :

1. What rent does the government pay Mr. S. Dickson for post office at Seaforth ?

2. What rent does the government pay the Bank of Commerce for custom house at Seaforth ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Postmaster General). An allowance based on the revenue from the office, and amounting at present to $200 per annum is made to the postmaster at Seaforth to cover rent, fuel and light.

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). 1. The office used as a Custom House at Seaforth is rented from Kruze Bros. at $40 a year.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT WINGHAM.

Mr. GUNN asked :

What did the public building and furnishing cost recently built in the town of Wingham ?

Hon. CHAS. S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works). $13,961.51, exclusive of site expended to date.

ELECTRIC LIGHTING OF PARLIAMENT BUILDINGS.

Mr. AMES asked :

1. To whom was given the contract for installing electric light lamps on the grounds around the parliament buildings ?

2. What was the price fixed for said installation ?

3. Were tenders for said work called through the newspapers ?

4. How many tendered for the work, and at what price ?

5. How much has been paid to the contractors for said work ?

Mr. BRODEUR.

Hon. CHAS. S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works) :

1. Installation done by Public Works staff.

2, 3, 4, and 5. Answered by No. 1.

Details of expenditure from July 1, 1905 to February 28, 1906.

Lead covered cable	$ 3,015 25
Conduits	3,187 85
Wire	124 62
Sockets	110 00
Lamp posts	156 04
Hardware	44 92
Rubber gloves	9 00
Cable clips	7 50
Paraffine	7 50
Sundries	146 51
Pay-lists	3,269 30
	$10,078 49

CLAIMS OF RETIRED SERVANTS OF HUDSON BAY COMPANY.

Mr. ALCORN asked :

1. What is the policy or intention of the government in respect to the subject of the claims of retired servants of the Hudson Bay Company and their descendants to one-tenth of the lands of Thomas, Earl of Selkirk, commonly called Lord Selkirk, situate in the former district of Assiniboia ?

2. Is it the intention of the government to take any, and what, action, with reference to that subject, as presented to the government in (a) letter of Honourable J. Norquay to the Minister of the Interior of November, 1886 ; (b) petition of February, 1887, lodged with the Secretary of State ; (c) address by the legislature of Manitoba in 1887, to the Governor General in Council ; (d) list of such claims presented by R. Marion, M.P., to the Minister of the Interior ; (e) petition to Minister of the Interior of June, 1889 ; (f) petition presented by Mr. Lamont, M.P., in June, 1905 ; (g) memorial to the Right Honourable the Prime Minister of March, 1905 ?

3. What area of land in said former district, parcel of said one-tenth of said estate, has been received by retired servants of the Hudson Bay Company or their descendants, pursuant to the terms of said will ?

4. What area of said one-tenth remains unappropriated to the purposes by said will directed ?

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

1. The government has no policy with respect to the subject of the claims of the retired servants of the Hudson Bay Company.

2. It is not the intention of the government to take any action with respect to that subject. I may say that the government consider that if these retired servants have any claims, they lie against the Hudson Bay Company and not against the government.

3. The government has no knowledge of any lands having been allotted to or received by the servants of the Hudson Bay Company.

4. The government has no knowledge of that.

SALE OF LANDS TO A. D. DAVIDSON AND ASSOCIATES.

Mr. ALCORN asked :

1. Will the government lay on the table of the House the following papers relating to the sale of 250,000 acres of land in western Canada to A. D. Davidson and associates, subsequently known as the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company :

(a) Any and all proposals or requests made by or on behalf of A. D. Davidson, his associates or any of them, for purchase or acquisition of lands from the government, or any department thereof, and particularly that proposal referred to in Sessional Paper No. 132a. 1903, page 159, being order in council, approved 24th May, 1902.

(b) Any and all recommendations of any such proposals, or dealings therewith, made by the commissioner of immigration, or general colonization agent, or either of them, referred to in such order in council.

(c) Any and all acceptance and acceptances. consent and consents, in writing, by or on behalf of the said A. D. Davidson, or associates, or any of them, of or to the terms of disposal of lands set out, in said order in council, and therein numbered one to nine, both inclusive, or of or to any of such terms.

(d) Any and all agreement and agreements in writing at any time made by government, or any department thereof, with said A. D. Davidson and associates, or any of them, for sale of lands based on said order in council, approved 24th May, 1902, or on any modification thereof.

2. Who was the commissioner of immigration referred to in said order in council, as recommending the proposals of said A. D. Davidson ?

3. Who was the general colonization agent referred to in said order in council, as recommending the proposals of said A. D. Davidson?

4. Is A. J. Adamson, member of this House for Humboldt, the same person as so named in said report, as an associate of said A. D. Davidson ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Yes—upon an Order of the House being obtained.
2. J. Obed Smith.
3. C. W. Speers.
4. Yes.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 64) respecting the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Gauvreau.

Bill (No. 41) respecting the Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Railway Company. —Mr. Macpherson.

Bill (No. 44) respecting the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company.—Mr. Hall.

Bill (No. 53) respecting the Crawford Bay and St. Mary's Railway Company.—Mr. Galliher.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 86) respecting the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company.—Mr. Carvell.

Bill (No. 87) to incorporate the Vancouver, Fraser Valley and Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Macpherson.

Bill (No. 88) respecting 'La Compagnie d'Assurance Mutuelle contre le feu des comtés de Rimouski, Témiscouata et Kamouraska,' and to change its name.—Mr. J. A. Ross.

Bill (No. 89) to incorporate the Ashcroft, Barkerville and Fort George Railway Company.—Mr. Duncan Ross.

Bill (No. 90) to incorporate the International Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Pardee.

Bill (No. 91) to incorporate the Minnesota-Canadian Bridge Company.—Mr. Dyment.

Bill (No. 92) respecting the Essex Terminal Railway Company.—Mr. Clarke.

Bill (No. 93) to incorporate the Alberta Northern Railway and Coal Company.—Mr. Clarke.

Bill (No. 94) respecting the Rio de Janeiro Tramway, Light and Power Company, Limited.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 95) respecting the Mexican Light and Power Company, Limited.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 96) respecting the Mexican Consolidated Electric Company, Limited, and to change its name to 'Mexican Tramway and Electric Company.'—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 98) respecting the Central Ontario Railway.—Mr. Northrup.

Bill (No. 99) respecting the Mather Bridge and Power Company.—Mr. German.

Bill (No. 100) respecting the Alberta Railway and Irrigation Company.—Mr. Turriff.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of any and all proposals or requests made by or on behalf of A. D. Davidson, his associates, or any of them, for purchase or acquisition of lands from the government or any department thereof, and particularly the proposal referred to in Sessional Paper 132a, 1903, page 159, being Order in Council, approved May 24, 1902, and of all correspondence and other papers in any wise relating to said proposal or proposals.

Also for a copy of any and all recommendations of any such proposals or dealing therewith, made by the commissioner of immigration, or general colonization agent, or either of them, referred to in said order in council, together with all correspondence and other papers in any wise relating to such recommendations.

Also for a copy of any and all acceptance and acceptances, consent and consents in writing, by or on behalf of said A. D. Davidson, or associates, or any of them ; of or to the terms of disposal of lands, set out in said order in

council, and bearing numbers one to nine, both inclusive, or of or to any of such terms, together with all correspondence and other papers, in any wise relating to such acceptance or consent.

Also for a copy of any and all agreement and agreements in writing at any time made by the government or any department thereof, with said A. D. Davidson, and associates, or any of them, for sale of lands, based on said order in council, approved May 24, 1903, or on any modification thereof, together with all correspondence and other papers in any wise relating to such agreement or agreements.—Mr. Alcorn.

For a copy of a certain report or communication to the Department of the Interior, from C. W. Speers, an officer of that department, dated in or about the month of February, 1901, recommending that 10,000 acres of land, included in or situate near the land afterwards sold by the government to Colonel A. D. Davidson and his associates, should be broken at the expense of the government, to establish the fact that grain could be produced in that district. Also for a copy of the map submitted therewith. Also for a copy of all reports, letters and communications to the said department, up to the 24th day of May, 1902, respecting the quality or value of the said lands, mentioned in the order in council of that date ?—Mr. Barker.

COST OF LIGHTING ON THE ST. LAWRENCE.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. Before the orders of the day are called I wish to call the attention of the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) to a question which I had on the order paper and which was answered by the minister on April 5. I quote from 'Hansard.'

Mr. TAYLOR asked :

1. How many lighthouses are there between Lachine and Bay of Quinté ?
2. How many buoys are there fitted out with lights between Lachine and Bay of Quinté ?
3. How much was paid for carbide used for lighting system between Montreal and Bay of Quinté during the season of 1905?
4. What was the total cost for maintaining lighting system beween Montreal and Bay of Quinté for the season of 1905, including cost of maintaining and operating the steamers 'Scout,' 'Reserve' and 'Maisonneuve.' used on this lighting system ?
5. What was the total cost for maintaining the lighting system between Montreal and Bay of Quinté, season of 1896 ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I shall have to get the information from Prescott. We have written to Prescott about it and have not yet received an answer.

The question was not answered and it was dropped off the paper. I would like either to have the information now or have the question restored until I get the information.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I happen to have this answer in my hand. It has just been sent by Mr. Fraser. The answer is as follows :

1. 43 lighthouses, 2 lightships, this includes Nine Mile Point.
2. 36 gas buoys.
3. $2,975.
4. $36,701.57.
5. $7,979.90.

BROCKVILLE CHEESE CURING ROOM.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR. I also wanted to draw the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to a question which I had on the order paper and which the minister answered. On April 3, I drew his attention to the fact that there was a discrepancy in the answer and the minister said :

I shall be very glad indeed to have the accountant go through these figures again. Perhaps, in order to facilitate, the hon. gentleman would be kind enough to let me have the details which he says he has and which have not been published in 'Hansard.' Of course my accountant only had the 'Hansard' report to go upon. My hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) speaks of what he calls the 'loss,' but he does not take into account the benefit which the experiments have reaped for the country and which far outbalance any apparent loss.

I gave the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) the items as I gathered them from the Auditor General's Report. He said he would have his accountant go over them and see whether the statement he had made in answer to the question when I first put it on the paper was correct or not. I have not had from him yet a statement as to whether his accountant's version or mine as taken from the Auditor General's Report is the correct one and I would like to have a reply. The hon. minister is not present to-day but the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will draw his attention to 'Hansard,' and when the House meets again he will give me an answer.

RURAL MAIL DELIVERY.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). I wish to call the attention of the Postmaster General (Mr. Aylesworth) and the House to a return laid on the table on the 9th instant in reference to free rural mail delivery. The return consists in the report of two officers of the department who on instructions of the late Postmaster General proceeded to Washington to make certain investigations. I am very glad, and the House will be glad I presume, to have this report, but it does not comply with the order that the House made on the 6th of March, 1905. That order called for :

Copies of all reports, returns, estimates, correspondence, writings, records, documents, memoranda, or written or printed information of any kind in the possession or control of the Post Office Department, in reference to the question of establishing rural mail delivery in Canada, or the manner of estabishing or conducting such service, and the probable cost; including any information in the possession of

the department as to the working of the United States system, or such a service or system elsewhere, and the annual expense and other particulars.

In fact all the documents in possession of the department upon this question. The House made that order no doubt inferring from the silence of the Postmaster General that there were papers, documents and correspondence upon this question, and of course there certainly are as we know from the discussion which took place. In answer to the order nothing has been brought down except this report which was not in existence at the time the order of the House was made, so there seems to have been some misconception as to what the order of the House referred to. I may say too, this order is dated 22nd May, 1905. As it is only fifteen pages, it is hard to understand the reason for the great delay in bringing it down. However, the main point to which I wish to call attention is this, that there must be a number of documents in the department which are of interest on this question, and which will probably show the matter in a different light from what this report does, and I would ask the hon. Postmaster General to call the attention of his officers to the matter, so that the order of the House may be complied with.

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Postmaster lation.) Before the orders of the day are of which I had no personal knowledge whatever until it was mentioned by my hon. friend in the House a few days or a few weeks ago. I then made inquiries in the department with reference to the whole subject, and I was told then, and also afterwards in answer to a categorical question on my part, that there were no other documents touching this question in the department. I can ask again, but that is what I was told.

Mr. LENNOX. I have no hesitation in accepting the statement of the hon. Postmaster General, but from statements made on previous occasions, we had reason to infer that there had been other papers. However, perhaps the Postmaster General will have no objection to ask again.

CIRCULAR TO THE JUDGES.

Mr. J. E. E. LEONARD (Laval). (Translation.) Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to ask the hon. minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) whether or not the circular letter which was referred to last week by the hon. gentleman, was really addressed by himself or his officers to all the judges. I would like to know whether or not this circular was addressed to all the judges in the province of Quebec, particularly to the judges of the district of Montreal. My reason for calling for this information is that the hon. minister in his statement declared that although he had sent the circular to all the judges in Canada, but few as much as answered it.

I would, therefore, ask for an answer as to whether or not this circular was really sent out and if so, when, by the Department of Justice.

Hon. Mr. FITZPATRICK. (Translation.) It is customary, when some hon. member wants to secure information, that the minister concerned should be given notice of it. If in this instance the hon. gentleman had seen fit to give me a few minutes' notice, he would not see me in the predicament his request has placed me in. Therefore, I contend that it would be wise not to depart from this wise custom.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) I do not mean to find fault with the course pursued by the hon. minister and my intention is not to throw any blame on him. I merely wish to find out whether or not this circular was addressed to all the judges indiscriminately. I am led to believe by the information I have that it was not.

Hon. Mr. FITZPATRICK. (Translation.) I am not in a position to give other information but that which comes to my memory just at present. It might be, of course, that these informations are not as complete as they otherwise would have been, had I had the opportunity after being duly notified to investigate.

A few days after that question was put by the hon. member for Grey, I immediately gave instructions to send out to all the judges a copy of the circular which is being referred to by the hon. member for Laval (Mr. Leonard). This circular was drafted by my deputy and looked over by me. When I spoke of it before this House, I was under the impression that my instructions had been carried out, and that the letter had been sent out to all the judges. But I found out since that owing to the officer entrusted with the mailing of it falling sick, the circular was not addressed to all the judges but to part of them only. As a matter of fact, some of the judges in the province of Quebec as I notice, had not received it at that time.

I may add for the information of my hon. friend and all who are concerned that notwithstanding the fact that this circular has been issued for some time past, I have so far received but very few answers.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) Would the hon. gentleman require that I should ask for a return for these documents ?

Hon. Mr. FITZPATRICK. (Translation.) Not for the answers which were received.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) I presume that these answers are of a private character ?

Hon. Mr. FITZPATRICK. (Translation.) I am quite willing at any time to let the hon. gentleman take knowledge of them.

Mr. LEONARD. (Translation.) I suppose copy of the circular will be brought down ?

Hon. Mr. FITZPATRICK. (Translation.) Most certainly.

The orders of the day having been called.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the House is not disposed to go in Committee of Supply, and therefore I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business may be expected on Tuesday next ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I expect that the Minister of Railways will take up his Bill on Railways, and the Minister of Justice will take one or two of his Bills, and then we will take Supply.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 4.05 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, April 17, 1906.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS—EXTENSION OF TIME.

Mr. A. E. DYMENT moved :

That all petitions for private Bills presented to the House on Tuesday the 10th instant and Wednesday the 11th instant be read and received forthwith, notwithstanding the expiration of the time for receiving petitions for private Bills.

He said: I may say in explanation of this motion that the time for presenting these Bills was extended to the 12th instant, but the House adjourned on the 11th. I think, therefore, it is proper to make this motion.

Motion agreed to.

GOVERNMENT CONTROL OF DAMS.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). I was asked a question with respect to certain correspondence, and I was also asked whether the government would be willing to have it laid on the table and I answered, yes. But as no motion was made for the return I now beg to move:

For leave to present copies of orders in council and corespondence having reference to the assumption by the Department of Railways and Canals of the several dams owned by the Ontario government on the head and subsidiary waters of the Trent canal.

Motion agreed to.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 110) respecting certain patents of the Toledo Glass Company.—Mr. Stewart.

Bill (No. 111) respecting the Lake of the Woods Milling Company and the Keewatin Flour Mills Company, Limited.—Mr. Adamson—by Mr. Turriff.

Bill (No. 112) respecting the Huron and Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. Ratz—by Mr. McKenzie.

Bill (No. 113) respecting the Northern Railway of Canada.—Mr. Dubeau.

Bill (No. 114) to incorporate the Canadian Lloyds Certificate.—Mr. Bickerdike—by Mr. Demers.

Bill (No. 115) concerning leprosy.—Mr. Fisher.

HAY TRADE REGULATIONS.

Mr. AIME BEAUPARLANT (St. Hyacinthe—(Translation)—moved for leave to introduce a Bill entitled an Act respecting the hay trade.

He said : Mr. Speaker, as some hon. members are anxious that I should explain the object of this Bill, I may state that, as indicated by its title, it proposes to regulate the hay trade. I shall not enter just now into an explanation of all its details ; suffice it to say that the object of this Bill is to add to the good name and, consequently, to raise the price of an agricultural product which is very abundant in this country. Moreover, this Bill has in view to prevent some unscrupulous and careless persons from depreciating the hay which is sold by a number of dealers whose reputation is unassailable. The object of this Bill is also to deprive buyers abroad of any semblance of reason for refusing to accept consignments—a thing of frequent occurrence when the price drops in the interval between the sale and the delivery.

As to what means should be adopted, I believe it would be fairly feasible and effective to enact that the hay presser shall affix to each bale a label giving his name, his address, the quality of the hay according to the standard established by the Bill, and the weight of the bundle.

Another means would be to prohibit the baling of hay in such a manner as to show on the surface an article altogether different from the hay contained in the interior of the bale. I would also recommend—for the sake of uniformity, in order to put all dealers upon the same footing—that the shipment of hay from any part of Canada be forbidden unless the bales are labelled as aforesaid.

So far as the extent of this trade is concerned, I may say that it amounts to about two million dollars annually, if we only take into account the hay which is exported. Surely, such a trade is well worth the attention of the law-makers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this Bill leaves the hay growers at liberty to deal as they think fit with those who buy hay for their own use. But, the moment the sale becomes a

commercial transaction properly speaking, that is to say, the moment the generality of careful farmers or the public are interested, I believe it is desirable that these should be protected. This Bill will, in my opinion, afford real protection to the mass of citizens, should the means I suggest be adopted.

I confidently submit it to the judgment of the House. I know that the hon. members, with the wisdoms that characterises them, will take it up in a spirit of fairness and adopt it, either in its actual form or with such amendments as they will deem fit to make after giving the matter due consideration.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INVESTMENT OF TRUST FUNDS IN PROVINCIAL SECURITIES.

On the orders of the day being called.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton). Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the government one or two questions in connection with a return which has been brought down, being a

> Return to an order of the House of Commons, dated the 17th July, 1905, for copies of all correspondence, documents, resolutions and other papers relating to any efforts or proposals to authorize the investment of trust funds in the United Kingdom in the securities of any province of Canada, and the fulfilment of any necessary conditions to that end.

I believe that this subject is governed almost completely by chapter 62 of the Imperial Acts of 1900. The second section of the Act provides that:

> The securities in which a trustee may invest under the powers of the Trustee Act, 1893, shall include any colonial stock which is registered in the United Kingdom in accordance with the provisions of the Colonial Stock Acts, 1877 and 1892, as amended by this Act, and with respect to which there have been observed such conditions (if any) as the treasury may by order notified in the London 'Gazette' prescribe.

I understand that an arrangement was made some two years ago by which the securities of the Dominion of Canada could be inscribed so that trustees in the United Kingdom might invest in them. There has been correspondence going on from 1900 to the present time between the government of British Columbia and this government in the first instance, and latterly between the government of Ontario and this government. That correspondence was directed to the end that the securities of these two provinces might be registered in the United Kingdom under the provisions of the statute to which I have called attention. I am not fully familiar with all the difficulties that have been found to exist but I observe a Memorial from the government of the province of Ontario which sets them forth pretty fully. As I understand the chief difficulty, it is that the government of the United Kingdom required the government of Canada to consent to the disallowance of any statute passed by the parliament of Canada which might be held to infringe upon the rights of the holders of such securities. I understand that the present administration gave their consent to the exercise of power by the imperial government for that purpose. So far as the provinces are concerned a difficulty, as I understand, has arisen in this respect that the power of disallowance under the British North Ameria Act must be exercised not by the government of the United Kingdom but by the Governor in Council of Canada. I observe that in the Memorial to which I have just now called attention—the Memorial of the province of Ontario addressed to His Excellency the Governor General some few months ago—a suggestion has been made as follows:

> The government of the province of Ontario would also respectfully submit that if deemed necessary the instructions from His Majesty to His Excellency the Governor General of Canada might be extended to authorize him to disallow any such legislation of this province as might prejudicially affect the interests of such stockholders.

In other words, as I understand the proposal, it is that the government of Canada would, at the request of the imperial government, exercise any powers of disallowance in respect to the provincial legislation which might be necessary for the purpose of protecting trustee investments in the United Kingdom in any securities of the provinces that have been registered under the terms of the statute to which I have referred.

I do not know whether any action has been taken by the government to bring about that result. I mention this because I notice that the government of the province of British Columbia are very firmly of the opinion, expressed several times in the correspondence which has been brought down, that if the securities of British Columbia could be registered in the United Kingdom so as to permit of the investment in them by trustees they would command a very much better price than they do at the present time and thus the finances of the province, in so far as they depend upon future loans, would be placed in a very much better position. I do not know whether or not the government are taking the suggestion of the government of Ontario into consideration. If the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) or the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) is not prepared to give an answer on the subject today, would either of them be good enough to take note of the matter and give an answer at some future day as it seems to me that it is of sufficient importance to demand immediate attention at the hands of the government.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Mr. Speaker, I fancy the correspondence to which my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden has referred includes all that has taken place, and if there is no report upon the line of what he has now suggested I fancy there is no such document in existence. However, owing to my absence from the House I have not seen the return. I should be very glad to look into it and if there is any information needed I should be most happy to give it to my hon. friend. The difficulties in the way of obtaining admission to the trustee list are very much greater than are supposed; they were found greater for a long time by the Dominion of Canada than we thought reasonable. It was many years before the Dominion of Canada was able to secure admission for its Dominion stock to the trustee list, and no provincial stock is likely to be admitted without hesitation and difficulty. Of course the provinces stand upon their own responsibility, but if without incurring any financial obligation we can in any way facilitate the provinces in this matter I quite agree that we should do it. If there is anything necessary to that end we should be glad to co-operate. I have no recollection of the imperial government ever stating that they would be prepared to admit the stocks of the provinces on these terms; possibly they may have made such a statement.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not think they have.

Mr. FIELDING. Even if we accept the suggestion of my hon. friend, I am afraid it will not be sufficient, but there is no reason why the Dominion government should not do anything it can towards that good end.

WESTERN BLOCK—COLLAPSE OF NEW TOWER.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton). I wish to ask the Minister of Public Works whether he has any further information for the House with reference to the investigation, which I suppose is now being held, into the cause of the disaster to the Western Block tower, and whether he can inform the House if there was an inspector and what was his name. I have gathered from the discussion in the House and in the press, that while Mr. Taylor had a certain charge of this matter he was not an inspector in the ordinary sense; that his office duties were such as to prevent him giving to the work as it proceeded that attention which an inspector or a clerk of works would be supposed to give. The name of some person was suggested in the previous discussion as having had imposed upon him the duty of inspecting the work as it went on. Would the minister be good enough to give whatever information he deems it proper to give at the present time.

Hon. CHARLES S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works). The gentlemen who were appointed by order in council to investigate this matter commenced proceedings on Monday and Tuesday and they went thoroughly into the plans and specifications. I have neither asked nor received from them any report as yet.

After they had proceeded a certain stage, they thought it of the greatest importance that a certain part of the wall should be taken down so that they would be able to see the nature of the construction. That necessitated the putting up of some plant, and the commission adjourned until that should be done with the intention of starting work to-morrow morning at half past ten o'clock. The plant in the meantime has been prepared. As to the inspector, Mr. Taylor had full charge of the work. The question as to whether sufficient care was exercised in regard to the construction is one which will be brought before the commissioners and it is specially mentioned in the reference to them asking for a full investigation. The House I think might very properly wait until we have a full report of the investigation in that respect. The very moment the report is received by me I shall lay it on the table of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I was not asking for any criticism of judgment on Mr. Taylor, but I was suggesting that his other duties confined him to his office, and for that reason, as I understood, there was an inspector appointed altogether outside of Mr. Taylor.

Mr. HYMAN. He was not an inspector in the proper sense of the word; I mean no inspector was on the work all the time outside of Mr. Taylor. I was very careful in the order in council to draw the attention of the commissioners to that particular fact and to ask them to report as to whether in their opinion the department have exercised sufficient care in reference to the building.

OTTAWA POST OFFICE.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the position in reference to the Ottawa post office building at the present time. I understand it has been in progress for between two and three years and that about $172,000 have been expended upon it. There have been statements made that the roof is not in a very satisfactory condition, that it is sagging or that the supports are sprung, that a good deal of water has come in, that the plastering of the rooms has been injured, and that the work generally is not in a very satisfactory condition. It is also said that the minister has found it necessary already to hold a certain investigation into irregularities in connection with the building. Would the minister state, when it is expected the building will be completed, why the delay has

been so great, and whether an investigation has already been held into irregularities in carrying on the work.

Hon. CHARLES S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works). The references of my hon. friend to the state of the building are entirely new to me. I have had no report, I have had no hint even of anything of the kind occurring. The post office building itself is practically finished ; there are certain fittings still required and this work the department has on hand at the present time. The House will understand that the work proceeded with difficulty because of the fact that the lower floor was occupied by the post office department, and great care had to be used during the reconstruction of the building. As to certain irregularities, spoken of by the hon. gentleman, a report reached me a few months ago in reference to the conduct of one of the officers employed on the building; it reached me in a way that I felt ought to be taken notice of. An investigation was held. The evidence was taken under oath and it turned out there was nothing against the officer in question. I shall be glad to lay the papers on the table of the House.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. A. MARTIN (Queen's P.E.I.). I wish to ask the Minister of Public Works when I may expect the correspondence between the government and the Dominion Coal Company in reference to the improvement of Glace Bay harbour ; ordered by the House on March 21.

Mr. HYMAN. I hope to be able to lay it on the table of the House by Wednesday next.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES (Victoria). A week or more ago I made a motion for the return of certain papers in connection with the construction of the Trent canal ; the minister has been good enough to bring down certain papers asked for in another matter by me, and I hope he will lose no time in bringing the Trent canal papers down.

Mr. EMMERSON. Does my hon. friend refer to the water-powers in possession of the Dominion government ?

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. No, I refer to the contracts and plans, and the moneys expended in connection with the Trent canal.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is in course of preparation. I have had to-day a statement from the clerk in charge saying that the accountant and law clerk are preparing statements, and Mr. Grant has been asked for a report as to the progress, and he hopes to have it within a day or two.

EMERSON POST OFFICE.

Hon. G. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called, I wish to draw the attention of the Minister of Customs (Hon. William Paterson) to a clipping from a Winnipeg paper which has been sent to me. I think it is my duty to allow the minister to have a chance to deny what seems to be the allegation in this letter, with reference to the collector of customs at Emerson. The report goes on to say that one Louis G. Gagnon, a collector of customs at Emerson, having been in charge for about three years or more, developed tendencies in several directions, one of which was to dismiss officers under him, who had to be restored to their positions when investigations were made by the superior officers and by the minister to whom the complaints were ultimately carried. It is also reported that some sixty-five irregularities were proved against him and that he went under cover for a number of months by way of suspension and now, when everybody supposed that he was gone to return no more, he has been reinstated and the paper says that there is something like an incipient strike developing in the office of Emerson. Now if this is so it is not very creditable, and if it is not so I hope the minister will give his denial to it. It may be that the minister's attention has not been brought to it.

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs). No, no article in a paper has been brought to my attention but I know the circumstances of the case. There has been trouble there and it was not a very easy matter to arrive at the real facts of the case. An investigation and report were made by the inspector for Manitoba and the Northwest provinces, which seemed to him to warrant the suspension of the officer. He was under suspension for some little time. The charges I might say were not in the opinion of the department at all conclusive. We did not feel that we were warranted in dispensing with the services of the collector altogether, nor did we, while things were in that condition, feel that we should remove the suspension. We waited until the chief inspector who was in Europe, where he had to attend to some public business, returned and then we had him go up and look thoroughly into the whole matter. As a result of his investigation and report the collector resumed his duties there. There seems to be a good deal of feeling and strife in the community there and it was a rather difficult matter to get at the facts, but from the chief inspector's report, which was very thorough, the department came to the conclusion that we would be warranted in reinstating the officer. I might say frankly that my own opinion is that when a suitable opportunity occurs it would perhaps be better for the peace of the community and for the conduct of the office if we were to effect an exchange to some other place.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the strike is practically on ?

Mr. PATERSON. No, there is no strike that I know of. Does this paper say there is a strike ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not know anything about a strike being on.

POST OFFICE AT GOODERHAM.

Mr. SAM HUGHES (Victoria). I desire to draw the attention of the Postmaster General (Hon. A. B. Aylesworth) to a communication which has been sent by one of his inspectors to the postmistress at Gooderham. The point to which I wish to draw the attention of the minister is that his post office inspector, without any investigation whatever into the facts of the case, seems to have taken upon himself to adjudge the postmistress guilty of charges never preferred against her, of which there is no evidence and of which no evidence can be produced. The letter is as follows :

Dear Madam,—I regret to say that very serious complaints have been made against the management of the post office at Gooderham, and as this is not the first complaint I look upon, it makes matters far more serious, and if proof can be established of the charges made of course it means a change in the postmastership at Gooderham. It has been reported to the department that matter passing through the mail is made the subject of conversation and publicity in the village. While post office business is strictly confidential it would appear that the public in your village learn from the officials of circumstances in connection with mail matter passing through of which they should have no knowledge whatever—that parcels coming and going are frequently opened and examined.

I would like a full explanation of this matter by return mail, as the charge is a serious one. Your daughter may be in charge, and if so this matter better be seriously discussed with her.

Yours truly,

H. MERRICK,
Post Office Inspector.

The Postmistress, Gooderham.

I may say that the secret of the whole business is that a certain gentleman named Mr. Pearson, in charge of public works for this government in that locality, has a friend whom he wishes to put into this office, and since the reappointment of this gentleman to the position he has been very active in the locality in making all sorts of trouble not only for this postmistress but for other persons in positions whom he wishes to get rid of and annoy. I draw the attention of the minister to the fact and beg to inform him that the postmistress invites the fullest investigation.

Mr. PATERSON.

SUPREME AND EXCHEQUER COURTS ACTS AMENDMENT—ORDER DISCHARGED.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK moved :

The order for the third reading of Bill (No. 67) to amend the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act be discharged, and the Bill be referred back to the committee.

Motion agreed to.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 62) to amend the Railway Act, 1903—Mr. Emmerson—read the second time, and House went into Committee thereon.

On section 1,

Subsection 3 of section 44 of the Railway Act, 1903, is repealed and the following is substituted therefor :

3. An appeal shall lie from the board to the Supreme Court of Canada upon a question of jurisdiction, but such appeal shall not lie unless it is allowed by a judge of the said court upon application and notice to the parties and the board and hearing such of them as appear and desire to be heard ; the costs of such application shall be in the discretion of the judge.

An appeal shall also lie from the board to the said court upon any question which in the opinion of the board is a question of law, upon leave therefor having been first obtained from the board. The granting of such leave shall be in the discretion of the board.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). The clause in the present Act is as follows :

An appeal shall lie from the board to the Supreme Court of Canada upon a question of jurisdiction, but such appeal shall not lie unless the same is allowed by a judge of the said court upon application and hearing the parties and the board ; the costs of such application shall be in the discretion of the judge.

The remainder of the section is not changed. The only change is the substitution of the words ' and notice to the parties and the board and hearing such of them as appear and desire to be heard.' These words are substituted for the words ' and hearing the parties and the board.' This change is made because of doubt as to the jurisdiction of the judge in case the board were not represented. It was submitted by the commissioners as a desirable amendment.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I should think it would improve the wording of the section if you would insert the word ' upon ' before the word ' notice.'

Mr. EMMERSON. I have no objection.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 2,

Mr. EMMERSON. This section provides that the Board may accept evidence upon

affidavits or written affirmation in cases in which it seems to it proper to do so. It also provides who may administer oaths and what documents may be accepted as prima facie evidence.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The matters dealt with in this section are more particularly matters which might be provided for by rules made by the commissioners, if appropriate powers were given them. Is there nothing to that effect in the present Act ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think there is, but there seems to be a doubt as to the power of the board to accept evidence by affidavit even under regulation or according to prescribed rules. This amendment will remove any such doubt.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is this on the recommendation of the commissioners themselves ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. Is there any precedent for this or is it an entirely new provision ? It would be well to consider whether it is advisable to give power to the board to accept evidence upon affidavit in cases where objection is made by the other side. Suppose a railway company, for instance, should apply for leave to substitute an affidavit for oral evidence, will the board have absolute power to grant that application even against the objection of the other side, and without giving the other side the opportunity to cross-examine ?

Mr. EMMERSON. This wide power seems necessary in order to avoid expense to litigants. This is not for the purpose of permitting such evidence by affidavit in contentious matters although such power is given to the board, but the object is to enable the board to accept evidence by affidavit or declaration in ex parte applications and avoid expense to parties who consider themselves aggrieved and send in applications for redress. Supposing application came from the territories or British Columbia, this would enable the board to accept evidence in favour of such application by affidavit or declaration. The board, however, may order a hearing, if one be deemed desirable, and call upon the parties interested to show cause. This amendment is intended to facilitate and make more easy access to this court by the citizens of Canada. A farmer along the line, interested in crossings, may seek redress for a grievance by this easy and cheap method. Otherwise it would be necessary for him to bring witnesses to Ottawa and incur considerable expense. While the discretion given the board is a large one, I think that, considering the fact that this court is one of the highest in Canada, it may be safely left with it. Because the words here are, 'in cases in which it seems proper to it—that is the board to do so.' And naturally, as a judicial tribunal they will exercise that discretion with great care.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. So far as evidence of a general character, such as service of a notice, is concerned, of course, it would be very proper that it should be given upon affidavit,—it usually is in all such matters in court. But, so far as evidence in regard to the merits of a case is concerned, evidence which one might liken to that given upon the trial of an action in court, it seems to me a little doubtful that such evidence should be given by affidavit without giving to the other side the opportunity of cross examination. It is a pretty general rule which should govern the courts——

Mr. EMMERSON. If my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) will allow me—I neglected to explain one point. My hon. friend has asked whether this was legislation that had been enacted elsewhere or whether it was original ? So far as I know, it is original with the chairman of the commission. And the chairman states that his experience as chairman of that board has led him to make this suggestion in the interest of speedy dealing with oftentimes, trivial matters, and the minimizing of the costs of applications.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Of course, these are powers conferred upon the commission, and we must assume, I suppose, that they will be exercised with very great discretion. But I was about to observe that giving evidence upon affidavit without opportunity for cross-examination—evidence respecting merits of an application—would be very undesirable—

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But should not assume however that the commission——

Mr. EMMERSON. The board will hardly——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Will hardly exercise its powers in that way.

Mr. LENNOX. It was asked a few moments ago about the general powers of the board to make rules. Section 23 and others provide for jurisdiction and general powers, section 26 and others for practice and procedure. Very probably all the powers it would be advisable to give the commission would be found capable of being worked out under these.

Mr. EMMERSON. Section 25 provides for orders and regulations.

Mr. LENNOX. I would pointedly call the attention of the minister to the fact that the Board exercises very great powers, and its findings have a very decisive effect, if we may use that expression. Under section 42, subsection 3, it is provided that 'The finding or determination of the board upon any question of a fact within its juris-

diction shall be binding and conclusive on all courts.'

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Section 44 gives unlimited appeal.

Mr. LENNOX. The section says, 'Subject to the provisions of this section, every decision or order of the Board shall be final.' We have to keep these sections in view in determining whether these——

Mr. EMMERSON. There are large powers of appeal under this section 44.

Mr. LENNOX. I was coming to that. We have to decide here whether it is wise to confer upon the board the right to deal with the production of evidence in the way contemplated,—by affidavit, and, so far as I know, though I may not be right in that, without the right of cross-examination upon these affidavits which is allowed upon ordinary proceedings in the courts. This, I submit, is a rather dangerous provision. Section 44 provides that subject to certain provisions, the decision of the board shall be 'binding and conclusive on all courts,' and it then goes on to provide under.

An appeal shall also lie from the board to such court upon any question which in the opinion of the board is a question of law, upon leave therefor having been first obtained from the board. The granting of such leave shall be in the discretion of the board.

Therefore even in a proposed appeal upon a question of law three different conditions confront you. In the first place, the board must decide that, in their opinion the question is one of law; then, only upon application to the board can you get leave to appeal; and in the third place, the granting of leave to appeal is wholly within the discretion of the board. It is altogether a matter for the government to consider and to consider carefully. Therefore, I again call the attention of the minister very distinctly to the point that this is an innovation of a very serious character. The minister points out that a resident in British Columbia may find it to his advantage to be allowed to put in an affidavit instead of bringing a witness to the sitting of the board here. But, I would remind him that it is expected that the board, will, from time to time, visit British Columbia. I believe that it will be found in actual practice that it will be the railway company that will produce the affidavit much more frequently than the individual. It is very easy to provide against undue expense by leaving the costs in the discretion of the board. If you give the board the right to direct an affidavit, subject to objection to be taken by the opposing party, and if you leave the question of costs in the discretion of the board, I think you will accomplish, probably, all that you can accomplish in the direction of giving each party a fair opportunity of getting a matter determined as inexpensively as possible, yet without running the risk, the very great risk that I think will be incurred by doing away with the ordinary safeguards provided in the production of affidavits.

Mr. EMMERSON. The provisions relating to this board generally are practically an innovation. It has been an experiment; there is no precisely similiar tribunal anywhere in America; even the Inter-state Commerce Commission is not on a par with this Railway Commission of Canada. It seems to me that in view of the experience that these commissioners have had in connection with the duties devolving upon them, their views should have very great weight with the members of this commission. I know that they have great weight with me. Their suggestions, unless very radical, unless they violate some principle of our jurisprudence——

Mr. HAGGART. Have the commission asked for this amendment?

Mr. EMMERSON. This is the request of the commission. And I have just said that I believe their suggestions should be followed as near as we can follow them, having regard to other principles governing our jurisprudence. Now, I do not think this power violates any principle of procedure followed in the other courts. This only leaves it discretionary. It is not a question as to who shall pay the costs, the question is to avoid unnecessary costs, I care not who is to pay them. The responsibility placed upon the board of determining whether it is proper to accept that written evidence, is a serious responsibility, and every time they have a question of this kind before them they will certainly hesitate before they accept such evidence. They will be guided, I assume, by the principles of justice and equity, having regard to the necessities of the case having regard to the circumstances and to the environments in connection with the grievance which may be sought to be remedied.

On section 3,

Section 91 of the said Act is repealed and the following is substituted therefor:

91. Dividends, at and after the rate of so much per share upon the several shares held by the shareholders in the stock of the company, may, from time to time, be declared and paid by the directors out of the net profits of the undertaking.

Mr. EMMERSON. This is to allow dividends to be declared by directors without the sanction of the shareholders being first obtained. The law has been different, but it has never been observed. Directors have been declaring dividends, for which they have never first asked the sanction of their shareholders. That is the uniform custom of the country.

Mr. FOSTER. Does that apply to all railway companies?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think that applies to all railway companies.

Mr. HAGGART. What do you mean by the words 'at and after?'

Mr. AYLESWORTH. That is a common legal expression.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is the expression of the Act as we have it now, consecrated by long usage.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I would ask the minister, in connection with this question of dividends, whether the Canadian Pacific Railway is making application this session for an increase of its capital, and whether he proposes to make any general legislation covering matters of that kind?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have seen in the newspapers that they are increasing their capital stock, that they have done so.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there more to come?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not know; I am not advised.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The minister knows that what they propose to do is to give stock at par to their shareholders instead of selling that stock at a premium and putting the premiums into the treasury of the company, as I believe they ought to do in the public interest.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am not the guardian of their conscience.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. But you are the guardians of the rights of the public, and if there is no provision in the Railway Act to secure that protection to the public then there ought to be a protection of that kind. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company, like all other great corporations enjoying public franchises, have a duty to the public, because the tax they take from the public is put upon the traffic that passes over the road, and it certainly follows that if stock is sold to shareholders at par when it could be sold at a premium, and the premiums put into the treasury of the company, the toll or tax probably would be less than it will be under the plan which it is proposed to follow. If that thing is done to-day, it is the duty of the Minister of Railways to see that an amendment is made to the Railway Act that will cover the case.

Mr. EMMERSON. Supposing a change as suggested by my hon. friend were made and they were compelled to sell, what would become of the premium ? It would go into the treasury of the company, and it is within the power of the company to divide that among their shareholders. This is not any violation of the principles which govern all corporations, and you would not apply to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company or any other company any principle different from that which governs general business transactions and corporations throughout the country.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. But does it not follow that if the company puts this money into its treasury then the Railway Commission would be justified in reducing freights, if the public ask for it? Certainly parliament would be justified then in doing what I asked them to do long ago, that is to make a maximum passenger rate. If the company has an overflowing treasury, as the Canadian Pacific Railway has to-day, and would have a still more overflowing treasury if it were allowed to put that premium in the treasury of the company, then parliament would be justified, and the commission would be justified, in reducing the rates of the company all along the line. Now, I ask the Prime Minister if it is the intention of his government to protect the people of this country in so important an issue as this. It will not do to allow the Canadian Pacific Railway or any other great corporation to give stock to shareholders for less than it will really bring in the market. That stock ought to be sold, the law ought to compel them to sell it and put that money into the treasury, and if the money is in the treasury, and the treasury is full to overflowing, then a case has been made out for a reduction of the freight and passenger rates. This proposition is of far-reaching importance, it comes home to the people of this country; it raises the question of a reduction of freight rates, and the regulation of companies in a most vital way. Therefore, it is a question worthy of attention and worthy of a declaration of policy on the part of the government.

Mr. EMMERSON. The line of argument followed by my hon. friend is certainly a very faulty one. The very fact that they would have the premiums in their treasury would be followed by the additional fact that their capitalization would be largely increased. For what purpose? In order to facilitate the operation of the road; in order to add to the betterments of the railway; in order to furnish the public with better facilities, both as to passenger and freight traffic —all this would be in the interest of the country, to the advantage of the patrons, and necessarily there would be a greater draft upon the earning power and less dividends to the shareholders. It seems to me it makes but little difference whether the shareholders are given the advantage of that stock at a fixed rate, a consequence which usually governs in relation to all corporations, or whether that stock is put on the market and sold at a premium and the premiums are paid into the treasury of the company for distribution among the share-

holders. Because the premiums do belong to the shareholders.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. To the public.

Mr. EMMERSON. To the shareholders. They have invested their capital and they are entitled to the accretion.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I dispute this doctrine of this twentieth century government, which is here to-day justifying the watering of capital stock in another way—it is nothing but stock watering. We know what other companies do. If a bank increases its capital stock the premium goes into the treasury of the bank. The Consumers Gas Company in Toronto are selling their stock at a premium, that premium goes into the treasury, and the consumers in Toronto find that there is a steady reduction in the price of gas taking place. I contend that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, by reason of its franchise and its contract with the public, is bound to husband its resources in every way that will lead to a reduction of rates. Now, the shareholders take all this money. They do not divide up a portion of it with the community or with the public. They are not doing justly by the public. They are benefiting themselves and they are keeping up the rates. The doctrine is maintained in this parliament and it has been maintained in other legislatures, that the legislature is not called upon to interfere with the watering of capital stock. Let me tell you how it works out in some prominent cases. In the city of Toronto there is the street railway franchise controlled by the Toronto Street Railway Company which has capital stock of $6,000,000. That was distributed among the promoters of the scheme gratis. It was given to the syndicate, they sold it to the public and the result is that now the first $1,000 that is earned every day by the street railway in Toronto goes to pay the interest on this $6,000,000 of watered stock, whereas that $1,000, instead of going to pay the interest on that watered stock, should go to the betterment of the road, to the improvement of the equipment and to giving the public a better service. But, the public get none of it and the shareholders get everything. Let me give you another instance. This big Electrical Development Company over at the Falls has been handled in the same way. The capital stock has been placed at $6,000,000 and it has been distributed among the promoters although they have paid for it not one cent. They are selling it to the public to-day at 60 and 70, and they are trying to get it up to par. In the latest statement of the Electrical Development Company this $6,000,000 is actually set down as having been expended on the works. It was not expended on the works. Now, in the official statement they say what the original franchise was worth and they say that this $6,000,000 was put into the work. They intend to ask the public to pay interest on this watered stock. The time has come when the watering of stock should not be encouraged. It should not be allowed to be issued by companies of this kind, but the General Act should compel them to stop watering their stock and it should provide that when an issue of new stock is made, where the stock is selling at a premium, the new issue should be sold at a premium and the proceeds should go into the treasury and be used as the basis of a reduction of the rates and tolls imposed upon the public. The hon. gentleman has not answered my argument, but he appears to justify this stock watering which is going on in all directions in this country. The greatest evil of to-day is this stock watering which is going on in connection with all kinds of public propositions and public franchises. I think that the time has come in dealing with a great corporation like the Canadian Pacific Railway to pass a law so that if they increase their capital stock they shall not give it as par if it will bring more in the market but they shall sell it at the highest price, place the money in the treasury and reduce the charges which they impose upon the public, or in other words, that they shall share the proceeds of the issue with the public. The public has put millions and millions into that company, has given them millions and millions acres of land, has given them great franchises, and now that the company have justified the original construction of the road the public are entitled to some of the benefit and the way in which the public can get that benefit is in a reduction of the rates.

Mr. EMMERSON. The use of the term 'watered stock' may tickle my hon. friend's ears but it certainly has no meaning with respect to the application which he has made. Any increase of the capital stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway can only be made under the authority of parliament, and it would only be, I would assume, for the purpose of expenditure in the improvement of the railway, and it could not be diverted from such use. Does my hon. friend wish that special legislation should be had in regard to the Canadian Pacific Railway? He has had that particular railway in his mind and he says that because of the increase of the capital stock and because of their action in this matter their profits would not be so increased that application could be made to the Board of Railway Commissioners in order to have their freight rates reduced. My hon. friend is surely aware of the fact that the freight rates on the Canadian Pacific Railway, over a great portion of their line, are not subject to the order and direction of the Railway Commission.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Will my hon. friend pardon me for a moment ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. EMMERSON. I want to finish. My hon. friend knows also that the fact that they are not so subject to the commission is due to legislation which, I think, my hon. friend supported when it was before parliament.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Will the hon. gentleman pardon me if I tell him that I have heard the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) say in this House that now the Canadian Pacific Railway freight rates are subject to the control of the commission, and that the special privileges they had enjoyed have been removed by negotiations of one kind and another.

Mr. EMMERSON. On the Crow's Nest ?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. No. Before this debate is over I may produce that statement and I think the hon. Minister of Justice will bear me out when I say that he has made that statement in this House. It all goes to show that the hon. gentleman is wrong and that the Canadian Pacific Railway and all railways should be compelled by a General Act to utilize their stock in such a way as to reduce the traffic burdens of the public. This is the first instance in which it has come up. Here is a railway which has had these great privileges, these great franchises, these great bonuses in money and lands given to them and now they are becoming wealthy. Their stock was all watered. We know that.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. At least the common stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway was handed out to the syndicate and they distributed it amongst their friends, they gave it away, some of it was sold for ten and fifteen cents on the dollar. To-day it is quoted at 176.

Mr. EMMERSON. 172.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The passenger and freight tolls of the Canadian Pacific Railway are so regulated as to pay interest on that 176 although the stock was originally given away for nothing. If this railway company now is allowed to continue to issue this stock at par to its shareholders who can sell it at 160 or 170 just as sure as the sun shines the traffic will have to pay interest on every dollar of that stock. The public should be protected by proper legislation being inserted in this Railway Act. We are dealing with dividends. The hon. gentleman has seen fit to deal with dividends, but now a condition has arisen under which he ought to deal with the issue of stock under the circumstances as they are presented here. I hope he will see some light before this debate is over and that he will find a way of dealing with this grievance.

On section 4,

Mr. EMMERSON. This amendment is proposed in order to give the minister power to approve of a portion of the route. In order to advance the construction of a railway it frequently becomes necessary for them to apply for the approval of the location map. They may not have all the data which the minister would require in determining as to whether the whole route should be approved or not, but it may be in the interest of the public in the interest of the company and in the interest of all concerned that a portion or a section of the whole route should be approved. This has frequently occurred in my day and I have always had doubts as to whether it was in the power of the Minister of Railways to approve of the route map unless he approved of the whole route covering the whole line as required by the charter.

Mr. HAGGART. The law formerly merely mentioned the objective points of a railway and left to the company the selection of the route ; the filing of the plans was a perfunctory affair and gave the minister no power to alter the location of the line. On account of some cases in British Columbia in which the railway companies had used their power for the purpose of building stations on their own property outside of a town, or, building up little rival towns to those already founded, the law was changed so as to prevent any such injustice as that. But the present Bill gives the minister very wide powers ; if a company is chartered to build from, say, Toronto to Ottawa, the minister can practically make the railway run where he pleases between these points. That is a power which should be vested, not in the executive but in parliament alone. It may be necessary to give the minister power to approve the location of a portion of a line so that construction may be proceeded with, but that is a different thing from giving the minister power to practically fix the location ; it may be at the instance of a political friend—of course I don't say this government would be influenced in that way——

Mr. EMMERSON. You shock me.

Mr. HAGGART. It may be that a political friend shall insist that the minister shall locate a line through his section of the country because in that section there live supporters of the government, as contrasted with another section where the residents are of a different political faith.

Mr. EMMERSON. If my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) has been at the railway committee the past two or three meetings——

Mr. HAGGART. I have never missed a meeting.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am not making any charge against my hon. friend, but occasionally he is not present.

Mr. HAGGART. I have always been there.

Mr. EMMERSON. At all events, this matter has been discussed in the railway committee and the object of this Bill is to ensure that the wishes of parliament shall be carried out with respect to the route. The two objective points between which a railroad is sanctioned to run are not to be the governing features; the people in the country between the termini are interested, and the minister has to see that justice is done them. The railway committee in its wisdom has required that there shall be a map exhibited, and that is done for the purpose of guiding the members of the committee to a conclusion as to in what particular parts of the country the line shall be authorized along a particular route. Section 122 is designed for the purpose of requiring the Minister of Railways to carry out the behest of parliament in that regard, and to see that the line is located where parliament intended it should be located. Cases have arisen in which the minister has approved of a route map, that subsequently the companies thought it in their interest to make application to the Railway Commission, which has large powers with respect to the location, to divert the railroad to the extent of twelve and fifteen miles from the route located by the minister. If under section 122 that can be done, then the section means absolutely nothing at all. If section 122 does not contemplate practically that before a railway company sends in a route map it shall make a location survey, then I cannot understand English. That section requires that the road shall be located on the route map, and on the minister lies the responsibility of determining whether or not that route should be followed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Suppose we concede all that; I understand that the point raised by my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) is this, that it is not the executive to whom that matter should be submitted but the Railway Commission, that it is a matter more properly to be determined by an independent tribunal than by the executive for the reasons he stated.

Mr. EMMERSON. The minister is called upon to carry out what parliament has determined with respect to that and I say that the map which is filed before the railway committee should be the governing map. This particular section which we are discussing has reference to the approval in sections and it becomes necessary in the public interest that such approval should be given or withheld with respect to sections. Perhaps the railway companies are not prepared to go on with the immediate construction of the entire road, but they do not wish to be delayed in the construction of a very necessary portion because, forsooth, they have not the data with respect to the whole route. It has therefore been deemed wise to make application for this power. I have always questioned the power of the Minister of Railways and Canals to take such a course.

Mr. BERGERON. What prompted my hon. friend to make this amendment? I was not here when the Railway Act of 1903 was passed, but it seems to me that parliament then divested itself of great privileges, even the government did so. It strikes me the government wants to take back all these privileges not for parliament but for itself. Has my hon. friend any case in view which makes it necessary to amend the Railway Act? Is there any special case, any reason for it?

Mr. EMMERSON. I know that on two or three occasions I have been asked to approve of sections, in one or two instances in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railway or one of its allied lines, and also with reference to other railways. They had not had the data to furnish the information I ask with respect to their whole route but they were in a position to give me all that was necessary with respect to that portion of the road which they wanted to construct immediately. I was called upon to approve of sections and I doubted the power of the Minister of Railways and Canals to do that. I think it is in the public interest that he should have that power, if he is to have any power at all with respect to these route maps.

Mr. HAGGART. The hon. gentleman is perfectly right that this clause is intended to give him the power of approval of portions of a route. His view of it was that unless the whole route was submitted and approval given to it, he could not proceed under the section. Under the old form the registration of the route was very particular; you filed in the minister's office the line over every block of land that the railroad passed. That was required by the law in connection with expropriation, and that information was also filed in the different registry offices of the counties through which the railways passed. This was as much for the purpose of expropriation and the unusual powers given under the Railway Act as anything else. What I object to is giving the general power to the minister to say to the railway company: You shall not build your line there but must build it 25 or 30 miles from there. What is the minister's answer to that? He says the minister must be trusted to carry out the views of parliament and the views of the committee. How does he know what the views of the committee are when the question perhaps never arose before the committee at all——

Mr. EMMERSON. He does every time.

Mr. HAGGART. Or the views of parliament in reference to the matter? Is it not better for the public to trust the railway company that the line will be built in the quickest, shortest and best route between the two objective points which parliament gives it, instead of giving the power to the minister to fix the route? Why would you not trust the railway company in building the road to adopt the best line between these two points rather than have them going to the minister who as I said before may be influenced by other considerations than what is best in the interests of the country in building a line of road between the two objective points? However, we are beating against the wind, because this is the law at present, that the minister should have that power, and the only question before the committee is whether the power is inoperative when applied to a short portion of the road and whether that power should be given to the minister to act in reference to these short portions as the general power is given in reference to the whole route. My argument is that the power given to the minister is one that the minister should not be able to exercise except for the purpose, as the minister stated when he first had that clause inserted in the Act of Parliament, of preventing injustice being done to particular localities on a line of road which parliament had already adopted. That is to say that no railway company should have the power of holding up a town or village and saying: If you do not give me a right of way, if you do not give me certain other powers, I will put your station a mile or two from your town and perhaps build up another town. Power should be given either to the Railway Commission or to the Minister of Railways and Canals to prevent such injustice, but to give a general power to the minister as to the location of the road I think is unnecessary and unwise and not in the interests of the government themselves.

Mr. EMMERSON. Let me explain briefly that my interpretation of this section is that the action of the minister is judicial, that it must be based upon evidence. I have so interpreted it and now the department has issued regulations governing the giving of notice to all parties interested in respect of application for the approval of route maps. All other railways and all towns interested must receive notice and in addition to that the applicant must furnish to the minister the original or a copy of the map which was used before the railway committee on the application for incorporation.

Mr. HAGGART. The minister is not limited even to that.

Mr. EMMERSON. He may require further information.

Mr. HAGGART. He may use his own judgment.

Mr. EMMERSON. But the responsibility is upon him of acting in a judicial capacity; it is not an act of administration. I may not have come up to my friend's high ideal——

Mr. HAGGART. That is a new view of the duties of the minister.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think it is the proper interpretation of the statute, and I hope I shall be able to live up to it, at least in so far as I am called upon to approve of route maps.

Mr. HAGGART. It is your successor I am after.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It seems to me that if the railway committee makes any determination with regard to the route that determination should be expressed in the statute. I do not see how the minister could carry out afterwards some undefined intention which the majority or certain members of the committee may have had in their minds but which is not set forth in the statute in any way. It seems to me that the minister's argument fails when he makes his position depend upon considerations of that kind. In the first instance, before this Railway Act was passed, it was necessary to have power of this kind vested either in the railway committee of the Privy Council or the Minister of Railways, and it did not matter much in which it was vested because the minister would practically have the control in either case. We have passed away from the stage in which the railway committee of the Privy Council exercised judicial powers with respect to applications of this kind and we have established a new system under which an independent tribunal is vested with even greater powers than those which formerly belonged to the railway committee of the Privy Council. But the power dealt with by this section is one which was reserved to the Minister of Railways out of the general powers to which I have alluded. It is true, as my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart) has pointed out, that we are not perhaps discussing the amendment so much as the general policy of parliament; but if we may be allowed to discuss that policy for the moment, was there any good reason why this exception should have been made? Would it not be more in accord with the general scope and intention of the Railway Act that a power of this character should be vested in the independent tribunal we have established than be exercised by the Minister of Railways? Let us assume that the minister is determining this matter purely from a judicial standpoint, yet his successor might put a different interpretation upon the statute. There are however no words in the statute which require that the determination of the minister should be

a judicial one so that his action may at any time be governed by political rather than judicial considerations. It seems to me that that is unwise for two reasons. In the first place, because political pressure should not be placed upon the minister as it may be under the present statute. He should not be subject to that pressure. And in the next place if there is to be a judicial determination for the purpose of protecting any town or village or other locality along the route, that protection could better be afforded by the independent tribunal we have established than by the gentleman who, for the time being, may be the Minister of Railways. That is the argument of my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart), and it seems to me a very cogent one and to concern itself with a very important question. I can see no reason why that protection, upon which the argument of the Minister of Railways is mainly based, could not be better afforded by the Railway Commission than by the Minister of Railways. It is perfectly obvious that the minister must be subject to pressure and to considerations which could not be brought to bear upon the Railway Commission, and it seems to me that every good object which could be subserved by the minister having the power given him by section 122 could be better subserved by transferring that power to the Railway Commission.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The criticism of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition is not directed so much to the amendment suggested as to the policy of the Act itself. Therefore it is important for us to understand what that policy is so that we may decide whether or not it is desirable to make the radical departure from it which is suggested by my hon. friend. I would be inclined to consider the power whica the Minister of Railways is called upon to exercise as political rather than judicial. Parliament incorporates a company and gives it the power to construct a railway say from A to E, subject to the obligation to pass through or near to the intervening points B, C and D. This section in effect puts upon the minister the obligation to see that the instructions of parliament with respect to the location of the line are carried out. That is an obligation placed upon the Minister of Railways who, in that respect, represents parliament. He has to see that the location indicated in the charter is followed. That is the policy of the Act. If my hon. friend will look at the very next section, he will realize that there are two distinct and separate functions performed by two distinct and separate bodies. The first is the political function performed by the Minister of Railways when called upon to control the general location of the line by approving what is called generally the route map. When once he has given his sanction to that map, then the matter passes from the political control of the minister to the judicial control of the commission. Thus the determination of the gradients and all the other things necessary to immediate construction of the line are under the control of the Railway Commission but the location of the line must first be approved by the minister. If you will look at section 122, you will see that what the minister is called upon to do it to see that the company prepares and submits to him in duplicate a map showing the general location of the proposed line of railway, the termini and the principal towns and places through which the railway is to pass. He has to see that this line from A to E, as indicated in the charter, passes through the intervening points also therein designated. Here is the clause:

> The company shall prepare a map showing the general location of the proposed line of the railway, the termini and the principal towns and places through which the railway is to pass, giving the names thereof, the railways, navigable streams and tide water, if any, to be crossed by the railway, and such as may be within a radius of thirty miles of the proposed railway, and, generally, the physical features of the country through which the railway is to be constructed, and shall give such further or other information as the minister may require.

The amendment now proposed is intended to meet a difficulty which has arisen by reason of the literal construction which may be placed upon this section 122. That section, as it now stands, requires that a map should be prepared in its entirety from the starting point of the railway to its terminus, and it is only after that route map is prepared for the whole line, that the minister has the right to give it his approval. The intention of the amendment is to authorize the minister to do that which the practical application of the Act has made it necessary for him to do. That is to say it authorizes him, without waiting for the complete location of the line from the beginning to the end, to take sections of it and approve of particular sections before the entire route map is completed. When the minister has done that, it is necessary for the railway company to comply with section 123.

Mr. BERGERON. The minister will see that by subsection three it can be changed again with the approval of the Minister of Railways.

Mr. HAGGART. That is the point, let the minister make that clear.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My contention is that in the first plan filed and approved by the minister the location is fixed in a way that the commission have no power to change except subject to ultimate control of the Governor in Council. They have power

to change the alignment gradients and so on. But the first plan filed and approved by the minister gives the sections and even the lots that are to be expropriated and used by the railway. So far as the route map is concerned, that map must state accurately what is known as the route of the railway, the general location.

Mr. HAGGART. The particular location—that is my argument.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) will permit me to say that it is not a matter of argument but of the reading of the statute. The statute says: 'no change or alteration on the general location of the line of the railway, as approved by the minister, shall be allowed, unless such change or alteration has been first approved by the minister.' That is, the general location of the line of railway is approved by the minister when he approves of the route map, and from that general location there may be no departure—that is no radical departure, such, for instance, as building a line to run east and west instead of north and south except as I mentioned a moment ago. The general location has to be determined by the minister as an act of policy, as a political act. But, when he has determined the general location, then all the details with respect to construction—the plans and book of reference—must be approved by the commissioners. They have the final say with respect to the construction of the road. There is no use amusing ourselves with discussion of issues that do not exist or making dissertations which merely create false impressions. There is no doubt that the position of my hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) is correct with regard to the control exercised over the route of a railway by the minister. A departure from our present system in that matter would involve a complete departure from a principle that we have hitherto upheld, that principle being that the location of the road is under the political control of the minister and the government must be responsible for it. With respect to the details of construction that is a matter under the control of the commissioners a matter with respect to which they exercise judicial control as against the political control exercised by the minister.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The position under the law as I understand it is this: A railway company is chartered with authority to construct a road from A to D, passing through B and C. It is quite clear that that cannot be altered by the minister, the Railway Commissioners or anybody else. But, between A and B, between B and C, and between C and D there is a certain latitude for the location of the road. The question is whether this should be determined as a political act by the minister or as a judicial act—or administrative act if you like to call it so—by the Board of Commissioners.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is the issue.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. So far as I am concerned, my attention has not been called to any objection to the amendment provided that it is wise to entrust this power to the minister. I would say that it is a proper thing to give him power to deal with the location, if it can be shown that it is properly a question of policy. But that is a point on which the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) has not convinced me. If there is any political question in the location of the line, it seems to me that it should be dealt with by parliament in the charter. As to any question of the location of the line between A and B or between B and C, or between C and D, I do not yet appreciate any reason, even after what the Minister of Justice has said, why such a question should be determined by the Minister of Railways rather than by the Board of Railway Commissioners. Parliament deals with the whole subject from the standpoint of parliament and the people when it issues its charter authorizing the construction of the road between the points named. Apart from that, would it not be the wise policy to leave to the determination of the Railway Commissioners, upon hearing of the parties interested, any questions that may be involved, rather than to determine them by the political act of the minister. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Emmerson) says that he does not deal with them as political questions—(of course, I am using the word 'political' in the higher sense—that is, the questions are questions of policy), he says he deals with them from a judicial standpoint.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) will pardon me. I deal with it as a question of policy in carrying out the wishes of parliament; but I hold that it should be dealt with by the Minister of Railways as a judicial act having great regard to the effects and all the circumstances. I do not care what it is called, whether 'political' or anything else.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understood from the minister (Mr. Emmerson) in the first instance, that he would deal with it very much in the same way as the Board of Railway Commissioners would deal with it, by hearing the parties and so reaching a determination.

Mr. EMMERSON. Having in view the intention of parliament.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That intention can be decided only by the statute. The hon. gentleman speaks of discussion before the committee of this House. It seems to me it would be wise in determining what is the intention of parliament, to go to the sta-

tute itself. You can hardly go back to the committee for an interpretation of the statute when the committee has not expressed its determination in the statute itself. Then, it simply comes down to what we said a moment ago—if parliament has dealt with the question of policy, as a political act, then, should not the location of the line be left to be determined by the Railway Commissioners apart from any influences which will make themselves felt whether my hon. friend the Minister of Railways (Mr. Emmerson) or any other man happens to be in office.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I appreciate thoroughly the position taken by the leader of the opposition, but I would repeat in a few words the view I hold. I would say that, parliament having authorized a corporation to construct a railway from A to D, passing through B and C, parliament has in itself power to see to it that the purpose it has declared shall be carried into effect. Parliamentary control over the location is exercised by the minister who is here in parliament to defend his actions. That is the view I take—that the minister exercises political control in the sense that he acts as the man responsible to parliament for the execution of the will of parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. But only up to a certain point ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Up to the point covered by the charter.

Mr. FOSTER. But I understand the contention of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Emmerson) to be that he is to have power to deflect the railway, between the points named by parliament, according as he may deem best. The discussion is a very interesting one. Parliament authorizes the construction of a road from A to D, touching at certain intermediate points. It seems to me that nothing should interfere with that location, and nothing should govern but the best interest of the road—considerations of grades, curves and so on, the object being simply to build the most serviceable road. But the Minister of Railways will see that a question may arise as to the location, and that it may be urged upon him that the line should go through a certain village situated between the termini named in the charter.

The commissioners and the railroad company generally seem to be disposed to put it through that village. Now I am to take up the question as to whether it is to be deflected so far as to pass through that village. Well, what happens ? We get right into what we ought to keep out of, that is, the machinations and influences of party, political considerations. A very influential supporter of the government lives in the village, and he says, I want that to pass through my village. He is backed up by every man jack in the village, because they want it to go through. The railroad company and the commissioners may have their views. They may say: That does not make the best kind of road, we would like it to go through every man's farm yard if it were possible, but it is not ; and if you deflect it to that village you have a poorer road than you would have otherwise. But the minister says : I will decide that point. Parliament did not decide it, the commission has not decided it, and the minister says, I will decide it—and not entirely from a judicial point of view, because he is the minister, he is the man who is put there by votes, who stays there by votes, and he is always amenable, and will be as long as he is a minister, to the influences that can be brought to bear upon him, and he deflects that road you may say in that instance, or in any instance, according to his view of what is best. Well, he says what is best for the road, but how often it happens that what is best for the road gets a little twist into what is best for the party. Even although the right hon. gentleman shakes his head, that may sometimes happen.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Has not parliament decided that all these things are to be regulated by the minister ? The Act provides that the location map shall contain the information necessary to enable the minister actually to decide what is best under the circumstances with respect to the location as authorized by parliament. The Act says positively :

> The company shall prepare a map, and shall submit information necesary to show the physical features of the country through which the railway is to be constructed, and shall give such further or other information as the minister may require.

Showing that parliament wished that the minister should exercise control, subject, of course, to his obligation to answer to parliament for the exercise of that jurisdiction.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is no doubt parliament did that, but we are discussing whether parliament was wise.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Let us take a case that frequently happens. An Act of incorporation determines the route, and decides that the railway shall 'as far as practicable' go to certain points. That is not unusual, it is not unusual for those words to be found in the charter 'so far as may be practicable.' Surely the minister has some discretion to exercise, he must take into account the physical conditions so as to see whether it is practicable to locate the line as proposed and he exercises this jurisdiction under a mandate of parliament, subject to the obligation that he shall answer to parliament for it. That is the law as we have it, and have had it, I think for years. I cannot speak with reference to the law

previous to 1903, but my recollection is that these powers were exercised by the minister previous to the institution of the Railway Commission.

Mr. HAGGART. No. Under the Act as interpreted at that time, although the minister had the general approval of the location, it was held by the Minister of Justice that he had not the right of altering the location in any way.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition has said that nothing can occur before the committee that will in any way affect the route as clearly defined in the Act of incorporation. That may be true in a general sense. But circumstances may occur before that committee which will throw light on the meaning of the words used in that Act of incorporation. For instance, we had before the railway committee a few days ago an application for the incorporation of a railway starting at some point, I forget where, but ending at or near a certain point in the county of Bruce. The promoter of the Bill was catechised with respect to that route. The general route of that railway was clearly defined in large red lines passing in a general direction with relation to certain intermediate towns between the termini. Now it seems to me that the minister, in reaching a conclusion under section 122, might very properly have regard to that map, because that map had an influence on the members of the committee in determining their action in approving that Act. The minister should decide having regard to all this information which parliament has, in its wisdom, seen fit to require shall be furnished out. The decision may be political. I do not take exception to what the Minister of Justice has said—it may be political in this sense, that the Minister of Railways and Canals is giving an interpretation to the intention of parliament as well as to all the circumstances surrounding the case. But in so doing I hold that the proper meaning and interpretation of that section 122 is that he shall, in a judicial sense, have regard to the topography of the country, and to the intention as to the route which the road shall follow, and the towns through which it is to pass when he gives judgment thereon. There must be in addition to that map a statement showing and explaining the localities through which that railway will pass. Now it is true that you could not keep them down to the exact spot where they located the line on this map which is presented to the railway committee. But you must have regard to the surveys, to the topography of the country. Even though the Act says that it shall go through a certain town, if, from an engineering standpoint, that is impracticable, or impossible, I say the Minister of Railways and Canals is empowered to take that fact into consideration, together with all the other facts, in giving or withholding his approval.

Mr. BERGERON. But would the board give permission to build in a place which is impracticable ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It seldom comes to that. After the matter has passed through the hands of the Minister of Railways then questions as to gradients, as to curves, as to limitations or deviations, are matters for consideration by the Board of Railway Commissioners, as I understand the Act.

Mr. FOSTER. I am getting more mystified all the time. When the Minister of Justice was speaking I thought I got hold of the thread of the argument, but after I listened to the Minister of Railways and Canals I found myself back again where I started from. May be it is because of my dullness.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is probable.

Mr. FOSTER. But I am bound to maintain it is because of the divergence between the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Railways and Canals.

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not see that we differ so widely.

Mr. FOSTER. The Minister of Justice cited that particular Act where a road was to go so and so 'as far as practicable,' pass through certain points 'so far as practicable.' Now, suppose that practicability meant—I got that from his argument as well—whether a possible route could be obtained for a road by passing through or near, and how far from and how near to, these points. Well, now if that is it which of the two is the better authority to decide on what we might call the engineering difficulties, problems of the construction of the road. We have taken it out of the minister's hands and we have called in three experts. We make it their business, in so far as grades, curvatures and engineering difficulties are concerned to decide. Whatever is to deflect the road or put it in a certain direction goes to the judgment of the experts. They are there for that purpose, but the minister says that this is just what he wants to control and to give his judgment about, and if there are engineering difficulties so that the railway cannot go where it was said it ought to touch at he is to be the judge of those. If we had that expert commission appointed at all it was to take up all questions which refer to the construction of the road in point of engineering difficulties, as to what is the best route for it as regards curves, grades and everything of that kind. Where will the Minister of Railways be if he takes that upon himself and says: I have to go back even further than that; I have to go back to what was said in the railway committee ; I have to have respect to certain maps which may have been there for a fleeting moment and away again, that some members may have studied and may have given their votes in

committee upon; I have to remember, to go back to and rake all that up and give my decision. Why, the minister is taking upon himself the location of the road between the points where parliament says it actually shall pass; he is taking that whole matter together with all kinds of engineering considerations into his own hands and he is giving the judgment. Everybody knows that when the minister arrogates this power to himself, when he has the right, for any considerations of the kind which may approve themselves to him, to deflect and change the road between the points that have been laid down actually in the charter, it becomes either a change from engineering considerations or a change from party and political considerations. If it is a change for the former reasons experts are the men who ought to be the judges and who are the best judges. If it is merely a change for party considerations ought the minister to ask that that power be thrust upon him and ought we in view of the fact that we have, by the creation of a commission, taken this matter as far as possible from the region of party politics, to put it back there again?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This whole question was threshed out three years ago when the railway laws were consolidated and when the Railway Commission was established. The considerations which are now before the committee were looked into and on that occasion by the very statute which created the Railway Commission the exercise of this power which is now under consideration was left in the hands of the Minister of Railways and Canals and not entrusted to the commission. We did that for reasons to which I will refer at a later period. The object of the legislation which is now before the House is not to change the intent of parliament as it was then expressed and put into the statute, but to improve the law. The law which was passed in 1903 provided that when parliament had decided to authorize the construction of a railway from a certain point to another point, or from A to D, passing through B and C, the location should not be left altogether to the company which seeks to build the road, but that there should be an authority to determine where the line should be located. Now parliament at that time thought that the approval of the location should be left in the hands of the minister. To-day the minister says that in the carrying out of the power which has been left in my hands I find that it would be more convenient if I were authorized to approve of a partial location instead of the whole location and I ask that the Act be so modified. The intent of parliament, as expressed in 1903, was to authorize the minister to approve of the location of the road. To this there seems to be an objection taken by my hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart), who has given a great deal of attention to railway matters and who says there is no necessity for any such legislation at all. He says that the location of the line should be left altogether to the company, that the company will select the best route in its own interest. So far so good; there is nothing to say against that and if we had to consider only in the location of the road the interest of the company and nothing else the argument of my hon. friend would be conclusive. It would be in the interest of the company to elect the best route. We might rest satisfied that under all circumstances it would select the best route according to its own interests. But, it is stated and rightly stated that in matters of this kind there has not only to be considered the interest of the company, but the interest of the public as well, and it is because the public have an interest in this matter that the right of supervision has been given to the minister. As I understand my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) and my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) they say it is quite proper that there should be the power of supervision of the location of the line and that the company should not be left to make its own location, but that the location should be supervised by somebody. My hon. friends contended that the supervision should not be left in the hands of the minister, but that it should be placed in the hands of the Railway Commission. Therefore, they contend that we should depart altogether from the policy which was adopted three years ago of placing the supervision in the hands of the minister by putting it in the hands of the commission which was created in 1903. When the law was passed in that year it was not authorized to exercise that supervision. I do not think that there is much difference one way or the other. There may be a good many reasons advanced one way or the other. My hon. friends have said, and said truly, that political considerations might weigh with the minister in the exercise of this power and perhaps that is the very reason why the exercise of this power has been placed in the hands of the minister rather than in the hands of the Railway Commission. If the power of supervision is placed in the hands of the Railway Commissioners there is practically no appeal from their decision. The commissioners will give drastic reasons for approving or not approving of the location. They may deflect the line from the proposed location or approve it as it is, but if the power is placed in the hands of the minister then there is behind the minister the powerful lever of public opinion. There is also the powerful lever that he is responsible to parliament for any decision that he gives; he is liable to censure and he must give reasons which will satisfy parliament. You might take a case in point that happens

very frequently. Here is a line of railway to be built. It has to cross a river. The engineers of the company place the crossing at a certain point. It may be within a mile or half a mile or within a very short distance of a rising village or town. Immediately an appeal is made to the minister, very properly, by the people of the town who think the line ought to pass through their town. Every one will agree that if the engineering conditions are such that the river may be crossed just as cheaply, just as easily and just as effectively by passing through the town as by passing a mile or two miles from the town the company should be compelled to pass through the town or through the centre of population.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. And put a station there.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. And put a station there. But, it may be that there are engineering difficulties in the way. The company will say it would be to our interest to place the crossing of the river at another point for this reason which we present to the minister. It will cost so much more, it will burden the road so much more and the minister has to determine what they should do and what they should not do. The minister having behind him the fear of parliament which is always present, and the weight of public opinion; he can be trusted to give a proper judgment on judicial lines, so far as judicial circumstances can apply in a matter of this kind. Would there be any greater guarantee if the matter were left in the hands of the Commission? My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) says that all kinds of political pressure would be brought to bear on the minister; that is very true. But the minister has to deal fairly between the public and the railway company, and he must consider his liability to censure if he does wrong. I believe this is one of the powers of the minister which he would rather be rid of, because it is always difficult in such circumstances to give an opinion. The very fact that this power has been vested in the minister compels him to accept the responsibility, and I think myself that the fear of the censure of parliament is the best guarantee that the public can have. If it is thought advisable that this power should be vested in the Board of Railway Commissioners I do not know that I would have much objection to it. But, when parliament three years ago passed this law, it came to the conclusion unanimously and uninfluenced by the government, that this power should rest with the minister and not with the commission and so far as I know there has been no cause to regret that decision. If it be admitted that the principle is a good one then it must be recognized that the amendment proposed by the minister is necessary. If I understand the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) he says that there should be no revision at all on the power of the railway company to locate its line as it thought best. I understood him to say that the company should be left to carry out the intention of parliament without revision by the Board of Railway Commissioners or the Minister of Railways.

Mr. HAGGART. If that power is necessary at all it should not be a political power; it should be vested in the Railway Commission.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The railways are built largely for the benefit of those who live between its terminals and, while the terminals are easy to locate, the people living in the intermediate territory have interests upon which they should be heard. These may be local interests, but they certainly are interests which are well worth considering. I believe that the amendment is in the direction of providing that the people living between the terminals shall have an opportunity to come to the government and give their reasons why a line should be deflected, and if it is in the public interest to have that line deflected then there should be some authority to which the people can appeal. I believe the proposal is a fair one and that the decision should rest with the minister who is responsible for the administration of the Railway Department. We have not yet departed from the doctrine of ministerial responsibility in this country, and I have no objection to the minister being held responsible in a matter of this kind.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The right hon. gentleman has suggested that the Minister of Railways, in a matter of this kind, would be influenced by public opinion to a greater extent than the Board of Railway Commissioners would be. If he should carry that argument to its legitimate conclusion, then he should abolish the Railway Commission, and all questions with regard to tariffs, and railway crossings, and so on, would be determined by the minister instead of the commission. The proposal of the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) is not one which departs from the general policy of the Railway Act, 1903. The provision reserving this power to the minister seems to have been an exception to the general policy of that legislation, and what my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart) suggests is that this exception should not be continued. In every respect mentioned by the Prime Minister, the public interest would be as effectually guarded by leaving this question to be determined by the Board of Railway Commissioners instead of the Minister of Railways. The Minister of Railways tells us that you must have regard to the railway map exhibited to the parliamentary committee, but if the committee desires that any special regard should be paid to the intermediate

locations indicated upon that map, then these intermediate locations should be set out in the Bill. If you do not insert them in the Bill, then the minister's memory would have to be refreshed by the production of the maps and the stenographic notes of the discussion before the railway committee, and these can be referred to just as well by the Railway Commissioners as by the minister.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. When the Railway Commission was established this particular power was reserved to the minister and not given to the commission.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Certainly.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The commission was given many powers which are more judicial than the location of a line. For my part I see no great difference, and I am sure the Minister of Railways would not be heart broken if that power were taken from him and placed with the commission, he would be saved a great deal of worry and a great deal of anxiety. But the question is as to whether it is wise for parliament to depart from the policy it adopted in 1903 with regard to this matter. Suppose for instance a railway is to be brought to the neighbourhood of a growing town and there are reasons for its location at one particular place or another; decision has to be given as between the balance of advantage to the public and to the railway company, and the question is whether it would be better to have such a matter decided by the Railway Commission or decided as at present by the minister. That is a question as to which for my part I can only say I have no great preference one way or the other, but I can see a great deal of force in the argument that in a matter of this kind the public perhaps, and the company will have a better adjudication, a better chance of having justice done to all parties if this matter is adjusted by the minister upon his responsibility to parliament.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. I may point out to the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) a number of instances of how it works out. The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) knows the pressure that was brought to force the Canadian Northern to cross at the old town of Battleford. Was that in the interests of the public or of persons owning land in Battleford? Then Lloydminister was held back for several years owing to the action of the Minister of the Interior in seeking to place the town in a certain position. Then there is the town of Dauphin. When Dauphin was started a number of gentlemen owning farms each wished to have the town site on his property and the result was that there were two towns created some distance from one another. They got people to go in guaranteeing them an interest in the town. The natural site for the town was where the town of Dauphin now stands. These people had squatted on the land about two or three miles on each side of it. If the matter had been left to the minister in some instances I am free to say I do not think justice would have been done to the same extent as it would be if it were left to the Railway Commission. The First Minister knows about the Battleford case?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is a great credit to us; I am glad to say we did not yield to the temptation.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. No, because the cost was too great.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Just so.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Of course it must not be overlooked that if in the exercise of the discretion or the control which is vested in the Minister of Railways he does an injustice to a railway company there is an appeal to the Board of Railway Commissioners, not an appeal by name but an appeal in effect. Section 130 of the Railway Act provides:

> If any deviation, change or alteration is required by the company to be made in a railway, or any portion thereof, as already constructed, or as merely located and sanctioned.——
>
> The plan, profile, &c.,—
>
> —shall, in like manner as provided in section 123, be submitted, for the approval of, and may be sanctioned by the Board; and the same when so sanctioned——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That seems very anomalous.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It may be anomalous but it is there.

Mr. FOSTER. An appeal from the creator to the creature.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. And what is the limitation on the Board of Commissioners? The limitation is contained in the last paragraph of section 130 which provides that they shall not have the right to authorize a change with respect to the termini only; in all other respects their power is absolute always subject to appeal.

Mr. LENNOX. Is that limited by the new section five in substitution for section 123 which provides that there shall be no deviation by the board of more than a mile from that location by the minister?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That is a limitation to be considered hereafter. I am now talking of the limitations we have as a result of the law we are to change, because we are now discussing the merits of the existing Act, not of the amendments proposed to that Act. We are dealing with the section of the Act which vests in the minister power with respect to the location of the road and with

the Board of Commissioners the final location of the road, carrying out the original distinction which existed in the Railway Act previous to 1903, because, as I said—and I have verified the accuracy of my statements since—the old Act provided that the minister should determine the location of the road but that the Railway Committee of the Privy Council should finally settle the location so that we have carried on from the old Act into the new one that distinction which existed with respect to the relative or respective powers of the minister and the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. To-day the minister continues on in the enjoyment of those powers which he has had under the Railway Act for years and years past, and the control exercised by the old Railway Committee of the Privy Council is vested in the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I must confess that I was not aware that that anomaly existed in the Act; I should think it ought to be corrected.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Let us correct one thing at a time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It bears out the argument of the hon. member for South Lanark, to a certain extent because it enacts that the Board of Railway Commissioners in the end may override the minister. I do not think that is very good legislation after all, because the argument has been made this afternoon, over and over again, that this is a proper power to be vested in the minister because of his responsibility to parliament. But after he has made his determination and incurred that responsibility to parliament, then it appears that by section 130 he can be overruled, his political responsibility can be reduced to zero because he can point to the overruling determination of the Board of Railway Commissionners. They in the end are the final judges and it seems to me they should be the judges in the first instance, and we should not have a minister of the Crown placed in the position of incurring a certain responsibility to parliament and the country and then having his judgment overridden by the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It must not be overlooked that the circle goes around, and any action of the board on such an appeal is subject to the Governor in Council. If you take the sections altogether, not take them one or two at a time, it works out all right.

Mr. HAGGART. The Minister of Justice puts an entirely different interpretation on the law to what I do and of course he must be correct. What is the first thing the company does ? It furnishes these plans, profiles, &c., and

If any deviation, change or alteration is required by the company to be made in the railway, or any portion thereof, as already constructed, or as merely located and sanctioned,——

The company can appeal to the board.

—as aforesaid, a plan, profile and book of reference of the portion of such railway proposed to be changed,——

It is not the whole plan as approved of by the minister but any portion of it as constructed or if there is a mistake in the location of the plan the company itself may appeal to the Board. But as to the other aspect of it, which the right hon. the leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has spoken of, and has said it is best it should be left in the hands of the Minister of Railways, let me give a practical illustration. There is an application this session to shorten the Canadian Pacific Railway line from Toronto to Ottawa. The railway company applied for leave to shorten the line from Carleton Place to Sharbot Lake. The hon. member for North Lanark says : Oh, you are going to shorten the distance between the two points; it will make it shorter to go by the village of Lanark. It may cost the company four times the amount to do it, but the company before getting the road located from Sharbot Lake to Carleton Place go to the Minister of Railways for approval of the location of that route. The company wish to build another line, the cheapest, shortest and best line in the interest of the public, making their connection at Carleton Place.

But my hon. friend says, no, you will better serve my political interests by building the line through Lanark and you must do that even though it makes your line four miles longer. The minister will force the company to all that extra expense but the company will have the satisfaction of knowing that he is responsible to parliament. I do not think that would be much consolation to it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What would my hon. friend do under such circumstances ?

Mr. HAGGART. I would do just the reverse. I would say to the railway company : build your line in the shortest and best way for the purpose of accommodating the public between Toronto and Ottawa, select the route that you like; and the company will be sure to construct its road in the cheapest, the best, the shortest and most expeditious way. You will, however, prevent it from doing that by this legislation. You will say to it : Before you can adopt the shortest and best line for the purpose of making the desired connection, you must have the approval—the political approval—of the Minister of Railways. And the Minister of Railways will say to the company : It is indispensable to my hon. friend from North Lanark, that your railway should go through his section of the coun-

try and we are giving you a subsidy for that purpose. It is true that will make your line four or five miles longer and it will not be the best line in the public interest but what does that matter compared with the importance of giving political assistance to our friend and supporter.

At six o'clock Committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. LENNOX. When we rose at six o'clock, I was about to suggest to the minister (Mr. Emmerson) that, even admitting that the proper principle is enunciated in section 122, there are several matters that could very well be further considered by him. Especially is this the case now that section 122 is being amended, and in view of our experience in the railway committee of this House. For instance there is the question of a map, to be submitted by the railway company. A map is produced for the railway committee. I suppose it would be useless to provide that that map should be made to a scale, because the railway company, in most cases, cannot have the information on which to base such a map. But more and more, the railway committee are endeavouring to define by local intervening points, and not merely by termini, the route of each railway that is chartered. But, when the committee have done the best they can do, there may be, on long stretches of railway, distances of 500 miles between defined points, and within that distance the railway company may deflect the line very considerably. The policy of section 122 is quite manifest. The subsection of section 4 which is now before us provides that 'before approving such map and location the minister, may, subject to the Special Act, make such changes and alteration therein as he may deem expedient.' And further on, 'and no change or alteration from the general location of the line of railway, as approved by the minister, shall be allowed, unless such change or alteration has been first approved by the minister.' This shows that the minister can, and that it is intended by the section that he may, deflect the line from the general location as approved by parliament at the time of the passing of the charter. Now, I think it impossible to deal properly with section 122 without referring to section 123, which also it is proposed to amend. I think we should aim at getting a provision in this Act to compel a railway company seeking incorporation to define specially what they propose to do and to be clearly bound to do only what is authorized by parliament. Either there ought to be a provision in this Bill, or it ought to be made a condition by the railway committee of this House that the map produced before the committee shall not leave the custody of the Minister of Railways and Canals. For it is impossible that we can be sure that the intention of parliament is carried out, in fact we cannot know that the minister has the means of knowing whether it is carried out or not, unless such a condition is observed.

There are one or two other points to which I may refer, especially as I intend to ask the minister to allow this matter to stand over, considering the importance of the points involved and considering also the fact that there are but few of the members who are interested in this matter present in the House this evening. I think, as this section 122 provides that 'the company shall prepare a map showing the general location of the proposed line of railway, the termini, and the principal towns and places through which the railway is to pass,' and so on, that there might well be a provision that the minister may alter the location only in detail. Of course, I do not give the form of words that I would suggest, but the idea, as the minister will understand, is to provide that the Minister of Railways and Canals shall not have power practically to build a new line, but that, in the railway committee and in this House we may feel assured that we know something of the general trend of the line from end to end. In the amendment of section 122 here proposed certain words of the section are omitted. The enactment seems to be the same as the original section down to the word 'board' in the seventh line. After that, special provision is made for the location of a portion of the line. As I understand this provision, it seems reasonable and I think, will be in the interest of the public as well as of the railway company. After the word 'board' the original section proceeds: 'And no change or alteration from the general location of the line of the railway, as approved by the minister, shall be allowed, unless such change or alteration has been first approved by the minister.' These words are not in the section now proposed by the minister.

Mr. EMMERSON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) will find that in the following section.

Mr. LENNOX. I do find something similar in the following section; I do not know whether it covers the same ground or not. But I would call attention to the fact that subsection 4 of the original Act would require a verbal alteration, perhaps. It says: 'The foregoing provisions of this section shall only apply to the main line and to branch lines over six miles in length.' Branch lines over six miles in length, I suppose, are included under the provision with regard to branches up to thirty miles in length, which require an order in council.

Mr. EMMERSON. We do not require even an order in council for branches under six miles in length.

Mr. LENNOX. I have not made myself clear. I take it that the 'foregoing provisions' referred to would apply to the thirty-mile branches that may be constructed under the provisions of an order in council. I do not apprehend that the minister would think that the special provisions which he introduces as to locating a portion of the line would be necessary to apply to a thirty-mile stretch. Therefore, I think it requires a verbal alteration. That is a matter that can be considered. It is mainly because of the importance of this section and the smallness of the attendence in the House this evening that I would ask the minister to allow this section to stand over.

Mr. EMMERSON. A special committee of this House now has under consideration certain amendments to the Railway Act referring to the subject of telephones. On the committee the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) as he knows, is a member. I do not understand the hon. gentleman to disagree with the principle involved in the sections now under discussion here, and the details that he suggests should well be considered by the special committee having the other sections in charge.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not wish to take upon myself responsibility for that. I do not know whether this should go to the committee. Certain members who are not here should have an opportunity of considering it.

Mr. HAGGART. Just mention the amendments.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not considered them. I have a number in my mind; they are coming in from day to day; there was one sent in recently from the Manufacturer's Association, and they come from other bodies. Those might be considered when I have gone through them and am in a position to place them before the House. They might be referred to this special committee which has to deal with amendments to the Railway Act.

Mr. LENNOX. I presume the minister would have no objection to furnishing a copy of the proposed amendments to the leader of the opposition and some others ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I certainly will. I think we might as well pass section 4 and the following sections, and then take up the other matters to which the member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) has referred.

Mr. LENNOX. If we passed these sections we could not refer them to the committee. I submit there should be some alterations in this section, even if we admit the principle of it. I would not like it to pass in the absence of the leader of the opposition.

Mr. EMMERSON. As I understand the suggestions of my hon. friend, they would in themselves amount to substantive amendments, they would not be incorporated in this section. The provision with respect to the route map being left to the Department of Railways and Canals is a provision covered by section 122 as it now stands. That provides that the minister may require such further information as in his judgment he thinks necessary. The regulations issued by the department and which have been distributed among the railway companies, require that all applications for approval of a route map should furnish the original map, or copies thereof, that was used before the Railway Commission on application for incorporation. That is a requirement now of the department on the hearing as to the approval of route map. The regulations further require that all parties and interests should have notice of the day of hearing and present their objections if they have any. If there are no objections, and in the judgment of the minister the route seems to comply with the special Act of incorporation giving powers to construct, the route map is approved.

Mr. LENNOX. As I understand the concluding part of section 122 concerning such further information as the minister requires, it does not refer to the beginning of proceedings in the railway committee, it refers to such further information as the minister should require when the route map comes to be placed before him, which is subsequent to the passing or granting of the charter of incorporation. There is no provision in the Act that I have been able to find, that requires that the map which goes before the railway committee should be retained in the custody of the department. That is an essential point, and was so considered by a great majority of the members of the railway committee. There ought to be a provision of that kind. Heretofore, in many important cases, we have gone through the sections generally, and those that were not quite satisfactory we have allowed to stand for further consideration; and this is about as important a matter as any we could have. I ask the minister to allow this matter to stand. There are some members on both sides of the House who are necessarily absent to-night.

Mr. EMMERSON. All right. Of course there is this to be said, that the map that is posted up in the railway committee on the application for a charter is not under the control of the department now in any way, I presume it would be under the control of the committee. But I claim that the Minister of Railways has a right, under section 122, long afterwards to require the applicant for approval of a route map to furnish the map which the committee used, or copies of it, as necessary information which the department requires.

Mr. LENNOX. Then the minister has a right to say: You must bring the map you had there so that I can compare it. Because without it we have no means of being sure that when they bring what purports to be a copy, it is a copy, and they could not expect the minister to be able to detect the differences in a case of that kind. What I want, and what I understand the committee wants, is a guarantee that that map should be in the department, and that therefore he will be sure to have the evidence as to what took place in the committee.

Mr. EMMERSON. Sections 4 and 5 may stand.

Mr. HAGGART. Do I understand the minister to say that when a route map is furnished by a railway company, before any changes are made in that map, notice in some manner should be given to the public, and that the public may have a right to give evidence before the minister, and that inquiry will be made before any changes are made in the route map?

Mr. EMMERSON. That is the practice of the department now, and has been for the last six months. All parties and interests, so far as they are known, have notice of the day of hearing and of the application.

On section 6,

Mr. EMMERSON. I want to make some verbal changes in that section. On the seventh line, after the word 'highway' I would like to add 'or for the substitution of one highway for another.' I would also like to strike out the words in the twelfth line 'in the opinion of the board' and the words 'proper and.' I would like also to add, after the words 'efficient construction' in the thirteenth line,' the word 'maintenance.' The section with these verbal amendments, will read as follows:

Should the company require, at any point on the railway, more ample space than it then possesses or may take under the preceding section, for the convenient accomodation of the public, or the traffic on its railway, or for protection against snow-drifts, or for the diversion of a highway, or for the substitution of one highway for another, or for the construction or taking of any works or measures ordered by the board under any of the prosions of this Act or the Special Act, or to secure the efficient construction, maintenance or operation of the railway, it may apply to the board for authority to take the same for such purposes, without the consent of the owner.

Mr. LENNOX. Does that mean that it can be taken by expropriation proceedings in the ordinary way?

Mr. EMMERSON. By expropriation proceedings.

Mr. HAGGART. The parties would have to have notice?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. It would have to be applied for under the ordinary proceedings.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It means the taking of additional land for this purpose.

Mr. LENNOX. A question in regard to the substitution of another highway arose in our section. I know for an actual fact that this is a very necessary provision. Perhaps the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals will explain the difference between what he proposes and the former section. We have section 139 and there is a general provision in it. What change are we making?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It practically provides additional cases where land may be taken.

Mr. EMMERSON. Section 139 of the Railway Act provides:

Should the company require, at any point on the railway, more ample space than it possesses or may take under the preceding section, for the convenient accommodation of the public, or the traffic on its railway, or for the protection against snow-drifts, it may apply to the board for authority to take the same, for such purposes, without the consent of the owner.

This is amplified and made more definite.

Mr. KEMP. I presume that these changes have been made at the suggestion of the Railway Commission. May I ask for any instances in which they have come up against difficulties in dealing with matters of this kind?

Mr. EMMERSON. The chairman did not give me any specific cases, certainly such as I would remember, but he spoke of the general exeperience of the board in the conduct of their business and said that generally these amendments were desirable in the interests of the proper administration of the Act.

Mr. KEMP. I was wondering if they had anything to do with the difficulty that arose in Toronto in the fire area where the railways and the owners had so much trouble in coming to terms.

Mr. EMMERSON. I really do not know, but you see that under the original section they are allowed to take additional land for the purpose of providing protection against snow drifts and matters of that kind. This provides that where they have to divert a highway or have to substitute one highway for another in all cases where such diversion or substitution has been ordered by the board the railway company may expropriate the land.

Mr. KEMP. Without reference to the Railway Commission or without going to them first?

Mr. EMMERSON. The Railway Commission would have to give an order in the first instance, or pass an order authorizing them to take this additional land for this purpose. They must first adjudge the matter; then, this gives power to expropriate the properties which have been ordered to be taken by the railway.

Mr. SPROULE. It gives power to expropriate the highway regardless of the wishes of the municipal authorities ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The municipal authorities have to be heard in the matter. Railway companies have power to divert a highway and even to substitute land for a certain highway.

Mr. HAGGART. Are all the suggestions of the Railway Commission embodied in the Bill ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not know that all the suggestions that were made were embodied in the Bill.

Mr. LENNOX. This provision as to the diversion of the highway is new ?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is new.

Mr. LENNOX. Would the hon. minister explain the effect of subsection two of section six ? It refers to the certificate provided for by the Railway Act of 1888.

Mr. EMMERSON. Under the Act the Minister of Railways and Canals is required to give a certain certificate in respect to the lands to be expropriated and having once given the certificate, the question, as I remember it, is as to whether he has exhausted his power. If subsequently the Board of Railway Commissioners should authorize the taking of additional land may he amend or add to the certificate originally given ?

Mr. LENNOX. Is the Railway Act of 1888 still in force ? I thought it was to be repealed.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Assuming that some action was taken under that Act ; that is to say a certificate had been given by the minister when the Act was in force. Now the question arises as to whether or not that certificate, having been given by the minister at a time when the Act was in operation, it can be altered, varied or changed, and it is in order to make that point clear that this section is in the Bill.

On section 7,

Mr. EMMERSON. The change made is by substituting the words 'by payment into court' for the words 'by deposit, in a chartered bank designated by him, to the credit of the company and such person or party jointly.' It is in order to avoid conflict when the money has to be paid out again. The amendment has been suggested by the chief commissioner.

Mr. LENNOX. Does the amendment say that the payment into court is to be to the credit of any particular party ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Mr. LENNOX. How will that work out ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. This is one of the series of sections which have reference to resistance ; you have to apply to the court to get your warrant for entering into possession. When the money is in court it is under the control of the judge who can order payment, but if it happens to get into a chartered bank to the joint credit of the individual and the company, a conflict often arises even though the issue is settled. The chief commissioner suggests that the payment should be made into court where it would be under the control of the judge who issues the warrant.

Mr. LENNOX. The system of paying money into court is considered as very satisfactory in Ontario. Has the minister considered whether in the courts of the different provinces there is such a system in force.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is paid to the credit of the case.

On section 8,

Mr. EMMERSON. This section is entirely new. It is to meet the changed conditions which have arisen in the country with respect to the transmission of power.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. The telephone people have had a lot of trouble getting their wires across railway lines, and there should be some provision made for that.

Mr. EMMERSON. In the original Act there is provision with respect to telephone and telegraph lines, but power transmission wires are not included.

Mr. LENNOX. In the Railway Act, 1903, there is a provision that in the various provinces the municipal law shall apply in reference to the drainage of land. Will this amendment in any way conflict with that ?

Mr. EMMERSON. No.

Mr. LENNOX. There is a provision in the Act that if a farmer carries his drain under a railway he should not be put to any more expense than if the railway was not there.

Mr. EMMERSON. This amendment does not conflict with that.

Mr. LENNOX. That being so it seems to be a beneficial amendment.

On section 9,

Mr. HAGGART. Why do you provide that the engines shall use coal instead of wood ?

Mr. EMMERSON. The sparks from the wood fires are dangerous.

Mr. HAGGART. In some sections of the country, for instance between Pembroke and Fort William, although the railway could burn coal as cheaply as wood, nevertheless they use wood in order that its purchase may help the settlers. Has the minister consulted the railway companies about this ?

Mr. EMMERSON. That section we have now, the only change is adding the words 'accommodation and comfort' in the last line but one from the bottom.

Mr. LENNOX. And also it is optional for the board to make the order or not, and if the people in the neighbourhood did not want it, it would not be made.

On section 10,

Mr. EMMERSON. The change in this is simply to strike out the word 'serious' as it appears in the original section. The original section read :

Every company shall, as soon as possible, and immediately after the head officers of the company have received information of the occurrence upon the railway belonging to such company, of any accident attended with serious personal injury,——

Now the word 'serious' is left out, so that any personal injury will have to be reported. The word 'serious' now limits it too much.

Then the words 'or to any employee of the company' are added, so that if any injury occurs to any of the company's employees they will be compelled under the amended section to report such accident.

Mr. LENNOX. That is a very good change.

Mr. KEMP. Has the government taken into consideration recently the appointment of a proper official to inquire into railway accidents ? I notice that in 1903 the question was before the House and the Minister of Railways at that time said the government had this matter under serious consideration. A question was asked by the late Mr. Clarke :

Is it the duty of any public official, and if so, of whom, to inquire into and report to the government, upon all railway accidents which occur in the Dominion.

And the then Minister of Railways answered :

No official in particular has been assigned to the duty of making inquiry into railway accidents, but since and owing to recent railway accidents, the subject has been engaging the serious consideration of the government.

I would like to point out in this connection that according to an answer to a question which I had on the order paper recently, the number of people who were killed on Canadian railways for the year ending June 30, 1904, was 448, and for the year ending June 30, 1905, 524. The numbers of people injured (seriously, I take it, under the present wording of the law), in the same periods, were 2,249 and 2,653 respectively.

It seems to me, in view of legislation in other countries, particularly in Great Britain where there is an official whose duty it is to inquire into all accidents and report to the government, and in view of the seriousness of this question the government have been a little slow in appointing this official. I understand no official has been appointed and that it is the duty of no one to report to the government or of the Railway Commission as to the causes of these accidents. Sometimes from motives of economy and at other times when there is a very heavy rush of traffic, it is possible that the rules of the railways, which I believe are very good if lived up to, are not lived up to, and I would ask, would it not facilitate matters and be more satisfactory to the public if the government were to investigate these matters on their own behalf through proper officials appointed.

It seems to me the time is ripe for the government to take some steps in this direction, more particularly in view of the fact that this was promised by the Minister of Railways in 1903.

From the answer to that question which I asked the other day I find that the government have no information before them in respect to these accidents, that the country has to depend upon the findings of coroners' juries in cases of death, and on any other information they can get. I would like to find out what the views of the government are in regard to this question.

Mr. EMMERSON. The Railway Commission have jurisdiction with respect to that matter already and have officials appointed and assigned to the duty of inquiring into all such accidents. The amendments here proposed give the board larger power with respect to investigations of this nature, that is that they may, of their own motion send their officials to inquire into these accidents. And the amendment which we passed a moment ago provides that the railways must report all accidents in which their employees are injured, so that it will be the duty of the board to take these cases into their consideration and they may send their officials—they have two, I think, who have been appointed for that very purpose—here and there throughout the Dominion with a view to having the causes of accidents inquired into. They have also larger powers by this amendment with respect to uniformity of appliances so that they can of their own motion issue orders, not merely on the application of one party or the other or of the general public ; they can take cogniz-

ance themselves of the conditions existing and will take cognizance by reason of the reports that come to them from time to time as required by this legislation from the different railway companies. Thus I do not think the government is open to any charge of laches with respect to the inquiry that should be had and is being had into accidents.

Mr. KEMP. It may be that they have ample power, and I notice, referring to 'Hansard' of 1903, that the Minister of Railways at that time claimed under that new Railway Act there was ample power for the Railway Commission to make such inquiry as I have referred to.

Mr. EMMERSON. They have held such inquiries from time to time.

Mr. KEMP. The fourth and fifth sections of the question which I referred to a moment ago, answered on March 22 last were :

4. Have investigations been held on behalf of the government in respect to such accidents?
5. If so, will the government lay reports of such investigations upon the table of the House ?

And the answers :

4. I have no information on this question.
5. No.

So I take it that while the Railway Act requires that while an official should be appointed to make these inquiries and report, no such official has been appointed, and has reported according to the answer to this question.

Mr. EMMERSON. The question was put as to the government doing it. I do not remember precisely the question, but these powers have been delegated to the Railway Commission.

Mr. KEMP. The question said 'on behalf of the government.'

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not recollect the question nor the answer. There were two men appointed for the express purpose of holding investigations. I know that Mr. Duval and Mr. Lalonde were the two gentlemen appointed and that they have held investigations in different parts of the Dominion.

Mr. INGRAM. This is another example which shows wherein our Railway Act is defective. We have the railway reports which give the number of accidents on the different lines, but our Act does not provide that the Railway Commission should report to the government so that we might know whether they have investigated these cases or not. I do not see that in the hon. gentleman's Bill.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have it ready to submit to the committee in a few moments.

Mr. McINTYRE. The object of the section evidently is to inform the Railway Commission of accidents which have occurred through carelessness or remissness or through some fault on the part of the railway employees. Injury to person or property is made the standpoint by which to judge whether or not there should be a report. But there may be very serious remissness or neglect not accompanied by accidents which the commission should be informed of. For instance, a short time ago I had an experience of this myself. A railway train on which I was travelling stopped half way between the station we left and the one we were approaching. It stopped in order to avoid colliding with another railway train which was coming in the opposite direction. Fortunately the two trains were approaching each other on a straight bit of track so that the railway men on both trains could see the danger and had time to stop their trains before they came together. But there was just as much remissness on the part of the officials as if a serious accident had occurred. No report of that carelessness ever reached the commission, and yet it would be well that the commission should be made acquainted with the facts.

Mr. KEMP. Would the hon. minister make inquiries regarding the question of accidents we have brought up and find out what the Railway Commission have done?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. He could get a report.

Mr. KEMP. Yes, and submit it to us before the Bill is disposed of. Will the minister do that?

Mr. EMMERSON. Certainly. I may say to my hon. friend from South Perth (Mr. McIntyre) that of course the railway companies themselves are interested in holding investigations, and do hold very rigid inquiries into any remissness of duty such as my hon. friend has mentioned. My hon. friend will see that the neglect or carelessness which occurred in the incident he speaks of must necessarily be due to the criminal negligence of some official of the road, either a train despatcher or some other train hand, who had exceeded or entirely disregarded his orders. In all such cases the companies, in their own interests, hold very strict investigations, and the public interest is thereby sufficiently safeguarded. I do not think it would be possible for the Railway Commission to hold investigations into cases of remissness or neglect on the part of railway employees which are not accompanied by any accident. But where there has been an accident the duty is imposed on the commissioners to hold an investigation.

On section 11,

Subsection 1 of section 295 of the said Act is repealed and the following substituted therefor :

Every conductor, locomotive engineer, train despatcher, telegraph operator, station agent, switchman or other person who is intoxicated while on duty in charge of or in any employment having to do with the movement of trains upon any railway, is guilty of an indictable offence and liable to ten years' imprisonment.

This amendment simply adds to the number of officials who should be subject to the penalty. My attention has been called to the fact that the penalty is excessive and that consequently juries will not convict because if they do the accused will be sent down for ten years which they consider out of proportion to the offence. Consequently the very weight of the penalty tends to defeat justice by exciting the sympathy of jurors in favour of the accused. I simply mention this for the consideration of members of the committee.

Mr. HAGGART. What is the penalty at present?

Mr. EMMERSON. Ten years imprisonment and that is not altered by this amendment. The amendment only adds to the number of persons who may come under the section.

Mr. LENNOX. At present it only applies to engineers and conductors.

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, and we are now making it apply to telegraph operators, train despatchers and switchmen, all of whom are just as liable through their neglect and carelessness or through intoxication, to cause loss of life as are locomotive engineers.

Mr. FOSTER. Why not strike out all the names and make it apply to everybody?

Mr. INGRAM. I think that the railway companies themselves will regard the offence covered by this section as a very serious crime and treat it as such. As a rule they will dismiss the guilty party. That being the case we ought to make the punishment lighter for a first offence by imposing a fine and short imprisonment. Then if the employee should be retained in the service and repeat the offence he should be made liable to a more severe penalty. I also see that under the old Act a fine and imprisonment are inflicted on persons found guilty of supplying liquor to railway employees, namely, a fine of $50 and imprisonment with hard labour for a term not exceeding one month, whereas the employee who is guilty is sentenced to imprisonment for ten years. It seems to me that there is some inconsistency in this and an amendment should be made putting both on a more equal footing.

Mr. EMMERSON. Perhaps this section could stand over ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. What is the suggestion ?

Mr. EMMERSON. To have the punishment graded according to the number of offences.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. There is only one offence, it seems to me.

Mr. EMMERSON. The question raised is as to the limit of ten years. Representation is made on behalf of the employees of the railways, and perhaps it is worthy of consideration.

Mr. LENNOX. Another point to which I would call attention and which arises in connection with what has been discussed here is this: Subsection 2 of this section 295 provides that any person selling or giving intoxicating liquor to a servant of the company while on duty 'is liable on summary conviction to a penalty not exceeding fifty dollars, or to imprisonment with or without hard labour for a period not exceeding one month, or to both.' That is a pretty severe penalty considering that it applies whether the act is knowingly committed or not. In many similar statutes, the penalty is enacted against those who knowingly and willfully commit the act—for instance the law of Great Britain relating to those who supply liquor to soldiers. The minister might consider the amendment of that subsection.

On section 12,

Subsection 4 of section 303 of the said Act is repealed and the following is substituted therefor :

4. The minister may, from time to time, change or vary the forms in the said schedule one contained, or may substitute other forms in lieu thereof, and, upon any such change, variation or substitution being so made, the company shall, in the manner above provided, prepare, make and forward returns accordingly; the company shall also, at all times, give such information to the minister as the minister may, from time to time, require for statistical purposes.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is found that our statistics are far from sufficient, especially by comparison with those that the American railways are required to furnish to the authorities of that country. Section 303 of the Railway Act provides that returns must be made 'in accordance with the forms contained in schedule 1 to this Act.'

Now, under this Bill we ask that the department be given power to change the forms from time to time. The department has under consideration improvements in the character of the statistics which the railways shall be required to furnish. Our requirements will be made more in accord with those that are imposed upon the American railways.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the minister the schedule of the information he proposes to ask for ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I have not. We ask for power to change the form from time to time, that the information may be more complete. If we were simply to amend the schedule, we should be tied down absolutely to the form provided.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the meaning of the words in subsection 4 : 'The company shall furnish such other information and returns as are, from time to time, required by the minister ?

Mr. EMMERSON. Our experience may suggest, from time to time, the necessity of getting more complete information, or information in some different form. And so we could, under this proposed new section, make our forms to meet the exigencies of the case.

Mr. SPROULE. I should think it was questionable if the present law, under the words I have quoted does not give the minister all the power he requires.

Mr. EMMERSON. But there is a governing feature in that the section begins with these words,' every company shall annually prepare returns in accordance with the forms contained in schedule one,' and so on. This seems to be a limitation. To remove the doubt, we ask for this amendment.

Mr. INGRAM. Is there any objection to it ?

Mr. EMMERSON. There surely cannot be any.

Mr. LENNOX. It seems to me the minister would have ample power if he would strike out the last three words of his amendment. He provides here that the company shall 'give such information to the minister as the minister may from time to time require for statistical purposes.' The words 'for statistical purposes' are not in the original section, and if they were struck out of this Bill the section would be left more general.

Mr. FOSTER. He might become an inquisitor.

Mr. EMMERSON. Of course, a minister of railways would never require information for any other purpose, and I think the words should be left there to indicate what it is for.

Mr. LENNOX. It seems to me that the old section is better than the one the minister proposes to substitute for it.

Mr. EMMERSON. The hon. gentleman will have to quarrel with the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) about that.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not want to quarrel with anybody ; I am only making a suggestion.

Mr. FOSTER. In a matter of this kind the advice of the lay members of this House may not be much considered, but there is one point which must appeal to the lay mind. We have in the present Act a schedule showing the information that the railway companies are required to furnish. That schedule was proposed when the present law was under consideration, and the business men on either side of the House considered it and determined what kind of information should be asked for. It seems to me that, whatever information is required of the railway companies, it should be required under a schedule of this Act. You do not need to change it every year, and if any change is required parliament can easily make it. It would then still remain an Act of parliament and the information would be called for by authority of parliament. Otherwise it is called for by requisition of the minister. The minister has power in relation to the railways, but perhaps, he has not as much power as parliament has. If it is left to the department, you never know what information is being called for until the schedule, each year, is laid before the House. But under the present system, everybody can read the statute and know exactly the position. I do not like the idea of authority in this matter getting out of the hands of parliament.

Mr. EMMERSON. The information required is only for the information of parliament and in the interest of the public, and I think the department may very safely be trusted to call for only such information from the railways as will serve some public interest and not be merely inquisitorial.

Mr. FOSTER. But we might have a lazy minister who would call upon the railways—

Mr. EMMERSON. But we have not that kind of minister now.

Mr. FOSTER. There may be a change.

Mr. EMMERSON. We will try to have matters arranged before that. The section as here proposed seems to be a reasonable one. It seems to me there should be no hard and fast rules as to the form of the return. The character of the statistics required by parliament can easily be anticipated. But the Department of Railways and Canals might fairly have the responsibility of securing that in detail.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not sure, but it is better that there should be a hard and fast form, and then the railways will know what to expect. If it depends upon a regulation of the department, the information may differ from year to year. It is much better, I should think, to have a fair and square declaration from parliament as to what is required, and then make them live up to it. If the minister's reasoning was pushed to the extreme, we need not have any Railway Act at all, but leave it to the

minister to do as he thinks best in the interest of the country.

Mr. PRINGLE. I quite agree with the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), I think this section is too sweeping. I think it far better that the corrections should come from parliament. While the present Minister of Railways will no doubt get such information as would be desirable and useful we must remember that ministers of railways change from time to time; and while some minister might be too inquisitive and ask altogether too much, other ministers might not get sufficient information. I think it far better that there should be a schedule prepared and attached to the Act, then we would know exactly what information we could expect with regard to the railways of this country.

Mr. SPROULE. Can the minister tell us what is the experience now with regard to these returns? I have understood from time to time that they were not very well made.

Mr. EMMERSON. They are not very satisfactory, I must say, and the schedules do not seem to provide a remedy. Even when they are conformed to, the information is not as full and comprehensive as it should be.

Mr. SPROULE. Have you any reason to believe that if this proposed modification was made, the information would be more easily obtained?

Mr. EMMERSON. Yes, it would be much more easy for the great railway systems to conform to the amended forms. If the forms were similar to those used in the United States, it would be easier for the railway companies to fill them out. There would be more subdivisions as to operating expenses, and everything of that character, and there would be less difficulty for them to furnish this information in detail than it is for them to give it now.

Mr. HAGGART. What power have you of compelling them to furnish the statistics?

Mr. LENNOX. A $10 penalty. I would like to know from the minister more definitely as to what returns are made. Have all the companies been making returns?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think all the important companies have done so. I have not inquired recently, but I can get that information later on. I do not think there is any complaint against the great railway corporations of Canada in complying with the forms sent out.

Mr. LENNOX. There is another point. Subsection six provides that the minister shall lay before both Houses of parliament within twenty-one days after the commencement of each session, these returns. Has that been done?

Mr. FOSTER.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think that is done, you will find it in the report of the Minister of Railways.

Mr. PRINGLE. It seems to me that under section 303 of the Act of 1903 and subsection four, very large powers are now given to the Minister of Railways. Under section 303 the company shall annually prepare returns in accordance with forms contained in the schedule. Now, these schedules seem to be very full. Will the minister tell us in what respect there is any deficiency in the schedules that are referred to in this section? Subsection four provides that the company shall, in addition to the information required to be furnished to the minister as indicated in said schedule, furnish such information and returns as are from time to time required by the minister. Now my objection to the amendment is this, that it leaves the whole schedule under the absolute control of the minister. He can amend it, vary it or bring it down to almost nothing. At the present moment he has a schedule which has been prepared with great care, and which provides for all the information which the minister or the public are likely to require. Moreover, if there is any information which is not contained in that schedule, he has power to ask the railways to furnish it. Now, I think it is better to leave the schedule which gives him that power, than it is to give him power to abolish the schedule, or vary it as he sees fit. The present amendment leaves the whole matter in the hands of the Minister of Railways to abolish, or vary or do what he pleases with the schedules.

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not think that we need attach so much importance to the form. The question is to get the information for the benefit of parliament or the country at large, which information is published annually in the report of the Minister of Railways. Now, why be tied down to any particular form? My hon. friend says that the Minister of Railways has all this power now. The character of the information that we now receive makes it impossible to draw any comparison between a Canadian railway and a railway in the United States. Take up the returns of the New York Central or of the Pennsylvania system; you will not find anywhere in the public records of Canada similar information with respect to any of the Canadian railways.

Mr. FOSTER. And your schedules.

Mr. EMMERSON. We will amend the form, as the requirements suggest, in order to get the information. My hon. friend asks what additional information do we want. We want better subdivisions as to the character of the expenditures, and all details respecting the operation of a railway. You do not want it in the aggregate; you want it so that these figures and statistics will

be of some value to you. I know that the system in connection with the Intercolonial Railway has been a very unsatisfactory one and it is only now that we are undertaking to have a reformation in this regard. It may have been delayed too long. Granted. But why delay it any longer? Give us the powers and we will secure the information.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to give one decided answer to my hon. friend. He says: Why not hand this power over to the minister and he will get you the information you want? Simply because it is an old fiction that parliament is the best judge of the information it wants and it ought to say what that information should be.

Mr. PRINGLE. I do not think the hon. minister understood me rightly. Subsection 4 of section 303 of the Railway Act as it now stands makes it compulsory that the railway companies shall furnish information according to certain schedules. I am not going to say that these schedules are too full or that they are not full enough, but it is absolutely compulsory that they furnish information according to these schedules which form part and parcel of the Act of 1903. Now, the minister wants to say that under this amendment I can wipe out those schedules altogether; I can follow them or not as I see fit. Then, it is entirely in the hands of the minister to get what information he may see fit. I think parliament has the right to say that it wants the information according to a certain schedule. If that schedule is not full enough then let us make it fuller; if it is too full, let us wipe out what we think is unnecessary, but let us have the schedule as part and parcel of the Act and not leave the matter entirely in the hands of the minister. I think that under the present Act pretty full power is given to the minister in regard to all the information he may require. If there is anything in the schedule that should be eliminated it could be eliminated, or if there is anything that he suggests should be added we can add it to the schedule.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Carried.

Mr. FOSTER. Is section 12 carried?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. If section 12 is carried I would say that before the Bill passes entirely I would like to have some fuller information as to what changes the minister expects to make in the schedule. At least, parliament should know that.

Mr. EMMERSON. I will remember that. I want to propose as the 13th section of this Bill the following:

The board shall, within three months after the thirty-first day of March in each year, make to the Governor in Council, through the minister, an annual report respecting (a) applications to and proceedings of the board under this Act and the Railway Act of 1903 during the year next preceding the thirty-first day of March; (b) such other matters as appear to the board to be of public interest in connection with persons, companies and railways subject to the said Acts, and (c) such matters as the Governor in Council directs. The said report shall be laid before the House of Commons of Canada during the first fifteen days of the then next session of parliament.

Mr. FOSTER. They are already required to make a report, are they not?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, they are not required under the Act to make any report.

Mr. HAGGART. Would you not require them to furnish any information which might be asked for from time to time?

Mr. EMMERSON. Would not parliament have the power to ask for information by order of the House?

Mr. HAGGART. I do not know. A body that is not removable in any other way than by impeachment might not pay any attention to an order of the House.

Mr. INGRAM. Would that report include decisions made by the board?

Mr. EMMERSON. It would include that information as I understand it.

Mr. INGRAM. It would be a very incomplete report if the decisions given by the board were not published or submitted to parliament.

Mr. EMMERSON. A statement of each case would be necessary. All the requirements are as fully provided for as I thought were necessary. You cannot frame a section that will go into detail as to everything that may be required. It is general and the general requirements of the Act would include all these details.

Mr. INGRAM. I am just pointing this out for the reason that there are many similar cases that are liable to come before the Board of Railway Commissioners. Their decisions would be known to the public and as a result the public would then be in a position to say whether it would be of any use to bring a particular case before the commission.

Mr. HAGGART. Clause (b) is entirely optional with the board. It calls for a report on anything the commission may think would be of interest.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Subsection (c) provides for such other matters as the Governor in Council directs.

Mr. EMMERSON. That follows the line of the Trancontinental Railway Commissioners Act.

Section agreed to.

Mr. EMMERSON moved that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Will the hon. minister say when he will take up the telephone clauses ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I stated that it was my intention to move that the telephone clauses be referred to a special committee. A motion will be made, when the other sections relating to railways have been determined upon, that the order of the House be discharged and that the telephone clauses be referred to a special committee.

Mr. HAGGART. To the same special committee or to a separate one ?

Mr. EMMERSON. One to be named.

Mr. HAGGART. You propose to refer different clauses of the same Bill to two special commissions ?

Mr. EMMERSON. This subject relates to telephones.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Will the hon. minister say whether he intends to bring in a government measure for the regulation of the tolls of express companies ?

Mr. EMMERSON. I cannot give the information to my hon. friend.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Immigration—Salaries, general employees Canada, Great Britain and other countries, $150,000.

Mr. FOSTER. The understanding was that the Inland Revenue estimates would be proceeded with. We are not quite prepared for these estimates now so that the minister will have to be patient a little while.

Mr. SPROULE. In the meantime will the minister give us information as to the number of immigrants who were refused admission to Canada during the last couple of years ; also as to the number deported from the United States to Canada and the number of these again deported from Canada to the country whence they came.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The deportations from Canada appear in the departmental report. Of the number sent from Canada to the United States and then sent back from the United States to Canada and deported, there have been only one or two.

Mr. SPROULE. I saw it stated in the newspapers that, speaking from memory some 300 had been sent back from the United States to Canada.

Mr. BARR. I am not surprised that only two or three of these immigrants were deported from Canada in view of the loose system of examination we have. We have reports from charitable institutions all over the Dominion that immigrants suffering from diseases of all kinds and unable to earn their living are placed in these institutions as a burden. These immigrants are apparently allowed to land in this country without hindrance, while in contrast the examination of the United States is very thorough. It has been proved beyond all doubt that the examination of immigrants in this country is of the most cursory kind and that large numbers of immigrants who never should be allowed into Canada have become charges on the different communities. The time has come when the government should give this matter their most serious consideration and order a thorough examination and inspection of all immigrants.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish information with regard to some of these agents and agencies. For instance, at page L—23 of the Auditor General's Report I find that Mr. DeCœli, the agent at Belgium was paid the following sums :—Salary 12 months to June 30th, $1,200 ; addressing and posting pamphlets, $154.10 ; advertising, $1,198.37 ; board and lodging, $437.87 ; cleaning offices, $13.40 ; clerical assistance, $292 ; delivery mail and parcels, $34.30 ; distributing literature, $33.82 ; freight and express, $76.70 ; livery and cab-hire, $37.71 ; fuel, $13.56 ; light, $6.78 ; picture frames and photos, $10.66 ; postage, $1,047.62 ; printing, $72.50 ; railway and street car fares, $247.75 ; rent of office, $467.20; repairs to offices, $5.65; stationery, $27.90 ; stove for office, $11.80 ; telegrams and cables, $12.75; translating letters, $13.55; small items, $87.23, a total of $5,503.22 paid to this gentleman.

Who is Mr. DeCoeli, what does he do and where is his work done ?

Mr. OLIVER. These expenses are connected with the conduct of an active immigration effort in Belgium, which is recognized certainly to be one of the countries having the most desirable class of people, sober, industrious, intelligent, progressive and it is the most densely peopled country in the world.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, we know that.

Mr. OLIVER. The people are energetic, aggressive, industrious, sober, intelligent, having all the qualities that make for success and it has been thought well to maintain in that country an active effort to induce immigration.

Mr. FOSTER. What does he do in the way of advertising for which $1,198 has been spent.

Mr. OLIVER. The advertising is by way of newspapers and also printing small pamphlets.

Mr. FOSTER. That would not be under advertising.

Mr. OLIVER. This is newspaper advertising.

Mr. FOSTER. What class of advertising?

Mr. OLIVER. This is of course advertising to bring to the attention of the people of Belgium the agricultural possibilities of Canada. A list of the papers can be produced later.

Mr. FOSTER. And a statement as to what kind of advertisments are published. Is Mr. DeCoeli a Belgian himself ?

Mr. OLIVER. No, a French Canadian.

Mr. BRODEUR. I remember having seen him some years ago, he was living in the county of Wright.

Mr. OLIVER. In the vicinity of Ottawa on the north side of the river.

Mr. FOSTER. And what experience had he in immigration matters and why was he selected ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. He is a Belgian.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend made a mistake; he was born in Belgium but came to this country many years ago and settled as a farmer in the vicinity of Ottawa. When it was decided to establish an agency in Belgium he was selected, partly on account of the fact that he was pretty well known in Belgium and also because he was conversant with the Flemish language.

Mr. MONK. It is pretty evident from the reports which we get from Belgium that there is not a very successful work being carried on there. But that is not the point which I raise. It seems to me that we are making a mistake in proceeding with the consideration of these very heavy items in connection with immigration at this stage. We are called upon to vote over $607,000 when we have just begun by the examination of two witnesses whose examination is not yet terminated, an investigation before the committee to whom our system of immigration appertains in order to correct such defects as these witnesses will point out to us. It seems to me to be contrary to every principle of common sense that when we are in the very inception of that investigation, which cannot be long but which must cover the examination of 10 or 12 witnesses and which will furnish us with ample information to enable us to appreciate the reasons given by the minister and to suggest appropriate criticism, we should be called upon to vote almost the entire amount for the payment of immigration agents this year in all the countries to which this investigation applies. I do not think it is reasonable or sensible or businesslike, and I would suggest to the minister that it would shorten the work of the committee and greatly shorten our work if we allowed these investigations before the committees to be completed first.

Mr. OLIVER. I quite agree that the investigation of these immigration matters by the committees would facilitate the final passage of the estimates in the House.

Mr. FOSTER. It should precede that.

Mr. OLIVER. I am quite agreeable that it should but of course as minister administering the department I am not asking for the investigations by the committees, and as we feel that we are ready to present the estimates to the House and to give some reasons for asking for these votes we bring them forward and offer them to the House and stand ready to offer such information as may be required by our friends in the opposition.

Mr. MONK. Have we finished all the estimates of the Department of Indian Affairs ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, the main estimates have been passed. The estimates of the Department of the Interior, separate from immigration, have not been dealt with.

Mr. MONK. It seems to me not consistent with common sense to vote money in connection with a subject we are looking into.

Mr. OLIVER. I am more than pleased with the suggestion that the work of the Standing Committee should precede the work of the committee here, but that is not a suggestion which should properly come from myself. If the members of the opposition wish me to accept that suggestion, I am quite willing.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the hon. minister his other estimates ready ?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, but unfortunately the officer of my department who has more immediate charge of these estimates is not here. However as the accountant is here, I am satisfied I can give the House a great deal of information.

Mr. FOSTER. And wobble along.

Mr. OLIVER. Perhaps even more than that. I do not expect the House to pass these large items without careful inquiry ; but by presenting these estimates to-night, inquiries might be made which would give me the opportunity to produce any further information desired that I may not have at hand and facilitate the passage of the items later on. If the opposition desire that we should forego the consideration of the immigration estimates to-night, I am quite willing to meet their view.

Mr. HENDERSON. Before passing away from the item, I would like to ask the hon. minister if we get many immigrants from Belgium. We hear about Galicians and Doukhobors and Mennonites and others, but I am not aware that we have any considerable number of Belgians and we seem to be

spending very considerable sums to secure immigrants from that country. Would the hon. minister inform us briefly what success has attended the agency in Belgium.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know that the results so far are at all commensurate with the expenditure. But it will be admitted that Belgium is a very desirable field for immigration efforts and that the department is justified in making every reasonable effort to secure settlers from that country, whether the result at the moment be large or small. Even if our efforts do not meet with immediate success, we always look forward to their bearing fruit in the near future.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I read the other day in a report published by the Society of Colonization of Lake St. John that the average number of Belgians who come to this country yearly is about 400 or 500 many of these people settle around large cities like Montreal and Quebec, and go in for market gardening. They are splendid gardeners. But the bulk of them go to the Lake St. John district and prove the best of farmers.

Mr. MONK. Does the hon. gentleman mean to say that there is any document which shows that 400 Belgians have gone during the year to the Lake St. John district ?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, I saw it in one of the reports published by the Lake St. John Colonization Society.

Mr. MONK. Well, I am prepared to deny the authenticity of that report. However, desirable that immigration may be, we do not get that number in the whole year.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have in my hand a statement showing the immigration by nationality. It is a statement which was made up by the Interior Department a short time ago, and it gives a list of the immigration from the fiscal year 1900-1 to 1904-5. In that long list, which includes South Africa, Australia, Austria, Bohemia and many other countries, I fail to find that we received from Belgium a single immigrant. We are spending very large sums of money to induce people to come here from that country, who apparently have no desire to leave their own land for Canada. I was very glad indeed to hear some of the statements of the minister with regard to the advantage of persistent efforts being put forward to secure the right class of immigrants. I am quite well aware that we cannot turn the current of immigration in one year or two or even in five years without some very extraordinary efforts. We are often told that the present government's policy of immigration has been very successful compared with that of the former government more especially as regards immigration from the United States. This is held out to us as one of the things this administration can boast of, but what the minister has told us with reference to Belgium has a very distinct application to the question of emigration from the United States. Many years ago the late government attempted to secure immigrants from that country. They put forth every effort, they spent large sums of money, but, as the minister has told us, it takes time to get people interested in a movement of that kind, and we must not look for immediate results, so that the present government are reaping to-day the fruit of the policy adopted by their predecessors some fifteen years ago. In this, as in many other things, they are getting the advantage of the good foundation laid by those who ruled this country before they came into power.

Had the predecessors of these hon. gentlemen not put forth the efforts they did, had not the scheme for inducing immigration from the United States been inaugurated prior to 1896, it is very questionable indeed whether the success that has attended the work of the present government would be in any degree equal to what it has been. I refer to this simply because I know that justice is not done to those who directed immigration affairs in this country prior to 1896. These were the men who laid the foundation upon which their successors have built; and, had it not been for the foundation the superstructure would have amounted to very little. We have been told that all the results are due to the efforts of those now in power. But the minister to-night has given this a flat contradiction. He tells us that you cannot expect to turn the tide of emigration in a short time—we must go on with the work year after year, and some time we may succeed in getting immigration from Belgium. The Belgians are a good class of people and would make desirable immigrants for this country. I am not sure but that the minister may be justified in pursuing the course he has pursued, if we are to seek for European immigration. That, of course, is another question and one which I am not going to discuss—the question whether it is desirable to spend money in order to secure immigration from Europe. I believe that Canada is now sufficiently well known to attract the people that we want quite as fast as we can take care of them. I merely rose to call attention to the endorsement given by the minister to the view that the present government are benefiting by the policy of their predecessors.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am glad to say that I have found the report of the immigration by countries. I find that the kind of immigrants from Belgium were as follows :

1900-1	132
1901-2	223
1902-3	303
1903-4	858
1904-5	796

So, I think I was not very far from the mark when I said to my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) that we had from 400 to 500 of these immigrants each year. I saw it stated in the report of the St. John Colonization Society that they had between 300 or 400 Belgians located in the Lake St. John district.

Mr. MONK. I understood the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) to state that about 400 Belgians had settled in Lake St. John district. I do not think he has quoted anything to justify that statement. And, if such a statement is contained in the report of the society, I think it is exaggerated. The figures quoted by my hon. friend show the number of Belgians who arrived at Canadian ports. That is not proof that they settled in the Lake St. John district, nor even proof that they settled in Canada at all; for as the hon. gentleman knows, large numbers of Belgians come through Canadian ports and go to the United States.

Mr. HENDERSON. I glanced hurriedly over the report to which I referred. It was placed in my hand and I was told that it did not include any immigrants from Belgium. The report is in a statement by the Minister of the Interior on the 24th March, 1906, in answer to a question as to the number of immigrants that had arrived in Canada during the years specifying the countries from which they had come. I find that I overlooked the line in this return of showing the immigrants from Belgium. However, that the figures are there given as they have been quoted by the Solicitor Geeral. I am glad to have the opportunity of making this correction. The error was due to an oversight on my part—I did not catch the word 'Belgium' in hurriedly looking over the list. However, this does not affect the remarks I made to the effect that the persistent efforts made by the former government to direct the tide of immigration to this country were an important element in the success of Canada in attracting immigration to-day, and the present government are reaping, very largely, the results of the work of their predecessors.

Mr. FOSTER. Immigration from Belgium has increased, but it is still not nearly what I wish it was. But though, we are receiving immigrants from Belgium, we must not jump to the conclusion that these are the results of what Mr. de Coeli is doing. What I would like to know is what is the method of work followed. Of course, it is easy for a man to go over to Europe, sit in an office in one of the cities there, and spend some money in advertising; but we hope that that is not what Mr. de Coeli is doing. When $5,000 is being spent we want to know that it is being spent on a plan of operations that offers reasonable prospects of results. If the plan of operations is good, and if the field is good, we are willing, of course, to wait for results as the minister suggests.

Mr. OLIVER. I am sorry I cannot give the information that is asked for. Of course, immigration work must vary with the locality and the person employed. I do not think it would be possible for the department, in sending an agent to Belgium, to give him detailed instructions as to the methods of work he shall follow in his field. The best we can do is to chose the person whom we consider to be the best qualified and send him into the field with instructions to do the best he can. The work of this agent in Belgium is supervised more directly from the office of the commissioner in London. Mr. Preston is commissioner of immigration for Europe and has general charge of this agency as well as others. Any direct instructions issued to this agent would be from Mr. Preston's office rather than from the office here.

Mr. FOSTER. That may be very well, but it does not do us any good. We have to vote the money and we would like to know. There is no doubt that in an immense expenditure of this kind it is easy to throw away a great deal of money, and the departmental officers here are not to rest content when they make a million dollars expenditure in a year by saying that so many thousands were spent here, so many thousands there and so many thousands elsewhere. There is another duty the department has to perform, and that is to follow up its work, to understand exactly the plans upon which they are working, the methods they use, and that is what we want to know here. I want to say to the minister that there will be no estimates pass the House this year which will be more carefuly looked into their important points than the estimates of the Department of Immigration, and the minister must come prepared to give us definite information about these larger items. We do not propose to make an inquisitorial search into every item, but where you spend money in a certain way we want to know what your plans are, how they are being carried out, and then to be able to judge as to whether it is a good expenditure. Now, in the next two or three pages there is abundant food, there are tremendous expenditures in advertising of different kinds, and it will not be sufficient to say that so much is spent in such a newspaper office or in the printing of so many pamphlets. We want to know what kind of printing this is; we want to know where it goes and how it is distributed, and most important of all, if it is distributed in a way in which it may do good. For instance, in another place we were trying to find out in what way certain expenditures were made by a certain agency which is being paid by this government. What did we find out? We did not have a single scrap of in-

formation as to how the work was done. The only thing we knew was that that agency said it had done so and so, and placed its receipt voucher before the department, but the department itself never exerted a half ounce of energy to know whether that work has been done, whether the receipt voucher was something which actually showed reasonable and continued and productive work. Now, that is not the kind of expenditure the committee ought to vote, and I am certain it is not the kind of expenditure the minister wants to carry on. If we are to spend a million dollars in a propaganda with reference to immigration, we want to revise it very thoroughly and understand the means and methods which are employed in the expenditure. Then the House comes to the conclusion that certain parts of it are not well expended, and certain parts of it might be dropped, and that certain efforts might be better directed otherwise it will have some basis upon which to come to a decision in the matter. I am sure the minister will not think that we are asking anything unreasonable. But these immigration expenditures are going to be very closely criticised, and we have to ask the minister to rub up his knowledge with respect to them and to give us the fullest information.

Mr. OLIVER. Nobody recognizes more fully than myself the perfect propriety of asking that the House be placed in possession of the fullest possible information with regard to all matters of expenditure, including those of the Department of Immigration. However, everybody must recognize that immigration effort is largely of the same nature as the business of commercial advertising. It is just as difficult, I might also say impossible, to give definite information as to a particular method followed in all branches of a great service like immigration, as it would be to describe all the methods of advertising followed by a great commercial house. Conditions vary in different countries and at different times in the same country, and in different localities, and the methods must vary to meet those conditions if we would expect success. Speaking generally, that the methods of immigration have been successful is evinced by the results. In the case of this Belgian agency, as was read a few minutes ago, we began that immigration with something like 125 persons in a year, which number has increased rapidly from year to year. I think that is fair evidence of reasonable ability, and reasonably good judgment in carrying on the work. The details of the expenditure are contained in the Auditor General's Report for the year closing on the 30th June last. The agent himself gives a report, which is incorporated in the annual report of the Department of the Interior for the year 1904-5. As to the nature of his work, he has the following to say:

Mr. FOSTER.

The volume of correspondence is increasing continually. No less than 8,086 letters were received at this office in 1904-5, and were promptly answered when necessary. Besides this, personal inquiries are so numerous that on certain days I am kept from morning to evening answering questions. The immigrant now applying for information generally belongs to the farming class, as I give little encouragement to trades people. I always solicit correspondence from those who immigrate, as well as from old Belgian settlers ; in most cases the letters received eulogize the advantages offered by the country. A certain number of these letters were printed in the winter of 1904-5 in a propaganda publication, which also gave the names of numerous Belgians settled in Manitoba and the Northwest, from whom information could be obtained. This little paper was in great demand, as it stated facts that could easily be verified.

That is part of the work that this gentleman is doing. Of course it will be possible to get a fuller and more complete statement from him.

Mr. FOSTER. How many years has he been there?

Mr. OLIVER. Five years.

Mr. FOSTER. At about the same expenditure?

Mr. OLIVER. I am informed that his expenditures were less in preceding years than they were this year. In his report he mentioned that the Belgian exhibition has had an effect on immigration work, and I assume that the expenditure made by his office was correspondingly increased by the greater business stimulated by that exhibition.

Mr. FOSTER. Does he travel to different parts of Belgium, hold meetings and meet the farmers?

Mr. OLIVER. I am informed he does travel in order to meet the people in different parts of the country

Mr. FOSTER. Is that all the information we can get hold of to show if he has exercised reasonable activity?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know whether we have a more detailed report in the department. Anything we have is certainly at the service of this committee or of the Standing Committee. To procure the information we may not have would, of course, take so long a time that it would deter the business of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. We do not want to be unreasonable but we want to get what there is to get, hoping it will be satisfactory.

Mr. BARR. In looking over the report it is extraordinary that whilst we have this very large expenditure in Belgium we have a larger number of immigrants coming from other countries where there is not so large

an expenditure and where, in fact, we have scarcely an agent. We find that from Syria we have received 3,276 immigrants in five years. It would seem that Belgium is made a sort of hub where these agents are sent and where they can operate. Whilst pretending to secure emigrants in Belgium they are bringing them from other countries where the law does not allow them to carry on a propaganda and the result is that we have a larger number of immigrants from other countries than from Belgium. It would seem that there is operating in this country a company which is very highly favoured, which receives extraordinary bonuses from the government and which we know nothing about. Although we do not know who is managing this corporation we do know that a large sum of money has been paid to it. We find that from such countries as Russia, Iceland and Syria a large number of emigrants are coming. It does not seem to me that the reports are not based on such facts as we should have presented to us, that there is a sort of grouping around Belgium and that they are endeavouring to cover up the propaganda which is going on in other countries. Looking over these accounts it is utterly impossible for hon. members of this House to know where the advertising such as we are being charged with is being done. It is contended that large quantities of advertising matter went out some two or three years ago, that this literature is piled up in rooms and that these old advertisements are sent out year after year. This material costs this company really nothing and yet large sums of money are charged up for the dissemination of the information contained in it. It does seem to me that the time has come when we should have a much more careful examination of these expenditures and a much more detailed account of them than we have at the present time. We are groping in the dark and, we really have no opportunity of checking the figures. I think that this country is now so thoroughly advertised that we will receive all the immigrants that we desire. We are getting them from the United States, and from the British Isles in such numbers as in the next quarter of a century will fill up the great Northwest and we will find in these people much more desirable immigrants who will become better citizens and do greater good to the country than the people we may secure from the continent of Europe. It is my opinion that we have now reached the point when our immigration system must be changed, but in the meantime we must have all the information so that we may have the proper data and vouchers to enable us to check these expenditures.

Mr. FOSTER. There is one point that strikes me as being objectionable in the make up of these votes and it is this: You give a general immigration vote and then you go to work and make large appropriations out of it for special objects. It would seem to me that when the House is passing the vote it ought to have these divided up. I spoke about this on two or three other occasions and my reason for urging it is to make more definite the votes that are given. For instance, you take a large vote for immigration and then you divide it and make special appropriations out of it. You give to the Societe de Colonization de Quebec an appropriation of $4,000; you give to the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company a grant for colonization service of $8,000; you give to the Quebec and Lake St. John Repatriation and Colonization Society a grant of $4,000 and you give to others grants in all amounting to $9,600. What I contend is that in bringing down your estimates these large sums of money which are paid out and which are meant to be subsidies or grants to these different agents or organizations ought to be voted by themselves. They go to these organizations. You have no supervision over them. They are regular subsidies which these different organizations expend as they think best for the purpose of promoting immigration and so they ought to be specialized in the vote. Arguing out on these same lines you might as well let every department just take a gross sum and then let every department divide it up. But, it has always been considered in the interest of definiteness and good administration of expenditures that these amounts ought to be specialized and voted in their several amounts in the estimates. That I think the minister will agree to. It means just simply a change in the itemization of the estimates as they are brought down. Then, I see that there are various smaller items about some of which we would like a little information. I see that H. Greenwood, correspondent of the British press, has been engaged in writing for twelve months and has been paid $584 therefor. Is that Hamar Greenwood, member of the English parliament, and what has he been specially doing ?

Mr. OLIVER. He has been writing articles for insertion in the English papers dealing with Canada with the view of bringing Canada favourably to the attention of English readers.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. May I ask the hon. minister if this Mr. Hamar Greenwood wrote the article commenting on that magnificent speech of the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) after the recent English elections, was he paid for it and if Canada also paid for having articles copied from the Yorkshire Post and other country papers cabled out to Canada? Does the hon. minister know anything about that?

Mr. OLIVER. I must admit that I know nothing about it. I am not aware that the department does either, but if the hon. member wishes it I will make inquiry.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. I will be very pleased if the hon. minister does so because we are anxious to know if Canada is paying out money to have these gentry writing articles in the English press. The Minister of Agriculture, deviating from the rule laid down by the right hon. first minister laid down a platform of his own in relation to preferential trade with England after the recent English elections. There were editorials, or comments in the English papers upon this and these comments were cabled back to Canada. I want to know if these articles in the English papers were written by Mr. Greenwood and others of his friends in the pay of the Canadian government and if the people of Canada paid for the cablegrams back to Canada. I just draw the minister's attention to it. I think the tax payers and especially the farmers on the side lines of Victoria and Haliburton object to that sort of thing. We do not want to pay our money for that sort of business.

Mr. OLIVER. This department does not pay for the cablegrams.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. What department is that in—the Finance ?

Mr. OLIVER. The Finance.

Mr. SPROULE. I notice a number of reports by Mr. Speers that he mentions as having sent to the department, but we have no information at all here or elsewhere as far as I know in regard to what these reports are.

Among others, he says that under date June 7, he reported to the superintendent of immigration concerning colonies of Belgian people settled in eastern Assiniboia ; on September 28, he reported on the Galician, German, Doukhobor and Mormon colonies ; in October he inspected and reported on various settlements in the Saskatchewan, and in November on the German, Hungarian, and Galician colonies in the Beaver Hills district. This gentleman refers to a great many of these reports, but there is no information in the report of the department with regard to the conditions he found existing.

Mr. OLIVER. If the committee wishes any of these reports they will be brought down. It would make the departmental report as bulky and as expensive as the Auditor General's Report if all these reports from officials were included in the volume.

Mr. SPROULE. We have practically only entered on the work of eliciting information from the commissioner of immigration, and the efforts of the committee have been set at naught by refusal to answer the questions put. We have another meeting of the committee to-morrow morning when the examination of the commissioner will be continued, and this information ought to be in our possession before we deal with these estimates.

Mr. OLIVER. If the committee orders any information within the control of the department it will have to be produced. Of course we do not know what the committee wants until it orders it. The committee having summoned Mr. Smart, they must deal with him in regard to the evidence they want him to give.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Yes, and Mr. Smart stated that the former Minister of the Interior knew the names of the gentlemen who are supposed to constitute this North Atlantic Trading Company, and that the information was in the department. That being so, the present minister ought to know, that Mr. Scott, the commissioner of immigration, ought to know who the members of this company are. Mr. Smart was very particular in saying that the information was known to the officers of the department and the minister, but, that he now being in the service of the company he would refuse to divulge it.

Mr. SPROULE. We cannot vote these estimates blindly, before we get the information necessary to discuss them intelligently. The committee should first do its work and then these appropriations should be dealt with in supply. I incidentally mentioned that the committee is handicapped by the refusal of the witnesses to answer questions. Of course they were sustained in that refusal by the Chair and afterwards by a vote of the committee.

Mr. LENNOX. Can't the Minister of the Interior help us in this matter ? It is hardly conceivable that the government would pay money to this North Atlantic Trading Company without knowing the parties with whom they are dealing. The Agriculture Committee and the Public Accounts Committee have been unable so far to obtain any information as to the personnel of this company. The government is paying out public money to this company and surely the minister must know to whom the money is being paid. He should give that information to parliament so that the public may know how responsible these parties are and whether that money is being honestly earned and wisely expended. The feeling of the people of Canada, regardless of political party, is that it is not common sense for the government to pay out money to people whom they do not know ; and if they do know who they are then it is the duty of the government to disclose the information to parliament.

I do not think the minister will find there is any doubt that I am speaking the sentiments of men supporting him as well those opposing him, and that I am speaking the sentiments of Liberals in the country as well as of Conservatives. Look at these

figures. The other day, in answer to the member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), a return was presented of the amounts we have spent on immigration for the years 1900 to 1905. They are given in four classes. for immigration generally, for immigration from the United States, for immigration from Great Britain and for immigration from continental Europe. In the year 1900-01 we spent to promote immigration from all countries, $444,729.63; for promoting immigration from the United States, $144,000; for promoting immigration from Great Britain, $110,000; and for promoting immigration from continental Europe, $43,000. We have increased that expenditure very greatly from that time down to 1904-5. The total amount spent last year for promoting immigration as a whole is $972,356.67, or an increase from the first to the last year mentioned of 118 per cent. In the last year mentioned we have spent in promoting immigration from the United States, $318,000, an increase as compared with the first year mentioned of 120 per cent—this being greater than the general rate. We have spent in promoting immigration from Britain, $198,000 an increase last year as compared with the first year mentioned of 88 per cent; but we have spent $130,000 in 1904-5 in promoting immigration from continental Europe, an increase for the last year as compared with the first year of 200 per cent. We are increasing the expenditure for promoting European immigration in a much more rapid way than that for promoting immigration from any other country, Britain included. Britain has the lowest rate increase of all, only 88 per cent in that time. We have in connection with immigration from Europe this North Atlatic Trading Company of which we can get no information. It is not only the opposition who are complaining. I refer to this for the purpose of urging on the minister that before we meet again, if not tonight, he will make up his mind to tell the committee and the country just who it is we are dealing with. Let me refer the hon. gentleman in that connection to a few lines in an editorial in the Toronto 'Globe,' of April 13, it is not often I care to endorse statements of the 'Globe,' but I can endorse almost every statement contained in this article. I give a few lines from it in case, for any reason, it should change its mind as it has done on other occasions. It says :

> It must be said, however, that the payments to the North Atlantic Trading Company for European immigrants brought to Canada brings up again the whole policy of offering bonuses as an incentive to immigration. The refusal to disclose the personnel of the company makes it the more imperative that that branch of it at least should be closed down. The average immigration from Europe is not so desirable that the ordinary safeguards of government may be ignored in order to secure it. The public does not like secrecy of any kind in the transaction of public business, and if immigration cannot be secured from Europe otherwise, we should try and get along without it. Canada will recover from the shock if Europe will.
>
> It may have been necessary in order to get the tide of immigration flowing towards the Dominion in the past to employ extraordinary efforts. The time has arrived, and, we think, had arrived some time ago, to trust to the general attractions of the country.

Later on it says :

> If anything were needed to give it its quietus the fact that it is necessary to work in secret in Europe in order to get immigrants should furnish the needed force.

It winds up by saying :

> At all events there should be no companies with secrets operating in the field.

I commend that to the minister and I urge upon him that he will consider the question of whether this committee is not entitled to a full disclosure from the department as to the parties to whom we are paying this money, not merely by the name of the North Atlantic Trading Company but the personnel of the company.

The minister said he had nothing to do with controlling Mr. Smart. Mr. Smart left the Department of the Interior where, he was deputy minister, on the express understanding, as I think he stated the other day, that he would enter this service and would not be called upon to disclose the identity of the company in case he entered its service, and he did that with the consent of the minister.

Mr. OLIVER. The discussion has taken a rather wide range and does not seem likely to lead to any very definite conclusion. I am quite able to agree with a great deal of what has been said by opposition speakers, but it seems to me that they hardly appreciate the position. My hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) has intimated that we should not do business with a company unless we know who compose the company. That is a remarkable doctrine. We pay subsidies to steamship companies to the amount of many, many thousands every year and we never inquire who compose the companies; it does not interest us who are the directors in the companies. We know with whom we do business and whether we get service or not, and that is all we require to know in the transaction. So in dealing with railway companies, we know with whom we are dealing but we do not know everybody with whom we are dealing, and it does not concern us and is not material, and so in transactions which the Department of Immigration may have in carrying on its immigration work the question is the results from that work rather than the personnel of those who are engaged in it.

Mr. SPROULE. Do you think there is any analogy between this and giving a subsidy to the Allan Line, the Torrance Line, or the Canadian Pacific Railway ?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not discussing that, I do not wish to enter into that branch of the question, but I should say that any payment for any service has an analogy to any other payment for any other service, whether large or small. But that is not the point. When my hon. friend suggested a little while ago that it was impossible to reach a conclusion with regard to the estimates now before the House because certain proceedings before a certain standing committee had not been concluded, I did not object at all to the position taken by him if he chooses to take it. But these estimates are put before the House for its information, and I am prepared to give all the information in my power both as regards the details and the policy of the department ; and there is no reason why the House should not make up its mind as to whether the expenditure proposed is a proper expenditure or not without waiting for a report of the standing committee. I do not know that the result of the proceedings before that committee would necessarily have any particular bearing upon the question of policy upon which the House must pronounce in voting these estimates. The question before that committee is not one of policy at all but is simply, if I may so describe it, a scandal hunt. In the presentation of these estimates I am not concerned with the result of the proceedings before that committee or the methods followed by it. That committee will carry on its operations as it may deem proper ; and if its proceedings should result in disclosures discreditable to one person or another or to the government, so much the worse for the parties concerned. But the investigation it is persuing has nothing to do with the question of the policy I am submitting to the House with regard to immigration and the expenditures necessary to carry out that policy, and in that connection I shall be very glad to discuss any question which hon. members may desire to have discussed and give all the information I can.

Mr. INGRAM. There is a question I would like to put now. Mr. Smart has sworn, as I understand from the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), that the names of those who compose the North Atlantic Trading Company are in the Department of the Interior and consequently are known to the hon. minister. Are we to understand that he declines to give the names which are already in his department.

Mr. OLIVER. Not at all.

Mr. INGRAM. Does the hon. gentleman deny that they are in his department ?

Mr. OLIVER.

Mr. OLIVER. I have no knowledge that they are, but if they are, they can be produced if the House wants them.

Mr. INGRAM. As I understand, the hon. gentleman has no objection to giving them.

Mr. OLIVER. Not at all. When this question was up last session, I explained to the House as well as I could the conditions surrounding this particular contract ; and I said then that it did not seem to me to be sound public policy, as long as we were going to stand by the contract, to disclose any of the names of those connected with it. However, I referred the matter to my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, and the names, so far as I knew them then and have known them since, were I believe then made public. If they were not, they can be made public now, so long as the gentlemen of the opposition take the responsibility of having them published.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I think that the members of the opposition will probably be willing to take the responsibility the hon. minister has referred to. I do not think there would be any responsibility in that connection which any one in this House ought to shrink from. The scandal hunt—if the minister desires to describe it in that way—is still going on before the committee of agriculture. At least I understand that the examination of witnesses in that connection is not yet concluded. I am not very familiar with the proceedings before that committee except as I have gathered them from the reports in the public press, but I did gather that Mr. Smart refused to give some relevant information which admittedly was in his possession, and that the majority of the committee sustained him. That however is not a matter for comment just now, though it may be at a later date. I did not know until this evening that the witness had undertaken to swear that the information which he withheld from the committee is in the possession of the department. The hon. minister seems not to be very sure whether it is or not. But I presume we can procure some information on that point at a later date. Of course the minister realizes that this contract was the subject of some discussion last year. As I understood the attitude of the government at that time, it simply amounted to this, that the operations, the supposed operations I would be inclined to say—of this company would be very greatly handicapped if it were known in certain countries of the continent of Europe that particular individuals are responsible for the efforts to induce immigration to Caanda from those countries. I recollect that the argument was to this effect, that these gentlemen had been employed to do certain work which they could not do without contravening the laws of the country where they were supposed to

work and that this government was condoning the infraction of violation by these gentlemen of the laws of their country. Therefore this government, being the accomplices of these people, should not disclose the names of their accomplices. However, I do not know that we can deal with that matter very fully at present. The hunt, as the minister calls it, is still going on before the agriculture committee, and although he disclaims any possibility that he may be at all interested in the disclosures which may ensue, still it is possibly within the bounds of belief that they may be interesting to him later on.

I do not rise, however, so much for the purpose of discussing that particular subject as for the purpose of asking my hon. friend for some information about a very considerable item which appears in the Auditor General's Report at pages L-24 and 25. I find there an item of $12,250 for what are called special delegates. It might be very opportune, when we are discussing the general subject of immigration, that we should have some knowledge of the results of the efforts of the thirty or forty different agents who have been despatched to the old country as special delegates.

I have heard from various quarters that the chief work in which a good many of these delegates are employed is simply taking a trip to the mother country at the public expense, and that it would be somewhat difficult to indicate, so far as some are concerned, any special advantage to the country from these expenditures—although I have no doubt that the trips have been very enjoyable to the individuals concerned. Can the minister point out, in respect to any one of these items, what the result to the country has been in the shape of any increase of immigration, any actual results that have made themselves manifest? I have had inquiries concerning the efforts of two or three of these gentlemen. I will take at random one of the larger expenditures. Here, for instance, is an amount of $1,237.97 paid in the case of a Mr. Wilson. Is the minister aware how many persons Mr. Wilson has induced to come to Canada, in what part of the mother country or the continent of Europe he has been carrying on his work, and what he did while there? Mr. Wilson was absent for four months—I suppose the expenditure is for the whole time, from the day of his departure until his return. Of this expenditure, $400 represents his salary, and $837.97 covers travelling expenses of various kinds. Was he endeavouring to procure immigrants for the west or for the province of Nova Scotia, from which province, I believe he comes? I think information of this kind might be usefully given because this class of expenditure represents a considerable amount. If it serves a useful purpose, we would like to know it; if it serves no useful purpose except to furnish trips for these gentlemen at the expense of the country, we would like to know that. Has the minister any report from these gentlemen? And what does this expenditure result in?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not able to say whether we have a report from the gentleman referred to or not, but I believe we have reports from nearly all of the special delegates; if there is such a report in the case mentioned, I will see to it that it shall be brought down for the information of the House. In view of the expenditure that appears opposite his name, I presume that there is a report from Mr. Wilson.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is there one of these gentlemen who has brought a single immigrant to Canada? Can the minister directly trace to the work of any of these gentlemen the bringing of a single immigrant? If the minister cannot point out that, can he show any general advantage, any single benefit to the people from the expenditure of this $12,250.

Mr. OLIVER. I have no personal knowledge of the results of the work of the gentleman in this list; but I have personal knowledge of the results of the work of a special delegate who went from the neighbourhood of Edmonton two or three years ago and through whose efforts a very considerable number of desirable people have come out and settled in Canada. I believe I have fair reason to assume, that, taken as a whole, the efforts of these special delegates have been very successful. It is impossible, of course, to put one's finger upon the total result of any particular effort in immigration work, just as it would be impossible to say of an advertisement that stands in the newspaper day after day, and week after week, that one particular issue had produced a certain result. No man can go through another country and disseminate favourable information in regard to Canada without having an effect beyond what he can show in immediate results. The visits of these special delegates have been part of the work done in England, Scotland and Ireland within recent years for the purpose of securing an increase in desirable immigration from those countries. Speaking for myself, I think it is the most desirable of all forms of immigration effort in those countries; and I think that the tremendous increase in the number of immigrants now coming from the old country, and especially the gratifying difference in the class of immigrants may fairly be attributed in some degree to these special delegates.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not exactly see the analogy that the minister points out. An advertisement in a newspaper is usually prepared for a special purpose, it is prepared by an expert, and it is by preference, inserted in a newspaper of large circulation. It is couched in striking langu-

age, for as we know, advertisement writing has become an art. But the method of the department is not at all like that, as I understand it. The department does not seek to procure men specially familiar with the business of inducing immigrants to come to this country. Speaking under correction, the method of the department is to select some men without particular record or qualifications, except those of services rendered to the Liberal party, and to send them to the mother country at the public expense on the theory that they are a special delegate and can and will promote immigration. I am not speaking so much of the method adopted by the present minister (Mr. Oliver) because he has been only a short time in the department, but I direct his attention to this matter because he is technically responsible for what has taken place under his predecessors. It is idle to tell this committee or to tell me, that this method is in any way analogous to the business of a great firm carried on by advertising. In one case you have systematic and effecient methods; in the other you have nothing of that kind; you have men selected without regard to qualifications, other than party qualifications, who are sent at the expense of the public treasury to the mother country nominally to promote immigration. It may be possible, and no doubt has occurred, that some of these men are men of force and intelligence who have done some good. I am not speaking of the exceptions but of the system as a whole. Will the minister, when he comes to deal with this matter again—for it will have to be dealt with again—give us some idea of the qualifications of some of these gentlemen—for instance Mr. Wilson, Mr. Gillies, Mr. Douglas. On the ocean passage of the last named gentleman $29.20 was spent. I do not know what that item means. Will the minster say why these gentlemen were selected? If the minister proposes to do work of this kind, why does he not select experts, men who are familiar with the work and who have had experience in it? Why do you go on selecting new men year after year with no other apparent purpose than giving a new lot in every succeeding year an opportunity to take a trip to the mother country at the expense of the people of Canada? That is the criticism I would be inclined to make upon the methods of the past. I do not know what methods the minster proposes to adopt in the future.

Mr. OLIVER. I think the criticism is hardly fair and scarcely in accordance with the facts. I have some personal knowledge of the system of sending these special delegates in past years, and the desire was to select successful farmers, men who had made a success of farming in the west; I speak only of that part of the country. The object was to select natives of the old country who had been successful in the west who could carry back with them evidences of their success in Canada which would do more to impress the minds of the classes likely to immigrate than any other possible means. The man who himself has succeeded in Canada, though he might not be as eloquent as the professional immigration agent, yet his very presence and statements would carry convictions to the minds of his neighbours and relatives. This is the principle upon which these special delegates were selected; it may have been departed from in some instances. But when the hon. gentleman says there was no principle in the selection, I am compelled to differ from him and tell him that that was the principle, and in my estimation it was a good principle and has produced good results. The large immigration we are getting to-day from the old country is a part of those results. The information asked for by the hon. gentleman will be brought down at the next sitting.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How many of these men whose names are given on pages L—24 and L—25 came from each province; how many are from the west; how many were originally natives of the old country and how many of them have been selected for that reason? It may be that I am under a misapprehension as to the practice, the department may have had a perfectly good principle to begin its work upon, I am speaking of the practice as it is carried out to-day, of which information has come to me from different parts of the country, though I do not vouch for its correctness. I have no personal knowledge of the facts, and I am giving them to the minister exactly as they have come to me. If the minister will be good enough to give us that information we will discuss it more fully when we next take up the item now before us.

Mr. SPROULE. We have heard many complimentary remarks on the system of immigration carried on by the present government, but it occurs to me that their efforts have not been attended with such great results after all as might be expected from the large expenditure of money that we make when we compare the results with the immigration that is pouring into the United States. In answer to a question I put on the paper some time ago it was stated that the amount spent on immigration last year was $972,356. In 1896, when the Conservative government was in power, they spent $120,000, owing to the way they were attacked for this expenditure. They had been cutting it down every year, and still they were being attacked, I was going to say ferociously attacked, for the heavy expenditure on immigration. We were told that it was not justifiable, that it was not attended with such results as might be expected, that there

was no wisdom in the expenditure. The incoming government put up the expenditure, and I think very properly, put it up at that time, because we were not receiving the immigration that we needed. But the expenditure has been increasing ever since, until last year it reached nearly a million dollars, and I have no doubt it will reach the million dollar mark this year. We are told that we receive wonderful results. But I notice in looking over the returns from the United States that they received in round figures last year about twelve times as many immigrants as we did. They have no more unoccupied land that they can offer to the immigrant, no more free grants, and the overflow from their country into ours is partly owing to that fact. Notwithstanding that I notice that they are getting twelve times as many immigrants as we get in Canada, and they were obliged not only to cut off their expenses for immigration, but to pass a Bill recently something like the following:

The house committee on immigration to-day completed its Bill to further restrict the coming of aliens to the United States. The Bill increases the head tax on aliens from $2 to $5.

They are charging $5 a head to let them into the country, while on the contrary we are paying them a bonus of $5 or $6 a head to come in.

It requires each male adult to possess $25 in money and each female $15. A family may be admitted on its head showing $50.

An educational test provides that each immigrant over sixteen years of age must be able to read in some language. It places in the excluded class imbeciles, the weak minded and manual labourers of poor physique. It gives the Department of Commerce and Labour discretion to admit or exclude immigrants under sixteen years of age coming to the United States alone.

Now if the United States are able to draw to their country without any free land grant to offer them, twelve times as many immigrants as we get, at the same time charging them $2 a head, as they have been doing in the past, excluding the physically weak, the imbeciles, the diseased, and all other undesirable classes, even sending them back at the rate of thousands every year, then I say we have not accomplished such wonderful results considering the great expenditure we have been making.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How much does the United States spend in Europe ?

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know, but their expenditure has been cut down greatly, they say to-day that they do not require to pay aliens to come out from the old country, the trouble is that immigrants are coming in in too large numbers. On the other hand look at our situation. The hon. minister gave us a list of immigration agencies in the United States, Europe and other countries, and if my calculation was correct, we have over 125 salaried agents that are employed to-day in scouring the world to find immigrants to this country. The minister spoke a short time ago about the very desirable class of immigrants we are getting to-day compared with what it was a few years ago, and he wished us to conclude that we are getting splendid results for the expenditure. Our experience is that we are not getting the most desirable class of immigrants to-day. In various parts of the country you will find people who were brought out here as farm labourers or farm servants, and they will tell you that they have never been on a farm in their lives, and never worked an hour on a farm. They are coming from London, Liverpool, Manchester and from the other metropolitan cities of England and although they know nothing about farming they are put down here for the purpose of going on farms. These are not desirable immigrants and after you distribute them in the province of Ontario it is found by very many of our farmers that they are of little or no use. What is the result ? Many of them drift back into the villages, remain there for a short time and then gradually drift back to the cities. I could count up a number with whom I am well acquainted who came into our part of the country, who were of no use, who got back into the villages, who in time became a burden on the charities of the locality and some of whom have been kept from starvation. A sum of money has been spent by the authorities of these villages to take them back to the cities to get rid of them. This is not a desirable class. The United States, whilst refusing admission to the physically weak, to those who are diseased, to the undesirable element, insist that each male adult shall be possessed of $25 in money, that each female shall have $15 or that a family shall have $50. The United States do all that and yet they get more immigrants proportionately to population than we do to-day although they have none of the valuable and fertile lands to offer to immigrants that we have. In my judgment we are not accomplishing very much and we are bringing in a large number of people who are becoming a burden upon the charities of the country. There is no doubt about that. I took up a paper the other day and it gave the number of immigrants who had gone back to be supported by charity in Toronto last winter. In Montreal and other places the same condition is to be found. People who are reported as farm labourers, as having been brought from the farms of the old country, are settled on the farms here a large number of whom, I have reason to believe, were never farmers in their lives and have not in them the makings of farmers here. While I admit that there will be a percentage of

them, who, although they have not been accustomed to farming, may succeed, the great bulk of them will not succeed. I do not think we have received the best results from the heavy expenditure we have been making in the last few years. I think the time has come when we should not require to have an army of paid immigration agents scouring the world for emigrants to bring to this country. I think that the inducements we can offer are sufficient to bring a desirable class here in as large numbers as in my judgment the country can assimilate and make good citizens of and that we do not require to bring in any other class. We are told that these immigrants are inspected in the old country, that we do not bring in any who are physically or mentally unsound. I took up a clipping from a paper a short time ago which refers to two cases and which I give as an example of many more that have got through in the same way. It is as follows :

Dumped in Toronto—Men suffering from trachoma, infectious eye disease, staying here.

Trachoma is a disease that is prevalent in southern Europe and we are told that these immigrants are examined and that any suffering from trachoma are not allowed to come in.

Trachoma is a disease of the eyes prevalent in southern Europe and in Asia and of such a virulent and infectious character that the government prohibits the entrance to Canada of immigrants afflicted with it. Recently a couple of Syrians affected with the disease passed the immigration authorities at Halifax or St. John and came on through Toronto en route to the United States. The United States immigration authorities stopped these two men at the border and they were sent back to Toronto, where they are now living in a poor way at the expense of a relative in the United States, who has work awaiting for these men. Mr. Walsh, assistant relief officer, endeavoured to see if these men could not get into the United States. but the authorities pointed to the evidences of the disease, which was plain to be seen, and consequently they are held in Toronto.

It is strange to me that if it was so plain to be seen by the inspector at the United States border it has not been equally plain to be seen by our inspectors at the Canadian border and if so I cannot understand why they were allowed to come in.

Mr. Walsh thinks it very curious that men who were stopped by the United States authorities should not have been stopped by the Canadian immigration physicians, who ought to be as strict. It is believed if the Canadian medical director of immigration, Dr. Bryce, knew of this, he would have these men sent back to Europe at the expense of the steamship companies. It is certainly felt they should not be dumped on Toronto.

I had two or three others. This is only one. An effort was made to send some of these people back but it did not succeed. It is claimed that they could not send them back and they are remaining in Canada. I merely read this as evidence that the inspection is not as thorough as we have been lead to believe or as we have been told it is from year to year because these people do come in. And they do come in, not at a time when the disease has not developed but when it has developed to the extent that it is quite apparent to the inspectors of the United States who do not admit these people into that country while the Canadian inspectors allow them to come in here. There are many of these cases drifting into the hospitals. I saw a report in which it was stated that a number had drifted into the hospitals in Toronto with other diseases as well. The same thing is true in regard to the hospitals in Montreal. If the inspection is as thorough as we are led to believe how do these people get in ? It seems that the inspection is faulty somehow or other. We allow this very undesirable class to come in, not only the diseased and the physically weak that are not fit for the rigours of life here but we are allowing a large number to come in who are not farmers, who never were farmers, who know nothing about farming and who are not even mechanics, but many of whom are becoming a burden on the charities of the country. Yet we say we are accomplishing such grand results by the expenditure for immigration. I say we have reached the day when the attractions of our country ought to be sufficient to bring immigrants here without spending the large amount of money that we are spending at the present time to try and get immigrants to come to this country. I say as well that there are many coming to this country who are very undesirable people and who become a burden upon the charities of the country almost as soon as they reach it.

Mr. OLIVER. I think that the committee is to be congratulated on the frank position taken by the hon. member who has just sat down (Mr. Sproule). If the position which he has taken is the position of his friends on the other side we can perhaps arrive at a conclusion in regard to this immigration vote. If I understand the hon. gentleman correctly his view is that immigration effort on the part of Canada should cease and that this vote as a matter of fact should be struck out. That is an intelligible position and one that my hon. friend is certainly entitled to take. If it is the position of himself and his friends on the other side of course we are compelled to take issue with them on that point.

My hon. friend fails to appreciate the value of the immigration work done in Canada in recent years. I can speak of it impartially because I have been practically interested in it only so recently that my effort has had comparatively nothing to do with the result. My hon. friend

compares the condition of Canada with that of the United States, and the immigration to Canada with that to the United States. The weakness of his argument is that there is no necessary similarity between the two countries. That is evidenced by the fact that although Canada has an area equal to that of the United States and although Canada has been the subject of colonization as long as the United States one country has 80,000,000 people to-day and the other but 6,000,000. That shows that there is a difference of conditions between the two countries which warrants the adoption of a different method in dealing with the increase of population. The people are not going to the United States because of free land for there is no free land there now; the immigration to the United States is largely of a class of people who are looking for opportunity which grows out of the occupation of land by others rather than by themselves. It is because such people carry with them the disabilities of which the hon. gentleman has spoken, that the United States government has found it necessary to take extra precautions to prevent the influx of the diseased and the undesirable This large emigration which is going to the United States is no evidence that if Canada ceased her efforts there would be a flow of desirable immigrants into Canada. We don't want the class of immigration that is going into the United States even if we could get it; we have a different field to offer immigrants and we are getting a different class. To-day there is a flow of people into Canada, from the United States, from Great Britain, and to some extent from continental Europe, at which many of us are astonished. But it has not always been so. Canada has been Canada ever since the world has been the world, Canada has been a united Canada since 1870; Canada has had a transcontinental railway since 1885; the Northwest has had railway development during all the years since; but although we have had the Northwest practically as it is to-day we did not have immigration. One of the hon. gentlemen opposite stated that we could not expect settlement in Canada until the United States had filled up. But the United States was practically filled up years ago, and still we were not getting immigrants. At the time of the Oklahoma boom, when that great territory was thrown open to settlement, land hunger was so great in the United States that the people lined up in thousands at the boundary of that territory and at a signal rushed across the line and staked their claims and staked that whole state in side of a very few days. But at that very time you could not give land away in the Northwest, and there was no immigration. It was not because there was not a desire to get land, but it was because the knowledge of the advantages of our Northwest had not been spread in the United States. As my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) said, this effort must be persistent in order to secure results. The first efforts of this government did not procure great results; it required persistence. It might seem to some that a complete withdrawal of efforts now may not be followed by the cessation of these results. That may be a possibility, but the fact remains that it is absolutely because of the efforts of the immigration department that the rush of immigration has been brought about. My hon. friends hardly realize what this rush of immigrants has meant to the Northwest and to all Canada. A few years ago we had vast areas on these prairies at the value of $1 or $2 an acre. It was not worth $3 an acre because it could not be sold for that price. The Canadian Pacific Railway had some 16,000,000 acres of land there, and the first and the last acre of it could have been bought at $3 an acre, but neither the first acre nor the last acre was bought, nobody wanted it at the price. To-day that land is worth $8 or $10 or $12 an acre; no one can fix a value on a great deal of it. This means that the actual assessable value of this Dominion has been increased by hundreds of millions of dollars because of the movement of immigrants into that country, and because the value has been created by the demand for the land. It is not necessary to point to the result that has come to eastern Canada by reason of the increased trade resulting from the increase in population in the west. The wholesale dealers of Montreal and Toronto, the manufacturers throughout eastern Canada owe their increased prosperity in recent years very largely to the increase of settlement and production in the west. That comes about, not because the Northwest is different from what it was before; not because of great railroad construction in the Northwest as compared with years previously, but solely because of the influx of people which has been brought about by the efforts of the immigration department. My hon. friend talks about the large expenditure on immigration to-day; he says it was $100,000 under the late government and that the Liberal opposition then said it was too large. The reason it was said to be too large was because there were no results, because the money was being thrown away and there was nothing to show for it. The condition now is altogether different. A million a year for which results can be shown is economy where $100,000 a year producing no results is an absolute waste. Considering the results of the immigration policy of my predecessor the value outweighs a hundred times and a thousand times the expenditure made upon it. Criticism of details of that administration may be legitimate but the

details are a small matter, let them be what they may, as compared with results.

Methods must change with varying conditions. Reference has been made to disease in immigrants. This government has dealt with that to a very considerable extent. One hon. gentleman wondered that two cases of trachoma had succeeded in getting past our medical inspection. If my hon. friend were to visit a seaport and see the passengers landing he would give great credit to the medical service of this department for not letting pass a very much larger number of such cases. The returns show that for the year 1904-5, 496 deportations were made of undesirable immigrants through Canadian Atlantic ports and 115 by American ports, a total of nearly 600 deportations for that year as the results of the efforts of our medical department. With thousands of people coming in there is always the danger of importation of disease and poverty and although efforts have been made by the immigration department in past years these efforts have been hampered by the state of our law. My predecessor referred to that in the House and I have given notice of a Bill to amend the law in respect to medical inspection of immigrants and I hope, I have no doubt, I will have the support of hon. members in getting that Bill through the House. It will make provision for much greater energy in handling immigrants, in following them, in classifying them, in deporting when necessary and in dealing with them generaly. It is necessary we should have these enlarged powers in order to handle this question successfully. We have to meet conditions as they arise and we hope to deal with them more effectually in the future under our new Bill.

In regard to the working capacity or cal ling in life of immigrants we are aware that in the past there has been some complaint, as there must necessarily arise complaints, in regard to the class of people who will take advantage of the supposed favourable conditions in a new country. Our arrangements for the encouragement of immigrants from England, besides advertising and general agency work, included the payment of a bonus of $1.75 per head to the booking agents as an inducement to them to book the prospective immigrants to Canada rather than to any other country. That is the principle on which the bonus has been paid, and the principle has been acted upon by the government of Canada for very many years. It may be good or bad, but that is the principle, that it pays to give the booking agents some small consideration as an inducement to book the passengers to Canada if possible. It was understood that this bonus should only be paid on immigrants who were of the farming or farm labouring classes, but this was so administered as to include as farmers or farm labourers, immigrants who on landing in Canada declared their intention of entering upon farm work, or entering upon farming as an occupation. The result of that system of paying the booking agents a bonus on the expressed intention necessarily was that any man of any class, an artisan or clerk or whatever else he might be might on landing in Canada, after expressing his intention of becoming a farmer, be rated as a farmer. In practical operation this was found to work out not entirely satisfactorily. On one hand our agents at the ports refused to accept very large numbers of these people for bonus, on the ground that they were not people of farming occupation. On the other hand the booking agents claimed that they were entitled to this bonus because these people had informed them that when they bought the tickets that they were going to engage in farm labour in Canada. Some little time ago the conclusion was reached that it would be advantageous to change the basis of payment of this bonus and to make it contingent upon the person having been actually engaged in farm labour or in some similar or kindred occupation in the old country for at least a year before starting for Canada. That is to say we changed the basis of paying the bonus from the expressed intention of the immigrant to his actual occupation in the old country.

Mr. SPROULE. When was that change made ?

Mr. OLIVER. That came into operation on the 1st of April of this year. The result of this change would naturally be to very much decrease the number of people upon whom the bonus would be paid. I thought that, under the circumstances, recognizing the shortage of farm labour in Canada at present and the desirability of getting a class of people who may be expected to be useful on a farm, it would be fair to increase the bonus, so that instead of paying $1.75 per head upon all who may declare their intention of becoming farmers we now pay $5 a head upon those who have been farm labourers or been engaged in kindred occupations in the old country. The notice is dated March 20, and is as follows :

The Canadian government has decided to make a change in the system of payment of bonuses to booking-agents on tickets sold to Canada, and I beg to inform you that the following rules will come into effect respecting tickets sold on or after the 1st April, 1906 :

1. Bonus will be paid, provided the regulations of the department are complied with, upon tickets to Canada sold to persons whose occupation in the old country is, and has been for at least one year, one of the following, viz.: farmers, farm labourers, gardeners, stablemen, carters, railway sectionmen, navvies, or miners, and who have signified their intention of following farming in Canada ; and to female domestic servants.

2. The bonus will be £1 on each person of prescribed classes, eighteen years of age or over,

and 10 shillings on those between one and eighteen years of age. No bonus on infants, tourists, returning Canadians, saloon passengers, prepaid tickets, or persons of other occupations than one of the above named, or on persons mentally or physically unfit.

We think that the result of this change will have a desirable effect in many ways; and not the least will be that it will place beyond question our position regarding the bringing in of artisans. It has been a matter of some comment and question among the labour organizations that there was possibility of the machinery of the immigration department being used to promote competition in their particular lines of labour. The department has never had any desire to take that position. Its efforts have been entirely in the interests of agriculture and not of manufacturing and other industries. We believe that the change of system will put beyond question the fact that the machinery of the immigration department is not to be used for the purpose of promoting the immigration of people other than those who are likely to engage in farm work.

Mr. LALOR. What evidence do you get as to the occupation of the immigrant? How do you know that an immigrant is a farm labourer?

Mr. OLIVER. We have the provision here that the booking agent must place the evidence as to his occupation before one of our accredited agents in the old country before he can get the bonus.

Mr. LALOR. Is it simply the statement of the immigrant which is taken?

Mr. OLIVER. No, our agents must be satisfied as to the class to which the immigrant belongs.

Mr. LALOR. I would suppose that the agent would be easily satisfied on account of the $5 he received.

Mr. OLIVER. It is the booking agent, and not our accredited agents, who receives the $5. It is our salaried agent, who has nothing to do with the booking agent, who has to pass an opinion on the qualifications of the applicant for the ticket. And if the individual immigrant does not receive a certificate from our accredited agent in the old country, then our agents at this end of the line question him and accept or reject him for the bonus according to their best judgment. And judging by the complaints we have had from ticket agencies, I am satisfied that there is little danger of the bonus being paid in any case where it is not warranted.

Mr. LAKE. Is there different treatment accorded to the British immigrant as compared with the foreigner? As I understood the other day in the examination of the Commissioner of Immigration, it is the purser on board ship who takes the list of passengers and finds out whether they claim to belong to the farming class or not.

Mr. OLIVER. Of course the purser makes out his manifest giving the list of passengers and all particulars in regard to them, but that is for information only, and it does not control our commissioners when checking the lists for the payment of bonuses.

Mr. LAKE. But our officials take the purser's list to ascertain whether an immigrant is a farmer or not.

Mr. OLIVER. That is the supposed case.

Mr. LAKE. Is it actually the case?

Mr. OLIVER. I am told it is within reasonable limits.

Mr. LENNOX. The answer we got from the Agricultural Committee was that the question was never asked.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. The manifest of the purser is taken as a guarantee.

Mr. PATERSON. Is it at all likely that the committee have the information they desire to enable them to let some of the items pass or do they require more? There are very few here at this hour and it is evident that if the items do not pass the whole thing will have to be repeated again, and I do not know why we should waste any more of our time to-night. If there is any possibility of the committee doing any work we will sit on, but if not we might as well adjourn especially as it is now past midnight.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is very sensible.

Mr. PATERSON. I take it for granted you have not yet had all the information you require.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. This is just a preliminary canter.

Mr. PATERSON. We have been at it two days now.

Mr. OLIVER. In reply to the hon. member from Marquette (Mr. Roche) I wish to say again that the ships manifest is not accepted as our authority in checking the immigrants.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. That differs from the evidence given in the Agricultural Committee the other day.

Some resolutions reported.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does the government propose to take up any of its own

business to-morrow if we should get through in time with the notices of motion and public Bills and orders?

Mr. PATERSON. I have no information on that point. Is it likely that we shall clean the order paper to-morrow?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I have no idea.

Mr. PATERSON. I can only say that if we do and the government business is gone on with we shall probably move to go into supply. If the idea of the hon. gentlemen opposite is that we should wait until the labours of the Committee on Agriculture and Colonization are completed, we might take some other branch of the estimates. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) informs me that he is ready and we shall probably take up his estimates first.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned 12.10 a.m. Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

WEDNESDAY, April 18, 1906.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

REPORTS PRESENTED.

Criminal statistics for the year ended June 30, 1905.—Hon. Mr. Fisher.

Annual Report of the Department of Militia and Defence for the year ended December 31, 1905.—Sir Frederick Borden.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 117) to incorporate the Erie, London and Tillsonburg Railway Company.—Mr. M. S. Schell.

Bill (No. 118) respecting the South Shore Railway Company and the Quebec Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Devlin.

Bill (No. 119) to incorporate the Vancouver and Northwestern Railway Company.—Mr. Macpherson.

Bill (No. 120) to incorporate the Fort William and Port Arthur Terminal Railway and Bridge Company.—Mr. Macpherson.

Bill (No. 121) respecting the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—Mr. Watson.

Bill (No. 122) respecting a certain patent of Franklin Montgomery Grey.—Mr. Campbell—by Mr. Johnston.

Bill (No. 123) respecting patent 69140 of the Underwood Typewriter Company.—Mr. Campbell—by Mr. Johnston.

PETITION OF PACIFIC AND EASTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

Hon. N. A. BELCOURT (Ottawa) moved:

That the petition of Sir Henry Pellatt and others presented this day praying that leave may be granted to Sir Henry Pellatt and others to present their petition for an Act to incorporate the Pacific and Eastern Railway Company, notwithstanding the expiration of the time for receiving such petition, be read and received forthwith and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders.

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

Mr. BELCOURT. The explanation is that the time for the presentation of petitions was extended until the 12th of this month. The gentlemen concerned in this Bill thought they would have until that date to present it and it would have been presented on the 12th, only the House was not in session on that day. You will remember that the House rose on the 11th and there was no opportunity of presenting it on the day fixed.

Motion agreed to.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

That the name of Mr. E. D. Smith be substituted for that of Mr. White on the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, and that Mr. Ross (North Cape Breton and Victoria) be appointed a member of the following standing committees: Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines; Banking and Commerce, and Miscellaneous Private Bills.

Motion agreed to.

HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS OF MONTREAL.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 124) respecting the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal. He said:

The object of the Bill is to reorganize the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal. Several representations have been made to the department by the boards of trade and others asking that a reorganization should be made of the Harbour Commission and it was found advisable after having given the matter serious consideration to reorganize the board. There are at present 11 commissioners; six are appointed by the government and five are nominated by different local bodies—the board of trade has one representative; the corn exchange one; la chambre de commerce, one; the shipping interests, one; and the city of Montreal is represented by the mayor who is a commissioner ex officio. Contracts were given some years ago to carry on certain works in the harbour and for different reasons those works have been greatly delayed. It has become

advisable and indeed urgent that the constitution of the board should be reorganized in order to push more actively to a completion the works which are now pending. The Bill provides for the repeal of all the sections of the old Act governing the appointment of the six commissioners appointed by the government and of the five commissioners nominated by the different bodies I have mentioned. It is provided that the eleven commissioners shall be replaced by three commissioners who will be appointed during pleasure by the Governor in Council. I am free to say that this step which we are now taking is in the direction of making Montreal more and more a national port. This idea has been long ago ventilated not only by the people of Montreal, but by the people of the different parts of the Dominion, and I believe we are voicing the sentiments of the people in declaring that Montreal should be more and more a national port. It is suggested also that the commissioners should devote most of their time to the business of the port. I have said that there are important works now under contract and the existing commissioners had not sufficient time to devote to the consideration of the different questions which were daily arising in connection with these works. It is expected that the three new commissioners who will be appointed will have to devote all of their time or most of their time, to the business of the commission.

Mr. MONK. Are they to receive a salary?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes; the Bill provides that they shall receive a salary out of the revenues of the harbour. There is a further provision that the Bill shall come into force on proclamation. It is thought that if the Bill should come into force immediately without proclamation, then on the day of its sanction the present commission would cease to exist and the harbour of Montreal might be for some time without any commission in charge. Hence the provision that the Bill shall come into force by proclamation.

Mr. MONK. Does the Bill deal with the existing funded indebtedness of the harbour ?

Mr. BRODEUR. The indebtedness of the Harbour Commission remains as it is.

Mr. MONK. What salaries are these commissioners to receive?

Mr. BRODEUR. That will be fixed by the Governor in Council. There is no stated salary in the Bill for these commissioners.

Mr. STOCKTON. I understood the minister to say that this was a movement in the direction of eventually making the port of Montreal a national port. I wish to ask, whether he, or the government of which he is a member, has also considered the desirability of moving to make our other Atlantic ports, national ports?

Mr. BRODEUR. As I have just declared, this Bill is in the direction of making Montreal more and more a national port. The question of making the other ports national ports has not been absolutely considered by the government, but of course that is a question which will have to be considered very soon.

Mr. DANIEL. Would the minister kindly explain what he means by 'nationalizing a port'; what does it really mean ?

Mr. BRODEUR. I said that the commissioners would be men appointed by the Governor in Council, and in that respect they become more and more under the control of the national authority.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that all?

Mr. DANIEL. Does it mean or does it not, that it will make Montreal a free port ?

Mr. BRODEUR. That is quite a different thing; it is a national port.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

NEW BRUNSWICK PETROLEUM COMPANY.

Mr. BARKER asked :

1. How, when and where was the New Brunswick Petroleum Company incorporated ?
2. What is said company's authorized capital, its subscribed, and its paid up capital ?
3. How much of such subscribed and of such paid up capital stock, respectively, is held by the Hon. H. R. Emmerson in his own name ; and how much additional stock, if any, is he entitled to or interested in ; and in whose name is such additional stock ?
4. What are the names of the several persons who have been presidents, vice-presidents, managing directors, directors or secretaries, respectively, of said company, from the time of its incorporation, and for what periods did they respectively hold such office ?
5. Has the Hon. H. R. Emmerson at any time, and if so, when, transferred to any person, and to whom, any and what stock in said company ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. Under an Act to encourage the discovery and development of oil and natural gas within the province of New Brunswick, passed in the year 1899, it was provided that in order to thoroughly explore and prospect a portion or portions of the province which furnished strong indications of the existence of oil or natural gas, and if possible to demonstrate the existence within the province of valuable deposits of such oil and natural gas, and to induce capitalists to venture and expend the amount necessary for that purpose, the Lieutenant Governor in Council be given an

authority to grant a license to search for oil and natural gas within an area or areas in the province, to be specified in the license, to a company of persons or body corporate, who should be incorporated under the laws of that province, for the purpose of prospecting for and mining oil and natural gas, and who should satisfy the Lieutenant Governor in Council of their ability and bona fides in the matter. Subsequently, and in the same year, the New Brunswick Petroleum Company was incorporated under the laws of the province to carry out the objects of the said Act.

2. The authorized capital of the New Brunswick Petroleum Company was $1,000,000, of 100,000 shares at $10 each, paid up and non-assessable. The subscribed stock at the date of incorporation was 32,000 shares, which has since been increased to 76,869 shares, there remaining in the treasury unsold 23,131 shares.

3. Mr. Emmerson was not a shareholder nor in any way financially interested in the New Brunswick Petroleum Company at the time of its incorporation, nor until June, 1901. He holds, by purchase from time to time since June 1901, paid up stock to the extent of 10,910 shares. Mr. Emmerson is not entitled to nor interested in any other shares than those standing in his own name.

4. The provisional directors at the date of incorporation in 1899 were: Hon. George G. King, Hon. Ambrose D. Richard, Henry C. Read, Mathew Lodge, Ernest Hutchison, Willard Kitchen, W. Frank Taylor.

Subsequently, the following persons were elected by the shareholders: Hon. George G. King, president; Hon. A. D. Richard, vice-president; Ernest Hutchison, director; Willard Kitchen, director; Henry C. Read, director; A. P. Barnhill, director; Mathew Lodge, director.

Mathew Lodge being the Secretary Treasurer.

At a meeting of the directors on 24th October, 1900, E. P. Eastman was appointed manager. He resigned in June, 1901, and H. R. Emmerson was appointed to fill the position.

On 5th November, 1901, the following were elected: H. R. Emmerson, president; A. D. Richard, vice-president; Mathew Lodge, secretary-treasurer; Joseph Allison, director; A. P. Barnhill, director; Ernest Hutchison, director; Harvey Atkinson, director.

In October, 1902, the directors of 1901 were re-elected.

In October, 1903, the following directors were elected: H. R. Emmerson, president; A. D. Richard, vice-president; Joseph Allison, director; Fred W. Sumner, director; Nathaniel Curry, director; Hon. A. R. McClelan, director; B. F. Pearson, director.

In December, 1904, the directors of 1903 were re-elected, with the addition of C. S. Hickman and F. H. Deacon.

Mr. EMMERSON.

Shortly after January of that year, Mr. Emmerson tendered his resignation as president and director of the company. This was not acted upon, Mr. Sumner assuming the duties of managing director and acting in the place of Mr. Emmerson in all matters relating to the company.

In 1905, the directors of 1904 were re-elected.

In March of the current year, the resignation of Mr. Emmerson as president and director, tendered early in 1904, was accepted, and Mr. F. W. Sumner was elected president, in addition to his duties as managing director. Mr. M. Lodge was elected a director to fill the vacancy.

5. Mr. Emmerson has not disposed of any of his stock in the said company.

EMPLOYEES OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Mr. SPROULE asked:

1. How many permanent employees are at present in the service of the Senate and House of Commons, respectively, and what are the names and duties of each?

2. What is the salary and length of service in each case?

3. How many sessional employees are at this date in the service of the Senate and House of Commons, respectively, the daily pay of each, and the names and duties of each?

4. What number of employees of both classes were employed in the session of 1896?

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). With reference to questions 1, 2 and 3, the information is too voluminous to be given in the form of an answer. If my hon. friend will move for an order of the House, the information will be given forthwith. With regard to the 4th question, the staff of the House of Commons in 1896 was as follows: permanent staff, 57; sessional staff, 117.

Mr. SPROULE. I may be allowed to say that I thought it was so easy to give this information that it was unnecessary to move for a return. When a return is moved for, it is so long before we can get any reply that it is practically useless.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, I have the reply here, but it fills several pages.

IMMIGRATION—IRREGULARITIES.

Mr. BARKER asked:

1. Has the Department of the Interior, or any department or member of the government, any, and if so, what, information regarding alleged irregular or improper dealings, acts, charges, payments or accounts of any officer, agent or other person in Great Britain and Ireland, or in Europe, in connection with immigration to Canada?

2. What is the period covered thereby?

3. What, if any, communications upon or in relation to such matters have been had from or with the High Commissioner for Canada, the

Commissioner of Immigration, or others, in writing or otherwise ?

4. Will the government lay upon the table of the House all correspondence, reports and papers, if any, relating to such matters ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The information asked for can best be given in the form of a return, which can be brought down as soon as an order of the House is obtained.

GEOLOGY OF PONTIAC COUNTY.

Mr. PICHE asked :

1. Has the government any information in regard to the geological formation of Pontiac county ?

2. Has a report been made by the officers of the Department of the Interior ?

3. Could a copy of this report, with maps, be laid on the table of the House ?

4. If the government is not in possession of full information, does it intend sending engineers to make a complete survey and report on the mines in that country ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. In Pontiac county geological surveys have been made of the eastern portion from the Ottawa river north for a distance of sixty miles, extending west thence to the upper Ottawa at Des Joachims rapids, the map now in the printer's hands showing the country north of the Ottawa as far west as Deep river, where the northern line of the map is distant about ten miles. The only other portions of the country which have been examined by the geological survey is a portion east of Lake Temiskaming extending eastward as far as the eastern shore of Kippewa lake, shown on Dr. Barlow's map of the Temiskaming area, and a portion along the upper Ottawa extending as far south as Grand land, Victoria, shown on Dr. Bell's map of the basin of the Nottaway river. Between these lines no work has yet been done by the survey.

2. A report of the area west of the Gatineau and north of the Ottawa as far west as Oiseau rock is in the director's hands, but not yet printed ; the map to accompany this is in the printer's hands, but not yet quite ready for issue.

3. Not until published.

4. The matter is under consideration.

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS.

Mr. DANIEL—by Mr. Taylor—asked :

What amount has been paid in fees for attendance at board meetings and committee meetings to each member and ex-member of the Harbour Commission of Montreal for and during the calendar year 1905, and the first three months of 1906 ?

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). The amount paid for fees for attendance at board meetings and committees to each member and ex-member for and during the calendar year of 1905 and the first three months of 1906, was as follows :

	1905.	1906.
Hon. Robert Mackay, president	$ 875 00	$ 155 00
Robert Bickerdike, M.P.	730 00	205 00
Alphonse Racine	755 00	215 00
E. H. Lemay	565 00	30 00
William E. Doran	775 00	230 00
E. Goff Penny (from 9th August)	205 00	115 00
H. Laporte, mayor (to January 31)	400 00	5 00
H. A. Ekers, mayor (from February 1)	.....	70 00
James Crathern	570 00	135 00
Alexander McFee	730 00	205 00
L. E. Geoffrion (to July 31).	385 00	.....
H. A. A. Brault (from August 1)	270 00	245 00
Robert Reford (to May 2)	185 00	.....
Andrew A. Allan (from June 16)	240 00	180 00
	$6,685 00	$1,790 00

This does not include the salary of the president, which is $2,000.

MR. P. J. HAMILTON.

Mr. LAKE asked :

1. Has the Indian Department received reports from their officials as to the qualifications of Mr. P. J. Hamilton, when farm instructor at the Touchwood Hills agency ?

2. Were these reports of a highly favourable character or otherwise, and what dates do they bear ?

3. Upon whose recommendation was this gentleman appointed to take charge of the Kinistino Indian reserve ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. A report was received concerning the Touchwood Hills agency and staff, of which Mr. P. J. Hamilton was a member.

2. This report, dated 8th July, 1904, dealt generally with the management of the agency.

3. Following the appointment of a new agent and a measure of reorganization it was considered in the public interest that Mr. Hamilton should be transferred to his present position at the Kinistino reserve.

MINERAL BORINGS IN THE NORTHWEST.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY asked:

1. Has any money been voted or appropriations made by the government to assist in boring for oil, natural gas, or other mineral, at or near Edmonton, Alberta ? If so, how much, and for what mineral ?

2. Have any applications been made to the government for an advance for the above purpose ? If so, by whom ?

3. Have any moneys been advanced by the government for the said purposes ? If so, how much, and to whom advanced ?

4. Have any applications been received from parties south of township 34, in the province

of Alberta, for said purpose, within the last twelve months ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Yes; $3,000 to be taken from the general appropriation voted for the Geological Survey Department, 1905-6. Natural gas or oil.

2. Yes. Northwest Gas and Oil Company, Edmonton, Alta.

3. Yes. $1,000 Northwest Gas and Oil Company, Edmonton, Alta.

4. Yes.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY asked:

1. At what dates, respectively and to what depth did the government, under the direction of the Geological or any of its departments, drill or bore for petroleum or any other natural product at or near the following points: (a) Pakan or Victoria, on the North Saskatchewan, probably about ranges 16 or 17, W. 4th; (b) Athabaska Landing; (c) Pelican Rapids, on the Athabaska river ?

2. What were the results of each of such undertakings ?

3. If any oil or gas was obtained, at what points, in what quantities, and at what depth ?

4. What was the cost or expenditure in each case ?

5. Is it a fact that a large volume of gas was struck by boring at the Pelican Rapid location ? If so, at what date?

6. What was the pressure of such discharge ?

7. What was its volume per minute, estimated in cubic feet ?

8. Is the gas still flowing there ?

9. Has any effort been made by the government to stop such flow ? If not, why not ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Athabaska Landing. Dates and depth —Commenced 1st August, broke ground; drilling, 15th; left off at 1,011 feet on October 24, 1894.

1895—Boring resumed 27th April. Owing to difficulties considerable delay all season. October 10 stopped at 1,722 feet. Actual boring operations 1894, two months; 1895, six months.

1896—Reaming out, &c., with little success. Hole finally abandoned at 1770 feet.

Pelican River boring—1897, bored 821 feet; 1898, bored further to 837 feet.

Victoria boring—1897, boring begun in June reached a depth of 705 feet; 1898, continued to a depth of 1,645 feet; 1899, completed to a depth of 1840 feet, when work ceased on account of the jamming of the casing in the hole.

2 and 3. Athabaska Landing—245 feet, strong flow gas (no oil); 267 feet, more gas; 334 feet, more gas roaring could be heard half a mile away and foreman considered flow as strong as that of the well known well at Kingsville, Ont. It was sufficient to make boring very difficult; 780 feet, small amount of salt water struck also strong flow of gas, estimated 50 lbs. pressure to square inch; 1,055 feet, struck gas; 1,090 feet, saline water; 1,643 feet, a little gas; 1,722 feet, stopped on October 10, 1896; 1,770 feet, stopped on December, 1896.

Pelican River boring—Gas and some oil struck at 750 feet; oil mixed through sand and stone.

At 773 feet a heavier flow of gas was struck with odour of petroleum. At 820 feet a tremendous flow of gas struck; the roar was heard for three miles or more. 837 feet, another very strong flow of gas.

Victoria boring—No indication of petroleum or tar sands at this depth, 1,840 feet.

4. Athabaska Landing, $16,437.99; Victoria, $12,869.52; Pelican, $8,998.89; total, $38,306.40.

5, 6 and 7. Yes, as stated above; pressure not measured.

8. Believed to be flowing yet.

9. Not up to present time. Pressure too heavy when the boring contractor was there.

CALGARY LAND TITLES OFFICE.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY asked:

1. Has the money voted in each of the last two sessions for the construction of land titles office at the city of Calgary been expended ?

2. Has the government changed its intention to build the same ? If so, when ?

3. If not, when will the work of construction be proceeded with ?

Hon. CHARLES S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works):

1. No.

2 and 3. When the matter of the extension of the public building at Calgary was considered, it was found that accommodation could be had in that building for the Land Titles office.

APPLICATION FOR SALE OF LANDS.

Mr. M. S. McCARTHY—by Mr. Taylor—asked:

1. Has the government or Department of the Interior received any application for the sale to a syndicate of a large tract of government land in Alberta, between Calgary and Edmonton, in the vicinity of Lacombe ?

2. Has it received any such application for the sale of lands situate elsewhere in the province of Alberta or in the province of Saskatchewan ?

3. Is the price proposed one dollar per acre, or what price ?

4. Has such proposal or offer been made by or on behalf of Messrs. M. A. Walsh, E. C. Walsh, E. G. Walsh, of Clinton, Iowa; A. W. Carrol, Charles Maher, Iowa, and J. Brown, of Neepewa, Manitoba, or any or either of them ?

5. If not, by whom has any such offer or proposal been made, and for what amount of land, at what price, and upon what terms and conditions ?

6. Has the government caused any valuation to be made of the lands proposed to be sold ?

7. What are the other particulars of the proposed offer or arrangement, if any ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. No price named.
4. No.
5. John W. Imes, G. Robins, E. H. Cuthbertson.
6. No ; no action taken.
7. Lands applied for by John W. Imes are in townships 22, ranges 4, 5, 6 and 7, west 4th meridian, and aggregate some 17,920 acres. Lands applied for by G. Robins are in townships 10, 11 and 12, south of Saskatchewan river, ranges 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12, west 4th meridian, and aggregate about 151,180 acres. Lands applied for by E. H. Cuthbertson are in townships 11, 12 and 13, north of Saskatchewan river, ranges 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12, west 4th meridian, and aggregate about 144,323 acres. Application is made under the irrigation system.

ACETYLENE PLANT AT FARRAN'S POINT.

Mr. J. D. REID asked :

1. Was work of constructing acetylene lighting plant on Farran's Point lock, Williamsburg canal, done under contract called by tenders ? If so, was the lowest tender accepted ?
2. What is name of firm that erected acetylene lighting plant ?
3. What was the total amount paid for lamps, lamp lighters, globes, burners and other necessary items for maintenance of acetylene lighting plant, Farran's Point canal, for season ending December, 1905 ?
4. What was cost for lighting Farran's Point lock, season ending December, 1896, what system was used then ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. Yes, the work was done by contract after tenders, which had been invited by newspaper advertisement, had been received. Yes, the lowest tender was accepted.
2. The Acetylene Construction Company.
3. $1,258.98.
4. Have no means of knowing the cost. Coal oil lamps were used.

WIRE FENCING ON BOUNDARY LINE.

Mr. CLEMENTS asked :

Is the government building or propose to build any wire fencing on boundary lines between United States and Canada this year ? If so, what firm received contract, price per mile of contract, style of fence, size of wire, posts, &c.

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

LIGHTHOUSE ON MAGANETAWAN RIVER.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

What amounts were paid otherwise than for wages to workmen in connection with the construction of a lighthouse on the Maganetawan river on an enlargement thereof, known as Lake Carcebe ?

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

Maganetawan River and Lake Steamboat Company, towing. .	$ 60 00
The Knight Bros. Co., lumber,....	21 00
John Schlade, lumber..	36 54
The Fred Taylor Lumber Company, lumber..	102 32
Geo. McKnight, hardware..	47 52
A. H. McLachlan, iron....	17 11
J. Mortimer, expenses..	31 40
J. Mortimer, lumber..	49 50
	$365 39

REFERENCES BY GOVERNOR IN COUNCIL TO SUPREME COURT.

Mr. BRISTOL asked :

How many times and in respect of what matters have the powers of the Governor in Council been exercised under section 52 of the Supreme Court Act, 1875, being chapter 11 of 38 Victoria, and under amendment of such section ?

Hon. CHAS. FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). Under the provisions of 38 Vic., c. 11, s. 52 :

1. In re New Brunswick Penitentiary, April, 1880.
2. In re Canada Temperance Act, 1878, and County of Perth Cass. Dig. 105.
3. In re Canada Temperance Act, 1878, and County of Kent, Cass. Dig. 480.
4. The Thrasher case, Cass. Dig. 480.

The Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act of 1875 was repealed in connection with the revision of the statutes in 1886 and s. 52 became s. 37 of c. 135 of the Revised Statutes. S. 37 was subsequently repealed by 54-55 Vic., c. 25, s. 4 (1891), and a new section substituted.

The following references have been made under the amendment of 1891 :

1. In re County Courts of British Columbia, 21 Can. S. C. R. 446.
2. In re Statutes of Manitoba relating to Education, 22 Can. S.C.R., 577.
3. In re Provincial Jurisdiction to pass Prohibitory Liquor laws, 24 Can. S.C.R. 170.
4. In re Provincial Fisheries, 26 Can. S.C.R. 444.
5. In re Criminal Code, Bigamy sections, 27 Can., S.C.R. 461.
6. In re Representation in the House of Commons, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, 33 Can. S.C.R. 475.
7. In re Representation in the House of Commons, Prince Edward Island, 33 Can. S.C.R. 594.
8. In re Sunday Legislation, 35 Can. S.C. R. 581.
9. Railway Act amendment of 1904, 36 Can. S.C.R., 136.
10. International and Interprovincial Ferries, 36 Can. S.C.R. 206.

TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION'S REPORT.

On the order, proposed resolution

That in the opinion of this House the government should at the earliest possible day, present the report of the Transportation Commission, together with all the evidence taken before the said commission, and that the same should be thereupon dealt with by the House.—Mr. Bennett.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). I beg to say that I intend to move that resolution next Monday, with the concurrence of the government the report is now published.

INVITATION TO HIS MAJESTY TO VISIT CANADA.

Hon. N. A. BELCOURT (Ottawa City) moved the following :

Address—To the King's Most Gracious Majesty :—

Most Gracious Sovereign,

We the members of the House of Commons of Canada, in parliament assembled, beg to humbly convey to Your Majesty, with the assurance of our loyalty and devotion to Your Royal Person, the expression of the desire and hope, long and fervently cherished by all British subjects inhabiting British North America, that Your Majesty would be graciously pleased to honour them with Your Majesty's presence, and thereby enable them to offer the personal tribute of their unwavering attachment to the Crown and the government of the empire, of their deep affection for Your Majesty's person, and their profound admiration for those kingly virtues and truly humanitarian deeds which have earned for Your Majesty first place among the great Sovereigns of the world.

Nearly fifty years ago Your Majesty, then the heir apparent to the Throne which Your Majesty now adorns, honoured Canada with your presence, on the occasion of the inauguration of the Victoria bridge. The approaching completion of the Quebec bridge, the initial step and one of the great links in the Transcontinental Railway of Canada, whilst affording Your Majesty a fitting opportunity to witness the progress and development accomplished in Your Majesty's possessions on this continent, would enable their inhabitants to indulge in the manifestation of their loyalty and devotion to their beloved King and Queen.

We therefore most humbly pray that Your Majesty and Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen will lend their august presence on the occasion of the inauguration of the Quebec bridge.

He said : Before proceeding with the motion of which I gave notice on the opening day of this session, may I be permitted, Mr. Speaker, to usurp for one moment and one moment only, your own functions in constituting myself the Speaker or spokesman of the House of Commons for the time being in order to extend, in the name of the honourable members of this House, a most cordial welcome to His Royal Highness Prince Arthur of Connaught, who, to-day, is honouring Canada and the Capital with his presence. The representatives of the Canadian nation, in parliament assembled, welcome with pride and pleasure, in the person of His Royal Highness, one of the members of the great and illustrious Royal family of England, so many of whom adorn the Thrones of Europe and have earned the respect and the admiration of the world, by their example in the practice of truly royal as well es eminently Christian and humane virtues and who, have assumed and ever performed with infinite credit to themselves and for the best interests of the nation, great and high functions in the diplomatic service, in the army and in the navy of the empire. We all trust and hope that the visit of His Royal Highness in Canada may prove highly interesting and as pleasurable to him as it is to all Canadians and that it may be our good fortune in the near future to again welcome him upon Canadian soil.

Mr. Speaker, almost fifty years ago the parliament of the United Provinces of Upper and Lower Canada adopted unanimously and with great enthusiasm an address to our late beloved and so universally lamented Queen, praying that Her Majesty would be pleased to honour Her Canadian subjects with Her presence in British North America. Most graciously was the address received by Her Majesty who being unable to comply with the loyal invitation decided to send in Her place and as Her substitute, Her own beloved son, our then future King, the present illustrious Sovereign of the British empire. The news of the approaching visit of His Royal Highness filled the hearts of all Canadians with deep feelings of gratification and gratitude, which upon his arrival among us found frequent and eloquent expression in loyal and enthusiastic manifestations. All over Canada and the British possessions in America His Royal Highness received a most cordial, a most fitting welcome, and his presence was the occasion for great rejoicing everywhere. He must, Sir, have been favourably impressed with the numerous and conclusive proofs afforded him everywhere of the loyalty of our people to the empire, and principally the affection, the deep affection, the profound veneration entertained by all for that noble and illustrious woman, his mother and our Queen. His visit must have been to him what it undoubtedly was to the Canadian people, an inspiration and an encouragement, an inspiration alike to him and to them to uphold firmly the dignity and power of the Throne which he would some day ascend and an encouragement common to both, to labour and strive constantly for the welfare and betterment of that empire of which it is no exaggeration to assert that it stands to-day first and greatest of all empires and a most potent factor in the civilization of the world. The coming of the Prince of

Wales and his sojourn among Her Majesty's subjects, his truly royal bearing, his uniform kindness, the heartiness with which he entered into the spirit of and took part in the demonstrations which everywhere were organized and prepared in his honour, his graciousness to all, whilst serving to enhance the love for and attachment to British liberty and British institutions, gained for him that personal respect and admiration which we in Canada have ever since entertained for him and cherished and which since, his accession to the Throne, he has done so much to deserve from the whole world. The presence of the heir apparent in Canada and the great American Republic to the South, where he received so many evidences of good will and such hearty and magnificent greetings was fraught with lasting and benificent results, not only to the British empire but to the English speaking world as well. It served, Sir, to enhance and render more permanent and stable the friendly relations which have since existed between the American Republic and the United Kingdom. Canadian hearts would throb with delight if His Majesty would graciously condescend to come among them and thereby give them the opportunity, for which they have long and ardently desired, of testifying, by every means in their power, their love and attachment for British institutions, their desire and ambition to follow the noble example given by him and with him contribute to upbuild and maintain British Dominions. His Majesty's subjects in Canada of every race, of every creed, and of every class, one and all, eagerly desire to be enabled to offer to him in person and upon Canadian soil the homage of their respect and admiration and the tribute of their loyalty and devotion to his person and his Crown.

They would delight, Mr. Speaker, in assuring His Majesty that they shall ever gratefully remember that it was under the beneficent reign of his illustrious mother they were granted that full measure of freedom and constitutional government to which they are so much attached, which they so jealously treasure, and which they are assured it is His Majesty's intention and determination to fully and freely continue to accord to them. The descendants of mighty Albion and La Belle France, who compose the great majority of our population, desire to be afforded the opportunity of telling His Majesty with what deep interest, with what keen concern, they followed the endeavours of their respective mother countries to bring to a fruitful conclusion the timely and happy alliance which to-day so closely and permanently unites the French Republic and the United Kingdom. Canadians of English as well as of French origin desire earnestly to be afforded the opportunity of expressing to His Majesty their grateful recognition of the large share which they know he took in the consummation of the 'entente cordiale' and to express the confident hope that His Majesty may be pleased to continue to exert his all-powerful influence to secure permanence and stability.

They would, Mr. Speaker, with pride and pleasure, take him again over the route followed by him nearly half a century ago and also from end to end of their ever expanding national horizon and point to him the progress and development, material and intellectual, accomplished since ante confederation days.

It would, Sir, gratify the people of the whole Dominion to be permitted to point to His Majesty in person the achievements due to the practical wisdom and patriotism of the statesmen who founded the Canadian confederation and of those who have since, with the help and co-operation of the people of all the provinces, guided its destinies.

They would have him witness to the concord, amity and friendly rivalry which animate the various elements of our population and the patriotic emulation and firm resolve of all, under the aegis of the British Crown, to erect and maintain upon this northern half of the North American continent a robust, moral, law abiding and progressive nation—a nation proud of its double origin and of the great store of noble and elevating traditions bequeathed to it; a nation conscious of its strength, deeply grateful for its bounteous freedom and prosperity, and realizing to the full the great natural advantages with which Providence has endowed it and all the magnificent opportunities which lie before it; a nation which seeks, by following the noble example and the truly humane precepts of His Majesty himself, to erect and perpetuate a great christian commonwealth, whose success, whose achievements, will be based upon the efforts and arts of peace rather than those of war or conquest.

All wise and great sovereigns, Mr. Speaker, have ever considered it part of their royal duties, as well as of their royal prerogatives and privileges, to stimulate and encourage, by all means in their power, the ambitions, the aspirations, and the achievements of their subjects. His Gracious Majesty, King Edward VII, has never failed to manifest the keenest interest in all that affects the welfare of his hundreds of millions of subjects. His Canadian subjects would fain believe that His Gracious Majesty takes a deep and abiding interest in the welfare of this Dominion and, at this particular moment, in the great national undertaking, to the realization of which they are now bending their energies, and that His Majesty looks upon this great national work as of vast importance, not only to Canada, but to the British empire as well. So deep indeed, Mr. Speaker, is the interest which Canadians believe His Majesty takes in their affairs and this undertaking that

they have conceived and do now entertain the hope that His Majesty would be pleased to come among them and thereby enable them, as I have said previously, to offer to him in person and upon Canadian soil the homage of their respect and admiration and the tribute of their loyalty and devotion, and receive from him in their national aspirations, in their national hopes, ambitions and achievements, that encouragement and approval of which his august presence would constitute such eloquent, signal and tangible proof.

Mr. Speaker, since the visit of his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales in 1860 to Canada and to the great and friendly American Republic to the south proved to be so interesting, so important, so gratifying, how much more important, how much more gratifying, how much more interesting, how much more pregnant with lasting, wide, far reaching, great and beneficent results would not be to-day the presence of him who has since become the sovereign of the British empire, on this continent of North America, whose progress and development have caused the admiration and wonderment of the universe and which has achieved so much for the cause of democratic institutions and liberty.

When His Majesty ascended the Throne, Mr. Speaker, who believed that the 'entente cordiale', such as it exists to-day, was probable or even possible? And if to-day the French Republic and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and its possessions all over the world are found allied in such a close, such a cordial, such a lasting alliance, it is conceded that it is due mainly to the wonderful tact, to the ever unerring judgment, to the genius, to the intense love of humanity, and the earnest desire for peace, of His Majesty. Have we not good reason to hope and to believe, Mr. Speaker, that His Majesty is not content to rest on the laurels, however great, which the world has so freely accorded to him, and that His Majesty will continue to devote his genius and his all-powerful influence in the cause of humanity until he has finally attained the realization of that so long and so ardently cherished hope of mankind, 'peace and good will to all men'?

And, Sir, may we not be permitted also to indulge the hope and the belief that a visit of His Majesty, the noble King of England, to that other noble and very distinguished man and statesman, the President of the United States, whose own efforts, whose own successes in the cause of peace among the nations, have gained for him likewise the gratitude and the admiration of the world, would afford an opportunity and the means of rendering more intimate and more cordial even the relations which exist to-day between the American Republic and our mother country? Nay, Mr. Speaker, may we not be permitted to indulge the hope and the belief that such a visit at this time would be the means of enlarging the scope of the entente cordiale so as to secure the mighty co-operation of the United States of America in the accomplishment of its great aim and its noble object? For if, Mr. Speaker, we are able to rejoice in an alliance between the Republic of France and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and its possessions all over the world, may we not hope to see that alliance extended so as to embrace the republic of the United States of America and that empire in the far east whose national emblem so typically and so truthfully symbolizes its recent brilliant exploits and its marvellous progress, an alliance between the foremost nations of Europe, the two greatest nations of America, and the only true great nation of Asia, an alliance encircling the world whose aim and motto would be universal peace, with all that these magic words imply for humanity? The time must come, may we not think the time has come, when the enlightened nations of the world will put an end to military armaments and cease paying to the devils of war the tribute of its best blood and of its best money? The nations of Europe have too long been staggering under the load, the heavy load of militarism. There is everywhere a desire, a demand for peace. Why, Sir, the very atmosphere is to-day filled with that fragrant air of peace. The noble King of England and the noble President of the United States have devoted themselves to the cause of peace, they are both thorough believers in, and have constantly and with maintained success preached, the gospel of peace. May we not to-day indulge in the hope that their recent brilliant successes are but the augury of universal peace in the very near future? Some may think and some may say, Mr. Speaker, that this is but a dream, though a very happy dream, still but a dream and an illusion. My answer is that dreams are not unfrequently followed by realization, and that what seems to-day to be an illusion to some may to-morrow be turned into a reality; my answer is that but a very few years ago the entente cordiale was nothing but a dream, but to-day it is a living and vigorous reality. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I have very much pleasure, and I deem it a very great privilege and a very great honour to be allowed to move the resolution which I now place in your hands.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). Mr. Speaker, from time to time there are measures and motions brought before this House which hon. gentlemen, both on your right and on your left, can support with equal sincerity and with a feeling of confidence that in so doing they are faithfully expressing the feelings of the people of Canada whom they represent. Such a motion, Sir, I believe is the one at present before

this House. I support it with pleasure for many reasons, and for three in particular, and in expressing them I believe I voice the feelings of the people of Canada. I am proud of my King, I am proud of my country, and I believe that it is in the best interests of the empire that the acquaintance happily formed half a century ago between the then Prince of Wales and the few scattered isolated provinces which then represented British rule in North America, should be renewed and strengthened to-day by a visit from His Majesty himself to this great and growing Dominion of Canada. When the last dread messenger summoned our late revered Queen, there was a feeling of fear throughout the whole of the British realms lest there should be an end or at least a limitation to that widespread and beneficent influence which, through her individual personality, she had been able to exercise for so many years throughout the civilized world. To-day, Sir, I say with pride and with pleasure, that there is not a British subject throughout all these broad realms who is conversant with world politics, who does not only feel that the sceptre has fallen into the hands of one who has been able worthily to discharge the responsible duties of his high office, but who has also, by his wide view of public affairs, by his diplomatic ability, and by his humanitarian sentiments, justly earned the title that has been conferred on him by the world, of Edward the Peace Maker. And I believe, Sir, that, speaking as a Canadian if our Sovereign should visit this part of his dominions, no matter how green may be the remembrance of his former visit, no matter how carefully he may have studied the growth and rejoiced in the prosperity of Canada, I venture to say that neither His Majesty or any of his advisers who have not visited this land, have the faintest conception of the realities of to-day and the possibilities of the future which our country affords. Situated as we are geographically midway between the white cliffs of Albion and the mysterious lands of the distant Orient, a link, as it were, between the shores of the mother land and its vast possessions lying under the southern cross, stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific, the one country in the world with both coal and iron on the coasts of both these oceans, blessed with marine, with mineral, with agriculture, with forest, with electrical wealth as no other country is, occupying the northern part of the temperate zone, in all continents inhabited by those who have been or are victors in the contest for eminence, presenting a climate unsurpassed and having a population which we believe is worthy of their heritage, I say that under these circumstances we are justified in asking our Sovereign to visit this brightest gem in his dominions and thus tighten and strengthen the ties that light as air but strong as steel bind us to the motherland.

Not only have we such a country, but I think that I am justified in saying that we have a people worthy of this glorious heritage. Observers of history well know that each country has certain peculiarities, certain characteristics, in which its people will excel those of all other countries, but to whichever land we may look, looking dispassionately and fairly, we must admit that in some respects the people of each excel those of all other lands. In Canada we have not one people sprung from a common stock, but a strong and progressive people descended from the greatest races of the earth. We have the honest, loyal, brave Englishman, we have the shrewd, long-headed, canny Scotchman, we have the dashing, eloquent, witty Irishman, we have the gay chivalrous, religious Frenchman, and we have the solid, methodical, contemplative German all living side by side, pouring all their blood into one common stream that flows in the veins and throbs in the pulse of Canada. I believe that not only is this country a part of His Majesty's dominions, that he should visit, but I believe the slightest reference to history will show us that there is no doubt a future before this country which perhaps few of us suspect. We find that we have four great continents, that the sceptre has passed through the hands of Asia, and Africa to Europe the smallest and poorest of the great continents, and surely we cannot be considered too extravagant in our views when we express the belief that the pendulum will still swing and the sceptre will pass to the continent of America, it must surely be to North America and to what part of North America shall it come? If not the northern half of North America surely all history must be reversed. The teachings of the past and the experience of all the different races prove the hardier character of the people who compose the nations lying in each continent to the north with its bracing climate, its pure air, its strength and invigoration, and that the nation with all these elements of strength is bound in the ultimate struggle to be the victor. So, Sir, I think that not only have we a country that our sovereign should see, but I believe that it is eminently suitable that the advisers of His Majesty should accompany him on his visit to our Dominion of Canada. We all know that a few years ago there was a disposition in the motherland on the part of statesmen on both sides of politics to regard the colonies as an incubus and the view was held that the sooner they were got rid of the better. To-day no statesman in England could more speedily and surely commit political suicide than by suggesting the disruption of the bond holding the motherland to her colonies. While I think it is fitting that we should extend this invitation to His Majesty it does seem to me that in all Canada no better or more fitting place could be found to welcome the sovereign to

this portion of his realms than the classic city of Quebec. We all remember how one September morning, the British troops having scaled the heights, the battle began and raged the live long day between the French and the English. We remember the result. We remember that when the shades of evening fell the Union Jack floated from the battlements of Quebec. We remember well the two brave leaders who that day shed their life-blood and to whose memory there stands to-day a monument in the city of Quebec which is unique. Quebec has a monument erected to the memory of these two gallant leaders, sacred on the one side to the memory of Wolfe, the victor, and sacred on the other side to the memory of Montcalm, the vanquished, a symbol of that magnanimity and mutual good will, that racial and religious respect which represent the fabric on which alone the success of Canada can be built. I think it is most proper that our sovereign should be met in the shadow of that monument erected to the memory of Wolfe and Montcalm in the city of Quebec, and standing a symbol of the only true national unity. I have therefore much pleasure in seconding this resolution which I am sure will meet with the unanimous approval of the House.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, the House, I have no doubt, will join heartily in this motion and will respond cordially to the sentiments which have been so eloquently expressed by my hon. friends, the mover, and seconder of the motion which is now in your hands. I have nothing to add for my part to the language of my hon. friend from Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) or to that of my hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. Northrup), except to say that if we should be honoured by a visit from their majesties the King and Queen of Great Britain, there can be no doubt whatever that the effects would be of the most happy nature. What has been said of His Majesty the King is the simple and literal truth. In the late reign of Her Majesty the Prince of Wales on many occasions gave evidence that he was possessed in the most eminent degree of those qualities which so well befit him for his high station, especially the quality of tact, the happy faculty of being able to reconcile differences and the capacity for pacifying quarrels. Since His Majesty has succeeded to the Throne it is nothing more than historical truth to say that on one or two occasions he has preserved the peace of Europe and that but for his happy interference probably we would have seen a conflagration such as we saw a few years ago in the Orient. Perhaps the conflict would have been transferred from the Orient to the plains of Europe. I also assume that his visit would have a desirable effect upon our relations with our neighbours. There is no need of any visit of this kind to strengthen the bond of empire between Great Britain and her colonies and especially between Great Britain and Canada. We would not be any more loyal than we are to-day if the King were to honour us with his presence and we will not be any less loyal if he should fail to accept our invitation. But, I believe it is the opinion of all who sit in this House that if the King were to visit Canada—and he could not visit Canada without visiting the United States also—the effect would be to bring more closely together than they are at the present time—and they are more than ever before—the two great branches of the Anglo-Saxon race on both sides of the Atlantic. But, whilst I agree cordially with the motion which has been made by my hon. friend, perhaps I may be permitted to offer him a suggestion. I would call the attention of my hon. friend to the second part of his motion which reads in this way :

> Nearly fifty years ago Your Majesty, then the Heir Apparent to the Throne which Your Majesty now adorns, honoured Canada with your presence, on the occasion of the inauguration of the Victoria bridge. The approaching completion of the Quebec bridge, the initial step and one of the great links in the Transcontinental Railway of Canada, whilst affording Your Majesty's possessions on this continent, the progress and development accomplished in You Majesty's possessions on this continent, would enable their inhabitants to indulge in the manifestation of their loyalty and devotion to their beloved King and Queen.
>
> We therefore most humbly pray that Your Majesty and Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen will lend their august presence on the occasion of the inauguration of the Quebec bridge.

To myself as well as to those who come from the district I represent nothing could be more pleasant or satisfactory than to have these words endorsed by the whole House of Commons, but I would suggest to my hon. friend and suggest to the consideration of the House generally, that perhaps it would be preferable not to limit the visit of His Majesty to anything in particuliar, but simply to invite Their Majesties to visit Canada quite irrespective of this or any other event. In the second line of the second paragraph I would strike out all the words after the words : 'on the occasion of the inauguration of the Quebec bridge :' down to the end of that paragraph.

Then I would beg to amend the prayer of the petition so as to make it read :

> We therefore most humbly pray that your Majesty, and Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen, will honour the Dominion of Canada with your presence at such time as may be selected by Your Majesty.

I beg to move an amendment to that effect.

Mr. SPEAKER. Sir Wilfrid Laurier moves in amendment that—

Mr. BELCOURT. Will you permit me, Mr. Speaker; I would suggest that the motion be put to the House as amended by the right hon. gentleman, so that there will be no need for a formal amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion as amended?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.) Everything that could be said has been most appropriately said by the right hon. Prime Minister and by the hon. gentlemen who have moved and seconded the motion. I agree with the suggestion of the Prime Minister as to the form ; the motion as originally drafted would seem to limit to one occasion our desire to have His Majesty visit this country, and while it may be that the occasion mentioned would be an appropriate one, yet it is better that the selection should be left to His Most Gracious Majesty.

It is sincerely to be hoped that Canada shall have the privilege and honour of a visit from their Majesties. What the Prime Minister has said in regard to the services of King Edward in making for the peace of the world, is undoubtedly true. In days gone by there were those who thought that the influence and power of the Crown had almost absolutely disappeared, but this is to be noted : That His Majesty the King while in every respect acting the part of a constitutional monarch, has nevertheless been of the utmost service not only to the empire, but to the whole world in his successful efforts to preserve peace among all nations. It has been truly observed by more than one recent constitutional writer that the Crown is to-day the strongest bond between the motherland and the dominions of the British empire beyond the seas. That has come about through a curious process of constitutional development. As the various portions of the empire have gradually attained greater powers in respect to their internal affairs; the parliament of Great Britain and Ireland has to a certain extent lost that influence as a central body which it formerly possessed. The Crown at the present time represents more truly the dignity and the greatness of the empire to all those who live in the dominions beyond the seas than does the parliament of the United Kingdom. This is the natural course of a constitutional development which has been proceeding for years and which undoubtedly will continue in the future. For this reason, as well as for the reasons which have been so adequately expressed by the mover and seconder of this resolution, it is to be sincerly wished that we in Canada may have the privilege and honour of seeing amongst us His Most Gracious Majesty the King accompanied by our beloved Queen, and of offering to them a tribute of that devotion and loyalty which exist in the Dominion of Canada to an extent at least as great as in any part of His Majesty's dominions.

Mr. HENRY HORTON MILLER (South Grey). If I may be excused for saying a word at such a time as this; I am sure every member of the House will be heartily in accord with the invitation extended to His Majesty the King. We all love and respect him, not only because he is a most kingly King, but because he is a most manly man. I am sure, however, we will not forget that we have in England a Queen, who, as one of the most trusted and beloved friends of Her Majesty Queen Victoria, has been a helpmate indeed to His Majesty. She has proven herself to be a friend in deed and a friend in need to the poor of Britain and to all of the poor who have come within the range of her wide-spread charity. I trust that when His Gracious Majesty may choose to visit this portion of his empire he will not come alone, but will bring with him Her Majesty the Queen, who will be most enthusiastically received as being the most loved and most highly respected woman of the empire.

Mr. SAM HUGHES (Victoria and Haliburton). I was in hopes that some of our friends on the government side would have seen their way to endorse still further this motion. I expected our friend from Labelle (Mr. Bourassa) to have risen in his place to give his endorsation to his good friend from Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt). I had hoped also that the junior lieutenant of the member for Labelle would have risen in his place and given his endorsation to this motion. However, Sir, the prayer of the petition which has been presented by our good friend from Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) will I am sure find a very earnest response in every heart, or almost every heart, throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion. And although I may not be a very good judge of the proper effect of prayer, it is said that when prayer is delivered in absolute earnestness it is sure to be answered. Therefore, I have every reason to believe that the prayer of this petition which finds as it does a responsive echo in almost every heart in Canada will at a very early date be answered. The member for Ottawa referred to the devotion of the people of Canada to the King of England and to his noble wife the Queen. I say with all respect to His Majesty that our devotion is not to himself personally, not all to himself as a constitutional sovereign. First, the King of England stands warm in the hearts of the people of Canada and of every part of the empire through the fact that he is the son of the late illustrious Queen Victoria, a woman who endeared herself in every home not only throughout the length and breadth of the British dominions, but whose name is revered and honoured in the United States of America ; in every civilized state.

Throughout every civilized land the name of Victoria has done more than any single name in history to elevate and ennoble mankind. We join in the prayer of the motion also because of the visit of His Majesty to Canada many years ago, when as a young man he laid the corner stone of this very building in which we are sitting. We will also welcome his Majesty on account of his having been, so far as lay in his power under the constitution, a distinguished soldier, always ready to help in the defence of the empire in any and every way within his sovereign power as limited by the constitution. We also welcome him to Canada because of his distinguished statemanship, both before he ascended and since he has ascended the throne of this great empire. On more than one occasion he has secured the peace of the world and has prevented bloodshed, that bloodshed which all good people are so anxious to prevent. But, Sir, we admire him and would welcome him the more on account of his being a constitutional British Sovereign than from any other cause. Some years ago, speaking of the position of the Sovereign of Great Britain—and I believe it is a universal sentiment—the poet Cowper said :

> We love the King who loves the law, respects his bounds and reigns content within them. Him we serve freely and with delight who leaves us free.
>
> He is ours to administer, to guard, to adorn the state, but not to warp or change it. We are his to serve him nobly in the common cause, true to the death, but not to be his slaves.

These are sentiments which I believe pervade the hearts of the people of the great Dominon of Canada towards our Sovereign of to-day. He has proved himself to be, like his beloved mother, a constitutional Sovereign. I hearily endorse the amendment suggested by the first minister. I was going to take the liberty, when I spoke, of suggesting that the senior member for Ottawa should amend his motion to read that the Sovereign of the empire should be invited to visit us on the occasion of the accomplishment of a full partnership union between Great Britain and all her colonies. I thought possibly this might enlist the sympathies of my good friend the hon. senior member for Ottawa. I know that the first minister is already warm in the cause of a full partnership union of Great Britain and all her colonies, each being represented in the Imperial parliament, with the various parts of the empire being left as now to manage their own local affairs; and I thought that the accomplishment of such a union would be a fitting occasion for the Sovereign of the empire—and I trust it may come in the time of the present Sovereign—to visit the component parts of the empire. He could readily cross the Atlantic, for oceans no longer separate, but rather unite the various parts of the empire—revisit Halifax, which he visited many years ago, traverse the Dominion of Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific, take a steamer of one of our Canadian line on the Pacific, touch at some of the islands of the Pacific, visit the great colony of Australia, thence back to New Zealand, thence to the Asiatic portions of the empire, thence to South Africa, and thence home again to England. I trust that if His Majesty is not able to see this consummation within the next year or so, the development of full partnership union between Great Britain and all her colonies will assume such proportions that long before the termination of his reign he will have the opportunity of visiting all the parts of the empire bound together in such a partnership union.

Mr. HENRI BOURASSA (Labelle). Mr. Speaker, it was my intention to rise and give my hearty approval and support of the motion which was presented by the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt), and seconded by the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup), and I do not think I needed the invitation of the hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Sam Hughes). I simply waited till the strongest and most eloquent upholders of loyalty in this House should have preceded my modest utterance ; but when I saw that so many of them were half sleeping, I thought I would give a deeper expression of support to the motion. I must, however, take a slight exception to the remarks that have just been made by the hon. member for Victoria, and I hope my loyalty will not be questioned on that account. I think it would be a pity if the visit of the King should be made the occasion of bringing forth and upholding the political ideas or principles of some specific group of party within the British empire. For my part, speaking especially as a French Canadian and as one of the representatives of the province of Quebec, I may say that of all the subjects of His Majesty none will be better pleased and honoured to receive their King than the subjects of His Majesty speaking French and practising the Catholic religion in the province of Quebec. If I were allowed on an occasion like this to speak of my own sentiments, I would say that of all those French Canadians, none will be better pleased to offer his homage to His Majesty than I will be—not because of my monarchical principles, because I may say I do not believe in the principle of hereditary powers—but because of my devotion and respect to the person of King Edward; and one of the reasons why he would be received in the province of Quebec, if he does us the honour of coming, with more fervent devotion, perhaps than in any other part of the British empire, is because we strongly believe that His Majesty is the personification of constitutional respect for

all his liberty-loving subjects, and that he would be the last one in the whole empire to uphold any policy or to support any scheme by which any section of the empire would be deprived of any portion of its liberty or autonomy.

I have nothing to add to what the hon. member for Ottawa has said in reference to the role played by His Majesty. King Edward may be truthfully called the peace-making sovereign of the modern world; and just as the part played by His Majesty in the affairs of Europe has been so greatly beneficial, so I think his presence in any part of the British empire would be the occasion of a greater development of liberty and of peace between all the subjects of His Majesty, whatever might be their origin or their creed. I need not add anything further, Mr. Speaker, to what has been said. I simply repeat what I said at the first, that, as a French Canadian and as a representative of the province of Quebec it is with the greatest pleasure that I give my hearty support to the resolution.

Mr. THOMAS CHISHOLM (East Huron). Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) deserves the thanks of the House for bringing this question forward. It is especially suitable that it should be brought forward by a French Canadian, and by one who was at one time the First Commoner and Speaker of this House. If King Edward accepts our invitation, we shall be able to show him a very different Canada from what he saw when he visited our shores many years ago. We will show him a Dominion occupying a territory three times as large as his Empire of India. We shall show him a population that is twice as great as the population of the United States when they set up business for themselves 130 years ago. But my principal reason for rising was the few remarks that dropped from the lips of the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup). He was referring to the different nationalities which compose the population of our country and it occurred to me that King Edward is himself the representative of very many lines. Every Saxon finds in him a descendant of Cerdic the Saxon; every Scotchman finds in him a descendant of the Stuarts and of the ancient Scottish kings; every Welshman finds in him a descendant of the Tudors and of the ancient kings of Wales; every Irishman finds in him by tracing through the ancient Scottish kings a descendant of the former kings of Tara; and every French Canadian, if he chooses to study the matter, will find that he is a descendant of William the Conqueror and in him of Rue, the majestic and powerful Norseman who founded the Duchy of Normandy. In this connection it is well to remember that for hundreds of years the Saxons and the Normans had the same sovereign and stood shoulder to shoulder in many a hard fought battle, in which they opposed the aggressions of France. It was only through the foolishness of King John that the Duchy was lost, and it was long after the discovery of America ere Calais the last stronghold of Normandy was taken by the French. In the meantime many of the Norman-French having in their veins the daring blood of the Norsemen like the Israelites of old, had departed by sea from the land of their captivity. Finally they too found a land of promise on the banks of the St. Lawrence, where they returned to their first love, and gave their allegiance and their loyal support to their hereditary and legitimate sovereigns the Kings of England. Therefore, it is fitting that this motion should be proposed by a French Canadian. When we remember that His Majesty represents in himself every nationality that goes to make up our country it is certainly well that we should invite him and I wish to add my mite to this invitation.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. BELCOURT. Before we proceed, I wish to move, seconded by Mr. Northrup :

That a message be sent to the Honourable Senate transmitting the address just passed by this House and requesting their Honours to unite with this House in the same.

Motion agreed to.

MINISTERS OR DEPUTIES PRACTISING IN CANADIAN COURTS.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe) moved :

That in the opinion of this House it is inexpedient that any member of the government, or deputy head of a department, should act or appear as barrister, counsel or advocate in an action, suit or proceeding, except where the interests of the Crown are involved, in any court presided over by judges or a judge appointed by the government of Canada.

He said : It is with some degree of regret that I turn from the contemplation of the matter which the House has just been considering, a matter in which we can all heartly unite. It is the result of the magnificent manner in which the recent sovereigns of Great Britain have cooperated with the parliament of Great Britain in governing the mother land that we have inherited the splendid system of constitutional government which we enjoy. The motion which I rise to move is not intended to be an attack upon any individual as such. I am actuated in bringing it forward by the desire to secure in this country the recognition of the splendid traditions which have obtained in Great Britain and which as a rule have been the traditions of the government of Canada in reference to the matters to which I shall refer. In a constitutional government such as ours, the various departments of the

government are divided for convenience of administration, and although all the departments which go to make up our system are necessary to our well being there are degrees of importance to be attached to each of them, some being of more importance than others. We have the immigration system which is very valuable to the development of Canada but is still something that possibly we could do without. We would not do as well without it but it is not absolutely essential to our existence as a country. We have our system of transportation, a very important question for us to consider. We have our trade policy which is very important to the interests of Canada and the educational system, so far as it relates to the Dominion of Canada, a matter of great importance but of some difficulty to properly adjust or administer. But above all these we have our judicial system which is of vastly more importance to the interests of the country than anything else connected with the government of Canada. It is therefore, I hope, not too much to ask the House, altogether independently of party considerations to seriously consider the position in which we find ourselves to-day by reason of certain departures which are well known to exist in this country from the practice which obtains in the mother country. The judicial system is necessarily a part of the government of the country. In some countries, for instance under the British system, it is made a separate branch and recognized distinctly as a sub-head of government, as in the Commonwealth of Australia, under the constitution which they have recently adopted. In Canada as in Britain for centuries past, we have recognized that the position occupied by the judiciary is all important in the interests of the people. The boy is said to be the father of the man and the lawyer is the father of the judge; beginning at that point it is all important that we should preserve a high status of professional conduct on the part of our lawyers if we are to preserve and secure that position for the judiciary which as a rule it has occupied in Canada in the past and which it so essential to the well being of Canada that it should continue to occupy. Belonging to the profession of the law, I am naturally solicitous not only for its well being but that it should preserve unsullied those traditions for high honour and high regard for what is right and fitting which the lawyers of Canada have observed in the past. That the lawyers have had a great deal to do with the success of Canada and its governmental institutions cannot be denied by any one who has any knowledge of our history, and that others have exerted most powerful influence in bringing about that system of constitutional government which now exists in Britain and upon which ours is framed must equally be admitted. In Taswell-Langmead's constitutional history I find the following tribute to the work accomplished by the legal profession :

> Towards the end of the sixteenth, and during the earlier part of the seventeenth century, the House of Commons included among its members a large body of men of ability, recruited especially from amongst the lawyers, who became known to the electors by the talent which they displayed at the bar. The services which this class of men rendered to the cause of freedom are incalculable. The learning of the ablest lawyers in the sixteenth century may have been small in comparison with the stores of knowledge which may be acquired in our own day ; but, relatively, to the general education, it stood far higher. A few years later a race of parliamentary statesmen would begin to arise from amongst the country gentlemen ; but as yet, almost all pretensions to statesmanship were confined to the council table and its supporters. For the present, the burden of the conflict in the Commons lay upon the lawyers, who at once gave to the struggle against the Crown that strong legal character which it never afterwards lost.

I read this in order to point to the fact that when it became recognized that there should be a clear distinction between the Crown and the courts on the one hand and the courts and the Executive on the other, it was the lawyers in these old days who became first impressed with the importance of that distinction and struggled so successfully to bring about that condition of things in which that distinction was clearly recognized. The page from which I am reading deals with the reign of King James the first, and the citation has reference to the fact that one of the first public acts of the King, while on his way to London, was to cause a thief to be executed without trial. Then began the important struggle between parliament on the one hand and the Crown on the other, in which parliament sought to keep separate its functions from those of the Executive, and the functions of the courts from the constitutional rights and powers of the Sovereign. The resolution that I have to propose is as follows :

> That, in the opinion of this House, it is inexpedient that any member of the government, or deputy head of a department, should act or appear as barrister, counsel or advocate in any action, suit or proceeding, except where the interests of the Crown are involved, in any court presided over by judges or a judge appointed by the government of Canada.

I have sometimes heard it said by the right hon. the Prime Minister and by others members of the government that they could not adopt a certain resolution because it contained an insinuation. Sir, this is no abstract resolution. I hope it does not contain an insinuation so much as a direct charge. And if the government or its followers see fit to vote it down, I shall at least have the consciousness of having done my duty in endeavouring to bring to the attention of the House, not as an abstract question but as a matter of fact,

the circumstance that in the courts of Canada to-day, presided over by judges appointed by the Canadian government, cabinet ministers and deputy heads of departments are practising the legal profession. We have in Canada as in Great Britain members of the government who are in the cabinet and others who are not; and in both classes we find offenders. I have no personal quarrel with any of these gentlemen, I have the honour to have some personal acquaintance with many, if not all of them, and I hope I shall say nothing that might be considered personally offensive to any gentleman who may consider that he has the right to be a member of the government and still practice before judges appointed by this same government. It is not necessary for me to deal individually with any of the deputy heads of the departments. The remedy will follow in their case which I hope to see applied to those who are in higher positions; and I would not be speaking openly and frankly if I did not state that my attention was drawn to this matter more particularly by the fact that the hon. A. B. Aylesworth, Postmaster General, is practising in the law courts of Ontario and the Supreme court of Canada while still retaining his cabinet position. This is not a matter which has now come to the attention of parliament for the first time, and the hon. gentleman to whom I refer has not been taken in any way by surprise in this connection. I do not see him in the House now, but I presume he is within its precincts, and I hope he will shortly be here, as no doubt he would be if something did not cause him to be unavoidably absent. At all events, at the request of the government, I allowed this matter to stand over until to-day; and in the meantime the government have no doubt considered their position and we will have from the right hon. gentleman who leads the government a definite statement of the position they take. While the hon. the Postmaster General was seeking election to this House, he was spoken to with regard to the position he would take in this connection should he be elected, and amongst other things he was asked at a meeting in Schomberg to define his position. And, as reported in the Globe of November 11, 1905, he said this:

> There is no understanding as to my practising. My idea is that there will probably not be very much spare time if I attend to my business in the government or in politics, but you remember that it was common knowledge among lawyers that when the late Sir M. C. Cameron was provincial secretary, he did not take any fewer briefs than before.

Now, the hon. gentleman is too astute a lawyer to think for a moment that there is any analogy between the case of the Hon. M. C. Cameron, a provincial secretary—in a local government—and the position of a cabinet minister in the federal parliament, a cabinet having power to control and the opportunity to promote or to retard the advancement of the gentlemen who sit upon the bench and before whom he practices.

Mr. LANCASTER. And fix their salaries.

Mr. LENNOX. Of course. The fact is the cabinet have the making or the marring of the fortunes of the gentlemen who preside in our provincial and federal courts. Now that the minister had that intimation before he took the position of a cabinet minister is evident by what I have read, and it is quite evident by what I have read that he did not at that time want to bind himself to the position that for what probably he calls a paltry salary, a paltry remuneration such as he would receive as cabinet minister and member of parliament, a matter of only $9,500 a year, he was going to give up the lucrative practice that he enjoyed up to that time. It is quite true that the hon. gentleman had led a strenuous life; had spent a great many years in the arduous profession to which he belongs, and that the time could not be far distant, looking at human concerns as we see them, when he, like Sir William Mulock and others, would become tired in the race, and would no longer have the earning capacity which he had enjoyed in years gone by. But at all events, he seems to have decided that he would not tie himself down to a statement that he would not carry on his practice in the courts after he became a cabinet minister in the same way and probably to the same extent, as far as circumstances would admit, as he had done previously. Then we find the matter taken up in the Canadian 'Law Times,' and its language is most significant. It would look as if it were inspired from a certain quarter. The 'Canadian Law Times' says:

> His friends think he is well fitted for a parliamentary career——

That may mean anything.

> ——and we believe that he can and will do much to elevate the standard of politics——

That would be very necessary, remembering some things that hon. gentlemen have been doing of late years.

> ——an independent man, whom the office has sought, will have a strong influence with his colleagues, and we may be sure that the new cabinet minister's influence will be on the side of truth and righteousness.

'Truth and righteousness'—that expression is ear-marked. That is the expression of the Hon. G. W. Ross. That expression was not made in Germany, but it was made in the local legislature where Mr. Ross presided. Whether it was made at the time of the Gamey investigation or before, when there was an important conference amongst some of those gentlemen, I do not know. But the Hon. G. W. Ross used almost the same words when he made that celebrated

speech at Whitby, and when, indirectly, he reflected upon the gentleman who had been previously premier of Ontario by saying that he was going to do so much better than Mr. Mowat had done. He said :

Righteousness exalteth a nation. Let us strengthen the moral foundations. Let us purify elections, and not elections only, but the whole moral atmosphere, &c.

Then the gang proceeded, as you know, with Captain Sullivan and Vance and all that bodyguard, to perpetrate actions of which I do not wish to perpetuate the memory by recording them on 'Hansard,' but which are painfully evident to the people of the province of Ontario at the present time. Now, I want to point out that this article seems to be inspired, there seems to have been a deliberate intention, before the Postmaster General was sworn as a member of the cabinet, that he would continue his practice as he had done before ; and there are people not a few in the province of Ontario, and they are growing in numbers every day, there are hosts of people and hosts of Liberals who, by reason of what has taken place before we assembled here a month ago, and by reason of certain answers that the right hon. gentleman has given since, have come to the conclusion that there was a bargain between the right hon. gentleman who leads this House and the Postmaster General, that when the right hon. gentleman persuaded him, induced him, entreated him, as he says, to enter the cabinet, it was upon the understanding that he should continue to practice in the courts that I have referred to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Have you not read what the hon. gentleman said himself ?

Mr. LENNOX. I have a statement of what the hon. gentleman has said, and I have the fact that the hon. gentleman is not in the House. Why ? I hope that we will have an opportunity of hearing a denial of the hon. gentleman before this debate concludes. I will tell the right hon. gentleman this, and I will tell those who support him this, that whether we have a denial or a statement, or an explanation upon the floor of this House this afternoon or not, every hon. gentleman who takes the position of pledging his vote this afternoon—because if the proposition is not agreed to it is coming to a vote—who votes that it is expedient and right that cabinet ministers should practice in courts presided over by judges appointed by these gentlemen, will have to face an electorate who will not be so easily answered as some of these gentlemen are upon the floor of this House. But that is not all. We have this same 'Canadian Law Times,' which seems to have been inspired when the hon. the Postmaster was elected, also paving the way for this practice which, I say, saps the institutions of Canada to an extent that nothing else I can conceive of would do—I say we have this 'Law Times' again apologizing for the Postmaster General in December, 1905.

It seems almost a passing from the bar, for, although there is no reason why he should not practice, as other ministers, Dominion and provincial, do and have done, the session of parliament is now a very long one, and attendance and departmental duties will doubtless engross most of his time.

Not all his time, 'almost' but not altogether, 'almost' passing from the bar but not quite, like 'almost persuaded' as they used to sing in the camp meetings, but is not quite persuaded. The fact is that instead of his passing from the bar, we have it heralded without shame and without apology in the press that the hon. gentleman is still practising in the courts, is still in the Supreme Court at the foot of Parliament Hill, at the same time that his colleagues of the Privy Council are deliberating upon what is best in the interests of Canada.

We have not only the general practice, but we have it in the newspapers that the hon. gentleman is advising as a lawyer—just as a common lawyer—giving advice in the city of Ottawa. Notwithstanding that he has a law firm of which he is a partner in the city of Toronto he is advising in cases here in Ottawa and advising on what?—amongst other things advising upon matters that have come before parliament, advising upon matters that are before parliament during the time he is giving his advice. It may be right. My experience is not very wide, but it strikes me that it is wrong and because I think it is wrong, because I think it ought to be stopped at once, I have ventured to bring forward this matter and call it definitely to the attention of the House. I said a few minutes ago that I would refer to the attitude taken by the right hon. gentleman who leads the House. I have great respect for the resoursefulness of the right hon. gentleman. I suppose he will be able to give some reason for departing from all English precedent in this matter. No one knows better than my right hon. friend that such a thing is unheard of in the mother of parliaments to which he so often refers. Such a thing would not be for one moment tolerated in Great Britain as that a cabinet minister, a gentleman, too, of whom it is said that he is brought into the cabinet for the express purpose of being Minister of Justice, should engage in the practice of his profession. It is no secret anywhere ; it is said every where that the present hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) refuses to stay very much longer in the government and that being the case my right hon. friend brings in this hon. gentleman who is practising in the courts of Canada to-day before the judges appointed by the present Minister of Justice and who is to be the maker of

judges in the future or the unmaker of them if he will, a man who is to have their promotion in his hand, a man who is to take, if he ses fit the highest judicial position in the land and who will be entitled to that position by reason of his being Minister of Justice. I thought that we might get along perhaps withont this discussion. I would like to have done so. No Canadian can fail to admire the eminent position which the talents of the Postmaster General have won for him at the Canadian bar. We are glad to see him honoured, but lawyers regret to find that he does in this particular forget what is due to his profession, what is due to his position as a cabinet minister and what is due to Canada by practising in the courts and being a cabinet minister at the same time. I say I wanted to avoid this and so on the 21st of March I asked:

Since the appointment of the Honourable Mr. Aylesworth to the position of Postmaster General, in how many actions, causes, matters or proceedings, has he been engaged as a counsel before a judge or judges appointed by the government of Canada ?

That was a plain, honest, modest question, I think. I think it deserved an answer. Here is the answer that the right hon. gentleman who leads the House gave amid the applause of some of his followers—not of all. He said :

There is no department of the government which is in possession of any information under which any answer could be given to that question.

That is clever. That is evasive. It may be discreet, or it may not be. We will see. Does the right hon. minister who leads this House, who is the head of this government know nothing but what is recorded in the departments? Does he know anything of what his ministers are doing? I know that the other day we found a cabinet minister did not know anything of the qualifications of the gentlemen whom he appointed to positions. I know that in some cases it might be more to the peace of mind of the right hon. gentleman if he did not know all that was going on, but I do say that it is not reasonable to assume that the Prime Minister was kept in ignorance of the fact that one of the most important members of his cabinet was practising in the court at the time I refer to. Well, that pleased some of the following. Before that the right hon. gentleman gave to the House an explanation of ministerial changes. He told of the persistent efforts that he had made for a matter of four years, I think, to induce the hon. Postmaster General to become a member of the cabinet. He told of his success. He told us nothing of the arrangement by which he was to be allowed to practise in the courts and in case there was any arrangement by which the hon. gentleman was to have the right to practise in the courts he told us that he made no complaint and he did not take the country into his confidence and explain why it was that contrary to all precedent the hon. gentleman was practising in the courts. Until recently the ministry have been evidently intending to crowd this matter through, to laugh it through, to ignore the protests of the people, to carry it with a high hand as they frequently endeavour to carry things with a high hand and just go on as they have been doing without giving any explanation. So, I find a statement in regard to the matter in the 'Globe' of the 24th March:

Colonel Sam. Hughes said that so far as had been shown the late postmaster at Cannington had no interest in the grocery business. If he had would it be any worse for that man with $900 salary than the Postmaster General himself, who goes down to the Supreme Court to plead for clients and earn more money ? The Postmaster General should have a higher sense of honour.

How is that received? The 'Globe' says 'with ministerial laughter.' It may be a laughing matter, Sir. Some rhymster has said :

Just try to wear a solemn phys,
Be sober if you can—
It is a very serious thing
To be 'a funny man'.

And it may be that these hon. gentlemen to whom it is very funny now may not find it so funny in the end. They have been reconsidering this matter within the last few days. This subject will be one of great interest to the hon. gentlemen who support the right hon. gentleman—to those hon. gentlemen on my left and to those who sit behind the right hon. gentleman. What future is there for these hon. gentlemen? A dozen or two men are of the cabinet or advisers in the inner circle. What future is there for those men who sit around and who are brought in to vote for the measures of the government whether they like them or not? I talk to them at present and I ask them if they believe it is in the interest of the public or if it is expedient or right that a minister of the Crown, having the promotion of judges in his pocket, shall have the right to enter the courts, to enter the lists and to compete with other lawyers who are on the outside. I refer to the fact that the Postmaster General is carrying on his law practice throughout Ontario generally I presume; in the courts in Toronto and in Ottawa at all events. I took occasion some time ago when I thought this matter was coming up to ascertain some of the facts having failed to get the answer I have already referred to. I find that on the 12th of March, in the case of Milne vs. Yorkshire Guarantee Company, the counsels were Aylesworth, K.C., and Deacon for appellants; E. P. Davis for respondent. On the 15th of March, in Bradley vs. Saunders, Riddel, K.C., for appellant ; Aylesworth, K.C., for respondent. On the

16th of March, in Gibb vs. McMahon, Ritchie, K.C., for appellant, Aylesworth, K.C., and Dalamere for respondent. On the 20th of March, in the International Harvesting Company vs. Graham, Aylesworth, K.C., for appellant, Lynch-Staunton, K.C., for respondent.

Mr. FOWLER. This last March.

Mr. LENNOX. This last March. I have only taken the cases heard when the House was in session, and while the Privy Council was sitting every day from two o'clock to three o'clock. On March 23, 26, 27, 28 and 29 when the case of the Toronto Street Railway Company vs. the City of Toronto was being heard; on all these days except the 29th the counsel were Nesbitt, K.C., and Laidlaw, K.C., for the appellant; Aylesworth, K.C., and Fullerton, K.C., for the respondent. I am informed that on the 29th Mr. Aylesworth did not appear in the Toronto case, but he did appear on the same day in Miller vs. Globe Printing Company. This will be sufficient as an illustration. The extent of the practice is not material; it is pretty extensive all the same and it makes a pretty good showing during the session of this House. The court is not sitting now.

I want to ask the right hon. gentleman and the House generally; Is this a fair practice from any standpoint from which we may view it? It may be said of course that this is a little thing, that there are only eight or ten cases mentioned all told that have been tried in the Supreme Court between March 12 and 29. But, if it is wrong as regards a great number of cases it surely is wrong as regards these few. Is it fair to the litigant that a member of the government should plead for one side, and that the other side should be obliged to retain some one who has not this advantage and influence? The trouble is that in these matters it is generally the strong corporation, the rich men who secure the prominent counsel, and the poor man has to take such less prominent counsel as he can afford to pay, and so the evil is aggravated just in that proportion. I will not refer to whether it is fair to the profession; I incidentally referred to that before. But I ask: Is it fair to the judges? How can it be fair to the judges, when after a case has been argued by a member of the government, it may be deemed right by the Supreme court that a previous decision of the lower courts, before which that member of the government did not apear as counsel, should be reversed. Will not public attention be attracted to that, and particularly if it be a case that has a semi-political bearing, will it not be impossible to disabuse the public mind of the idea that injustice has been done by reason of what happened?

Mr. GERMAN. Would the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? Does he suggest that any one of the judges of the courts of Canada will be biased in his view of the law by reason of the fact that a lawyer who happens to be a minister of the Crown is arguing the case?

Mr. LENNOX. I will try to make my remarks so plain——

Mr. GERMAN. I would like the hon. gentleman to answer the question.

Mr. LENNOX. I will try to make my remarks so plain that they can be understood even by the hon. gentleman (Mr. German) who has just spoken. The hon. gentleman is a member of an honourable profession; he is the material of which we make judges—sometimes. I want to tell the hon. gentleman that as a lawyer he will appreciate as well as the general public appreciate it, that it is not only that we have to maintain conditions under which the judges shall do right and will do right, but we must preserve that condition of things under which the judges will be above suspicion. If I had been more successful in expressing myself I would have made it plain to my hon. friend (Mr. German) that what I am trying to point out is this:—take that case of the Toronto Street Railway Company vs. the City of Toronto; Mr. Christopher Robinson was counsel in the early stages of the case. I do not know the history of the case, but let us suppose it was lost by the City of Toronto in the lower courts and when it comes to the Supreme court the Postmaster General is counsel, and perhaps when the judges have done the very best they could do, and have endeavoured to do absolute justice between the parties (as I believe our judges in Canada almost universally endeavour to do) suppose they find themselves compelled to reverse the decision of the lower courts and give judgment in favour of the side supported by the Postmaster General. It may be a just verdict, it may be the only verdict the Supreme court could honestly give, but will the public take it that way? I tell you that we are tampering too much with the judges and the administration of justice, in Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. LENNOX. We are giving them too many political and other jobs. We are bringing them in to too close touch with the executive, a thing that was fought against in the past history of the empire. And unless the government will right about face on this matter they are doing a serious injury to Canada. They may talk about immigration, they may talk about the prosperity of the country, but, if they do not reverse their policy in this respect they are doing an injury to Canada which never can be righted by them even though they remain in power for the next fifteen or twenty-five years. That is what I mean. I am not saying the judges will do wrong; I do not

believe as a rule they will do wrong. But they are human like the rest of us ; some of them are very human. We don't want them to be tempted, and above all we don't want to have them put in a false position. We do not want that their judgment shall be open to suspicion by reason of the way in which the case was conducted before them or because of the position of the counsel who may appear before them ; we do not want it to be understood that the government, (in a word the executive) and the court is to go hand in hand in the trial of the case of this man and the other man or this corporation and the other corporation in the Dominion of Canada. The other night my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) stated in respect to a Bill which he was introducing, that he was quite willing to go back to the old state of things and lop off the additional $1,000 indemnity granted last session, and the Minister of Customs said: Is it right to do a little stealing and wrong to do a great deal of stealing ? How would it be to apply that now? We pre-empted, we bought, possibly at a low figure, the best services of the Postmaster General when we invited him to take a position in the cabinet, and the country understood and had a right to understand that his best energies, his time, his splendid talents, if you will, would be devoted to the service of Canada, and to the service of Canada alone.

What a grand position the hon. gentleman would have occupied, as compared with his position to-day, if, having attained to the high place that he has in his profession and being well able to afford it, he had said : I will henceforward devote my whole time to the service of Canada, and I will leave to the junior members of the bar a chance to fight out these cases on fair terms, not pitting against them a cabinet minister with all the prestige which that position implies. I read to-day or yesterday the following remark of President Roosevelt in a speech which he made the other day :

> The eighth commandment reads, Thou shalt not steal ; it does not read, Thou shalt not steal from the rich man ; it does not read, thou shalt not steal from the poor man ; it reads simply and plainly, thou shalt not steal.

The time of every cabinet minister belongs to the country. When he does not feel that it belongs to the country, he should surrender his position to some man who will give his undivided allegiance to the country, and the sooner the First Minister realizes that none of those who surround him and belong to his cabinet shall take from the country that which belongs to the country, whether it is time or money, the better it will be for the interests of Canada and also for the government, so far as their tenure of office is concerned. My hon. friend who interrupted me a few moments ago with his timely observation, has a high regard for the judiciary. So have I. I do not lag behind him in that respect. Let me read a line or two that will commend itself to him :

> The judges in their calm surroundings are above party prejudice and passions, remain garbed with that solemn oath they take of giving even handed justice to all contending parties before them and carried that atmosphere of calmness and impartiality from the bench into those inquiries, and I, &c.

That was said by an hon. senator of Canada. It will meet exactly the high ideals of my hon. friend, as it meets with my ideals. Let me read a line or two more from the same source :

> They (the judges) are clothed with absolute independence and removed from party factions and prejudices and have their own reputation at stake, which as judges they value.

Clothed with absolute independence—that is just what we want. We want that the judges shall be independent of the executive, and that the executive and the judges shall not go hand in hand in this matter. We want that the practice in Britain shall be followed here. They have no such thing in Great Britain as a Minister of Justice being a member of the cabinet, so that if there is a necessity for that rule being observed in Britain, that no member of the cabinet shall for one hour after he becomes a cabinet minister appear in the courts, surely it is much more important that it should be observed in Canada, where our conditions make it more fatal for the rule to be infringed than it would be even in the mother country. I said it was unfair to the judges. Let me read a few lines from a statement which was discussed some years ago in connection with New South Wales. Judge Boothby, reporting to the home government at the time, on the question which was then under discussion, as to having the Minister of Justice and the Solicitor General members of the cabinet, said :

> The independence of the judges would be endangered, for they must listen to arguments at the bar, on great constitutional questions, arising between the Crown and the people, from the lips of men having the power of cabinet members, and who on leaving the court, might do so only to join a cabinet council to decide on the promotion to a higher rank in judicial office of the very judge to whom, the previous hour, they had been addressing their arguments in behalf of the Crown.

Is it any better, I ask, to have the argument addressed, not on behalf of the Crown —and I except that from my resolution—but on behalf of a private litigant ? In 1806 the question came up of appointing Lord Ellenborough, then Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench, to the Presidency of the Council in Great Britain ; and the ideas of a large section of the British parliament were enunciated in these words :

> That it is peculiarly inexpedient and inadvisable, tending to expose to suspicion, and

bring into disrepute, the independence and impartiality of the judicial character, and to render less satisfactory, if not less pure, the administration of public justice.

In 1903 the matter of the practice of law officers and deputy heads—not cabinet ministers—was brought up before the English House of Commons, and Sir William Harcourt on that occasion spoke as follows :

I took part myself in laying down and carrying out the principle that the law officers of the Crown should not engage in private business, because it was held that they had quite enough public business to do, and that it was possible that in undertaking private business they might have to deal with matters which come into conflict with their responsibilities to the government and the country.

He also said, in reference to the question of divided allegiance :

But when a man takes a responsible position such as that of a minister of the Crown, I say it is only common sense, to lay down the rule that he shall give up the whole of his time to the responsibilities of that position. This seems to me to be a proposition which can be unanimously accepted, and therefore I hope, &c.

Mr. Swift Mackevill, said on the same occasion :

Every person who enters into the service of the state should give his whole time to that service, and not place himself in a position in which there was any possibility of his public and private duties coming in conflict.

On a previous occasion Lord Hotham, bringing up a question similar to the one we have in this House to-day, and quoting with approval what had been said by the 'Times,' spoke thus :

Is the House prepared for such an incorporation of professional and legislative duty on the part of its legal members as that gentlemen who have been retained by private individuals in the one capacity, should take advantage of the other to further their clients' claims ?

I called the attention of the Prime Minister to the fact that we are unfortunately mixing up the duties of the judiciary with the duties of the executive more and more. It is not an intentional mixing up in this instance but it is the inevitable consequence of what we are doing. We are doing it all along the line. We are calling in the judges to pull us out of our difficulties, to take a part in the government, to take the odium and the blame of what should be undertaken by responsible ministers and we are submitting, as has been suggested to me, hypothetical questions to them all the time instead of making these people who are directly responsible to the people and the people's votes shoulder the responsibility, those people who are amenable to the people's votes and who should suffer if they go wrong. We are putting in the judges between the government and the people and so shielding the government. The

whole system is wrong and the sooner we stop it the better. This is one of the elements in that system that is- - -

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Would my hon. friend particularize what he has in mind. He speaks of the tendency to mix the duties of the judiciary and of the government. I understand he gives a case in point, but what other point is there ?

Mr. LENNOX. For instance the Minister of Justice gave a long list of cases to-day.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Taking back to 1880.

Mr. LENNOX. Very likely, I am one of those who do not care a rap whether the Tories did it or the Grits did it. You said you were coming into power because you were going to do better. God knows you have not done it.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The people don't say so.

Mr. LENNOX. The people thought at one time that you were going to do it. The people thought that even my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston) was going to do better than he is doing. He could easily do it.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I satisfied my people.

Mr. LENNOX. Yes, he satisfied them.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Yes, you bet your life.

Mr. LENNOX. And my friend (Mr. Johnston) satisfied himself by voting for the government every time the whip was cracked. He satisfied those people without redeeming the promises his party made.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is a very important question and I have listened to my friend (Mr. Lennox) with very great interest. He says there is a tendency prevailing at this moment on the part of this government to mix the functions of the executive with those of the judiciary. He mentioned a case in point from his own point of view. I have no fault to find with that, but I would be obliged if he would particularize the other instances he has in mind which go to prove the general tendency.

Mr. LENNOX. I will give the right hon. gentleman an instance without going out of the city of Ottawa. We have a sick commissioner at present somewhere in the city of Ottawa, a judge who has been appointed on a royal commission. When we inaugurated these proceedings it was said on the government side of the House : Everything is all right, everything is lovely, we are only doing this thing for fun, there is not a thing wrong about the insurance companies, there is not one thing wrong with the administration of the insurance laws of

the Dominion of Canada, they are worked in perfection. What is the fact? Any one who has read the press knows perfectly well that there have been things wrong, that there are things wrong, and there are other things wrong that have not been divulged, and that this parliament should have known, this cabinet should have known that this insurance department was not being properly, was not being efficiently, aye, and was not being honestly administered by their subordinates who have given evidence at that commission. I did not say this government, I said the trend and tendency of governments in Canada is and it is the same in England, and has been spoken of in the legal journals there, and has been called 'jobbery' in the most respcetable legal journals there—the tendency is for governments to appoint commissions of judges and place those judges in position to be discussed by the public. Take the Gamey investigation by the government's friends in Ontario. Did they condemn it? No they sided with the government of Ontario in appointing that commission and is there a gentleman in Canada to-day who knows anything of public affairs who is so dense that he does not know that in all the history of the judiciary there has never been anything so utterly subversive of the best interests of the judiciary in Canada so utterly at variance with the respect and reverence we should owe to the judiciary and which we do owe and did cheerfully yield the judiciary here before the Gamey investigation as——

Mr. GERMAN. Will the hon. gentleman assert that the High Chancellor Boyd and Chief Justice Falconbridge were not two of the most upright judges in Canada?

Mr. FOWLER. They gave a rank decision.

Mr. LENNOX. All right, I am not saying anything derogatory of any judge, but if you take two of the most eminent judges in the land as my hon. friend has said—I think they would want a stronger champion than my hon. friend—but if you take the two most prominent judges in Ontario as my hon. friend has said and find that the result of that investigation is that one half the people in Canada are traducing them while another half are trying to uphold them, and that one half the people in Canada will never believe that that was an honest and fair investigation,—I ask when we find that—does it not emphasize what I have said in the most abundant and conclusive manner if there is anything we owe to Canada it is that we should see to it that at all hazards we preserve the independence of the judiciary and protect them from the assaults of politicians and maintain them in the confidence of the people as heretofore. I am glad my hon. friend referred to these judges, because, after all, if I remember rightly, I think the Postmaster General (Hon. A. B. Aylesworth) was one of those who stood up for the maintenance of British institutions on that occasion, and gave evidence and did a lot of judicious work previous to the hearing. I have a thorough appreciation of what my hon. friend said and I only ask him to come again.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I understand under the rules of the House this matter cannot be taken up to-night, but I presume on Monday next, when an opportunity will be given to my hon. friend to continue. We must not leave this matter undisposed of in its present form.

Mr. LENNOX. I want to go on at eight o'clock to-night.

The PRIME MINISTER. It must stand over till Monday next under the rules of the House.

Mr. LENNOX. Very well, I will be here.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 102) respecting the Schomberg and Aurora Railway Company.—Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 103) respecting the Quebec and Lake Huron Railway Company.—Mr. Lachance.

Bill (No. 104) to incorporate the Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Railway Company.—Mr. Zimmerman.

Bill (No. 105) to incorporate the Sterling Life Assurance Company.—Mr. Lennox.

Bill (No. 106) respecting applications for patents of Henry Wurts, Jr.—Mr. Belcourt.

Bill (No. 107) respecting the Erie, Ontario, Power Company.—Mr. German—by Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 108) respecting the Kettle River Valley Railway Company.—Mr. Duncan Ross.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

On the order:

Resuming the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. W. F. Maclean for the second reading of Bill (No. 9) to further amend the Railway Act, 1903.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. Might I ask the Minister of Justice whether the government intend to announce their policy with regard to express companies? They did not make that quite clear the other night.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). I understand that the conclusion to which the government has come is

to wait until the Bill presented by the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn) is disposed of.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stand.

ANNUITIES FOR CERTAIN PRIVY COUNCILLORS.

On the order :

Second reading of Bill (No. 18) respecting annuities for certain Privy Councillors, and respecting the Senate and House of Commons.—Mr. W. F. Maclean.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN. I was ready to go on with that, but I want to wait until another Bill dealing with the same question comes into the House to-morrow, so that the two Bills may be before the House at the same time.

Mr. SPEAKER. Stand.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—SURVEY BETWEEN QUEBEC AND MONCTON.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Crocket for copies of all correspondence had between the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and the government, or any department thereof, and between the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and the Transcontinental Railway Commission, in reference to the survey and location of the proposed Transcontinental Railway between Quebec and Moncton.

Hon. JOHN COSTIGAN (Victoria, N.B.). I moved the adjournment of the debate on this question when it was last before the House, because I wished to say a few words upon it. The motion deals with the location of the transcontinental line, especially through New Brunswick, and representing as I do a constituency in that province, I thought I ought to say a few words before the motion was disposed of. I have no intention of criticising the motion itself, nor the speech delivered by the hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket) in moving his resolution; nor have I any intention of entering into a lengthy discussion as to the merits of the two routes. I take the ground that it is no longer the business of laymen to discuss the merits or demerits of each of these two routes mentioned in the reports of the engineers. I take it for granted it is a question to be settled by the engineers, after a careful examination of the whole country. I can remember very well that when the government announced its intention of building a transcontinental line, an all-Canadian route, and when the Bill was introduced in the railway committee, that Bill was not fully satisfactory, nor did it indicate what we expected it would from the announcement of the government policy of an all-Canadian route. The Bill was introduced, I think, by the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Leighton McCarthy), and it left the whole eastern country out on the ground that there was already railway communication from North Bay down to Quebec, and from Quebec to the maritime provinces by the Intercolonial. A movement was made then to extend that line further east, and a strong representation from Quebec very properly felt that the line ought to go to Quebec, and the eastern members from the small provinces thought it ought to go to the maritime provinces.

Unfortunately at that time for the province of New Brunswick, the minister of the province, the leader of the members in parliament, here, for reasons best known to himself and which I do not intend in any way to call in question or criticise, retired from the government as a strong protest against the whole scheme. It left the members from New Brunswick in a very weak position. Those who looked forward to the construction of an all Canadian route as a national undertaking, as one that would develop and build up the best interests of the country, felt themselves to be in an awkward position, but we thought our best efforts should be given to try to get that line extended eastward beyond Quebec and on to the sea-board. The absence of the then Minister of Railways and Canals, the Hon. Mr. Blair, left us in a very weak position. We had to look at the advantages as to distance that Portland, an American port, had against any port we had to offer. My idea at the time was and is still that in order to compete with Portland our efforts should be directed towards securing the construction of the railway to the nearest Canadian port we had. That would be the city of St. John. Now, whatever, opinions hon. gentlemen may have about my attitude towards the City of St. John on some other questions I want to say here and now and to affirm it most distinctly, that, viewing St. John as the commercial metropolis of the province, St. John has no better friend in so far as my confidence goes than the member for Victoria who is now addressing you. Mr. Speaker. I contend that St. John, like any other city in Canada cannot rely upon its own resources for its future. St. John is the commercial metropolis of our province, as Toronto is the commercial metropolis of Ontario and as Montreal and Quebec are large centres in the province of Quebec, but I say that the duty of the rural members and of those representing the city of St. John is to co-operate together because we are bound to build up St. John in the interest of the province and all we ask of the city of St. John and of its representative men is that they should remember that in building up the rural districts they are building up the trade of St. John.

One or two points in the remarks made by the hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket) might be referred to in this way: The hon.

member for York, in making his statement, complained of the greater length of time devoted by the engineers to the examination of what is called the back route, or the central route, as compared with the length of time devoted to the examination of the river route. I am sure that when I call the attention of the hon. gentleman, or of any other hon. member from New Brunswick, to the nature of the country along the Valley of the St. John he will readily understand, as I do, that it should not require anything like the same time or expense to examine the valley route that it would the central or the back route because the valley route runs down the valley of the St. John river. There are railway facilities along it, there are turn-pike roads on each side of the river, besides the use of the navigable river itself. It should not cause any surprise at all if the engineers were obliged to spend more time on the line across from Grand Falls to Moncton, through a wooded country, back from the river and without means of communication. Therefore, I say that the hon. gentleman in making the complaint that too much time was given to that examination, and in concluding that it looked as if there had not been fair play given to the river route makes a complaint in which I do not think there is much force as the hon. gentleman will, I think, admit when he considers the fact that on account of the facilities that can be obtained to examine the river route it should take very much less time to examine it throughly than it should take to examine the central route.

Another point that the hon. gentleman made was that several trial lines were run on the central route to shorten the distance while no such effort was made to shorten the distance on the River St. John Valley route. While in looking at the map and studying the available routes for an all Canadian transcontinental railway it would strike any one that if you could get the grades the distance should be shorter by going from Grand Falls direct to Moncton, the only question was as to whether you could get satisfactory grades. If you could get the grades you would have a shorter route and a more satisfactory route but that was an unknown country at that time to a large extent. Several lines were tried in the distance between Moncton and Grand Falls. Now, there was not the same necessity for different lines along the valley route because the contention of hon. gentlemen who preferred the valley route from their point of view—and I do not quarrel with it at all—is that the valley route should be followed on account of the grades you can get by following the flow of the water from Grand Falls to Fredericton. That is an arbitrary line. There was no necessity to try any other route because no other route was required. You had to start at Grand Falls and follow the route down to Fredericton. There was not the same necessity for trial lines to shorten the distance that there was going across country where you had a wide scope on each side of the proposed line. Another argument was used at the time that representations were made to the government recently in favour of the river route and against the back route which I think ought not to have too much weight. It was contended that while the back route, so called, or what is called the central route, was certainly some miles shorter than the river St. John route, still you had to climb over the elevations that were objectionable and that were not to be found upon the valley route at all. What I complain of is that the engineers having lengthened the line by the central route in order to get satisfactory grades, such grades as are required by the government and the transcontinental railway commission, the two objections should be used—first the length of the route and then the elevations to be overcome. The elevations do not exist. The elevations have been overcome by the lengthening of the central route, but the length of the route is still much shorter than that of the valley route.

In regard to the city of St. John I may say that when this question came up before and when the surveys were started I noticed in the Fredericton 'Herald' a strong article denouncing the central route and appealing to the muncipalities and counties to enter a strong protest against the road going by that route and to try and force it down the valley of the St. John. I had been well acquainted with the editor of that paper for many years and I wrote him a friendly letter. I have no objection to stating the reasons I gave why I thought he was making a mistake. I said that if I lived in Fredericton I would hold up both hands for the central route for the reason that going by the central route the moment you strike the Canada Eastern line, a government road which is part of the Intercolonial Railway, you strike communication with Fredericton and you approach Fredericton in connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific line, east and west the mileage would not be more than by the River St. John route, you leave Fredericton with the existing railway and you give it the advantage of the newly constructed trunk line. You would develop a country of considerable importance and notwithstanding all that has been said about it as being a country well adapted for agricultural purposes you would open up a country well suited for the manufacture of lumber. Another objection has been urged against that route which I think is not a very strong one and that is that if you run the railway through there you will destroy the whole of the timber of that country which is more valuable to New Brunswick than the construction of the road. If that argument is any good at all you would have to change the whole line from the Pacific

coast because one of the great advantages to Ontario and Quebec especially and to British Columbia is that you are opening up and developing a new country and that through British Columbia to some extent but principally through Ontario and Quebec you are opening up a large timber country. If it is going to destroy the timber in our province it will have the same effect in the other provinces, but what strengthens me is that the other provinces do not take the same view of it because Ontario and Quebec so far have hailed the construction of that road with delight because it will develop a country which it would tax them to their utmost to develop if it were not developed by this undertaking. I do not pretend that it is a colonization scheme. I do not pretend that it is a development scheme but I do claim that it is a scheme growing out of the transportation question. The problem was sought to be solved by the construction of an all-Canadian route having such grades and curvatures and being of such a character as to be able to carry freight in such a way as to compete successfully with Portland.

I believe the results of that project will be realized to its fullest extent. It is true that in constructing this road to meet the requirements of transcontinental transportation it incidentally becomes a great developing power, with respect to large sections of British Columbia, of Saskatchewan, of Alberta, of Manitoba, of Ontario especially, and of Quebec. There is no doubt that the distance through which it runs in New Brunswick will also be developed. I do not want to enter into any strong argument against the views of my hon. friends who have spoken and whose opinions are just as honest as my own, but I must speak my personal conviction with regard to the route which should be selected. When the National Transcontinental Railway Bill was first introduced I expressed the idea that it was possible to get a satisfactory line through that part of the province of New Brunswick which was supposed to be mountainous. As a matter of fact the country is not of that character at all. The reports of the surveys made under the supervision of Sir Sandford Fleming before the building of the Intercolonial Railway have been cited very frequently in this House, but it must be remembered that these surveys were made largely with the view of keeping away from the frontier. These surveys started from Moncton and different points and they nearly all centered at the head waters of the Tobique and Restigouche, making for River du Loup and Trois Pistoles. They therefore passed through the height of land in the province. Every one who knows the province of New Brunswick knows, that the Tobique, the Miramichi, the Restigouche, the Nepisiquit, all flowing in different directions take their source in the height of land in the centre of the province so that it is only a very short distance from the head waters of one river to the head waters of the other. But, at the time of the Intercolonial Railway survey a good line was found to the south of that territory by the late Mr. Hartly who lived in the county of Carleton and who represented that county in the legislature of New Brunswick. During the session of parliament when we were discussing the building of the Intercolonial Railway, he was sent out to make a survey, but it was a foregone conclusion that the railway should be constructed on the Robinson route, and the fact is that a satisfactory report on the central route was not wanted. The central route was then offered as a compromise between the advocates of the North Shore route and those who wanted the River Valley route. We joined in favour of the central route offering to take it as a compromise and Mr. Hartly was sent out, but the moment he reported that he was getting a favourable location he was called off and no further survey was made at that time. However, that route has been surveyed recently and it is proven that a practical line having the curvatures, the grades, and the requirements necessary for a first-class railroad can be obtained. I shall not pretend to speak for the city of St. John in the presence of hon. gentlemen who are better qualified than I am to deal with that point, but I am free to express my opinion that the city of St. John will be as well served should this route be adopted as it possibly can be served by the river route to Fredericton and thence to Chipman. It is my conviction that when this road is built, the city of St. John will be taxed to its utmost to handle the traffic that will be hauled into it over this very central route. What difference can it make to St. John at any rate, whether the river route or the back route is adopted. The advocates of the river route want to go to Fredericton and cross over to Chipman, but suppose the back route, or rather what I call the center route is taken, it also will go to Chipman and therefore Chipman is the objective point for St. John in any case. I cannot see that the people of the city of St. John would have any choice as between the two routes so far as their interests are concerned. I have no objection at all to the statements made by the hon. gentlemen from York and Carleton, but I do hope that we will not forget that the great object is to have an all Canadian railway built on all Canadian territory, to carry the grain of the Canadian west to a Canadian port in the east. I gladly supported the national transcontinental project, as I supported in earlier days the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway; I supported the National Transcontinental Railway with a good deal more confidence than I did the construction of the Canadian Pacific Rail-

way, because the experience we have had in the meantime led me to the conclusion that there was no doubt in the world about the success of our latest transcontinental scheme. But I supported it as an all Canadian route; I did not support it for any local considerations, and I say now that we should not divert that line one single mile to accommodate any local interests to the detriment of the greater interest we have in view. I hold that the line should be built as a commercial enterprise and with a view of getting the best grades and the shortest possible distance so as to enable us to successfully compete with American ports. I have confidence in the commissioners appointed for the construction of the eastern section; I have confidence in the chief engineer selected to carry out the surveys, and so I am prepared to accept the report of the engineers from the scientific point of view, and I trust that a sensible view will be taken of the matter by all those who want to do the best for Canada.

Mr. A. A. STOCKTON (St. John). I do not think I am sufficiently acquainted with the facts which have arisen in this discussion to speak at any great length. My hon. friend (Mr. Costigan) has put in a very strong plea for an all Canadian route, but I do not think that question is involved. Whether the railway goes by the central route or by the River Valley route it will be all on Canadian soil and therefore the plea that the hon. gentleman has put in—a very proper plea from a patriotic standpoint—that this transcontinental line should be all on Canadian soil, has no relevancy to the discussion. I listened with considerable interest the other day to my hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) and the way he crumpled up railway distances and stretched out railways as if they were made of India rubber, was somewhat startling. However, his conclusions came out pretty well, and I think he proved, as did my hon. friend from York (Mr. Crocket), that from the point of view of commercial success the valley route should be adopted by the government. I was somewhat interested in listening to my hon. friend (Mr. Carvell) because I had not forgotten that when he ran his election in 1904 he had considerable to say with respect to railway construction in New Brunswick, and he practically told his electors that he had the assurance of the Prime Minister that the road would be built down the valley of the River St. John. My hon. friend (Mr. Carvell) who is sitting beside me says he does not wish to call me down, but I am perfectly willing he should.

Mr. CARVELL. I am very sorry to have to correct my hon. friend (Mr. Stockton), but I never made such a statement in my life during the election of 1904.

Mr. STOCKTON. I am glad to hear it.

Mr. CARVELL. In 1904 I took the same ground I took here last week, that both these routes should be honestly surveyed and that that which offered the best transportation facilities should be chosen.

Mr. STOCKTON. I accept unreservedly the statement of my hon. friend (Mr. Carvell), but he certainly did impose to a certain extent upon the credulity of the editor of the St. John 'Globe,' because during the progress of the election that gentleman undertook to make some little corrections as to the statements of the Liberal candidate for Carleton county, saying, he thought there must be some obscurity and that probably the Prime Minister had not made the statement as distinctly as was alleged by my hon. friend (Mr. Carvell). Now, I agree in the result with my hon. friend from the County of Carleton. I am not going to discuss the question at length, but I was impressed with the statement of my hon. friend—this was the inference—that there was no honesty on the part of somebody in preparing the first survey and making the first report. What did my hon. friend say, as reported in 'Hansard,' and as I understood him at the time? He said, on page 1502, speaking of the reports :

> While I do not say that they were dishonest—I won't go so far as that, and I am going to make no comments on these reports, because, if I did, I might say something uncomplimentary to somebody—but I do say they were very incomplete.

Who is the 'somebody' as to whom uncomplimentary remarks might be made, and by whom dishonest reports have been sent in and incomplete information has been given to this government? Who is responsible for that incomplete and dishonest information? Is it the chief engineer who is under the instructions of the government? I think that some member of the government should rise in his place on the floor of this House and make some statement with respect to that observation of my hon. friend from the county of Carleton. I may say that there is a rumour, a feeling, in my hon. friend's county and in all the counties along the River St. John that a report was put in which was not complete, which was not honest, and about which uncomplimentary remarks could be made. I agree with my hon. friend from Carleton as to that, and when my hon. friend from Carleton and Senators King and Thompson insisted that an honest survey should be made of the valley of the River St. John, what was the result of that survey? According to the statement of my hon. friend from Carleton and of the two senators whom I have named, whereas it has been represented in the report that there were hills to climb and engineering difficulties to overcome in the valley of the River St. John, an honest survey showed that all along that route of 137 miles only one hill

of 30 feet in height could be found, with the exception of one 25 miles above the town of Woodstock. Therefore, I ask who made this report and under whose authority and direction was it made, that went into the government stating that there were great engineering difficulties in the St. John River route? All I want is that there should be an honest survey made and honest information given to this government and this House with respect to the Transcontinental Railway through the province of New Brunswick. My hon. friend said, and I suppose said truthfully, that he had nothing particular to say with respect to the city of St. John—that the city and county of St. John were not deserving of very much credit or of very complimentary remarks at the hands of the friends of the government. But, Sir, the city of St. John stands at the mouth of one of the noblest rivers of Canada. We are not responsible for the geography of the province of New Brunswick or for the fact that that river flows through one of the most fertile parts of that province to the sea. We have planted a city at the mouth of that river by the energy and industry and activity of its people, and they expect that justice shall be done in the expenditure of public money from the treasury of the Dominion. I feel it an honour to represent such a constituency as the great constituency of the city and county of St. John, and because we are independent and send men to parliament to suit ourselves, and not a particular minister, is that any reason why we should be penalized in the expenditure of public money, or that a great transcontinental railway should be ruined or impaired? The city of St. John was founded by men who preferred to leave their homes in the neighbouring republic in 1783 and to live under the British flag, and would the men who are their successors in the city of St. John to-day be worthy of their ancestors if they were willing to give up their judgment and their individuality at the beck and call of a minister of the day or of any clique or body of men? I do not think any minister would ask them to do that. All that we ask at the hands of the government of this country is fair play. We have a harbour there on which over $1,000,000 has been expended at the expense of the people of the city of St. John—what for? To provide facilities for the export trade, not of the province of New Brunswick alone, but of the whole Dominion of Canada—to handle the western freight which is to go forward to the markets of the world, and if there is any port in the Dominion of Canada entitled to consideration at the hands of the government and to be nationalized it is the port of St. John. With respect to that, I see my hon. friend the Minister of Finance present to-night, and I am glad to see him in his place again. I do not wish to say one word against the port of Halifax or the port of Montreal or the port of Quebec. I believe that all four of these ports should in the interest of the country be nationalized and that the facilities required for the transportation of the products of this country from the west to the east and to the markets of the world should be provided by the government of Canada. We have done our share and because we are in opposition that is no reason why we should receive unfair treatment at the hands of the government. We do not hope to be in opposition very long, Sir, but if the change takes place would it not be a small thing for us to penalize some other place because it happened to be independent enough to send men to this House who did not support the government of the day which is to be led by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition? That would not be statesmanlike; it would not be fair. We do not want a political railway in the province of New Brunswick. We want a commercial railway, a railway that follows the best possible route through the province of New Brunswick, and that will best subserve the public interests of the whole Dominion of Canada.

Mr. W. S. LOGGIE (Northumberland, N. B.). I have not had the pleasure as my hon. friend from the northern portion of New Brunswick said he had had, of speaking on this subject in the House before, but I have had an opportunity of presenting this question before the electors of my own county. I endeavoured to show my constituents or to tell them that the government had made a most favourable bargain in the interests of Canada at large, I told them that it was proposed to run this railway through the centre of New Brunswick diagonally across the province, touching the Canada Eastern a little west of the town of Boiestown. When I was at that town addressing the constituents of that parish I said it would not be many years until we could say to them, 'all aboard for Quebec or for the Pacific coast.' Although this was very clearly explained to be the shortest and most feasible route on which an all-Canadian railway could be built, yet in our province the Conservative press heralded it from one end of the province to the other that we were giving away at the cost of the country a railroad costing $150,000,000 to the Grand Trunk Pacific, and they said that having paid 90 per cent of the cost we had better pay the other 10 per cent and operate the road.

Mr. DANIEL. Control the road, not necessarily operate it.

Mr. LOGGIE. My friend from St. John speaks about controlling the road, not necessarily operating it. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if we are not controlling the road as it is?

Mr. LENNOX. You are not controlling the expenditure very much.

An hon. MEMBER. It is an unknown quantity.

Mr. LOGGIE. That is part of the contract, it is all an unknown quantity until it is realized on. But, so far as we have gone, certainly the most favourable view that any man in the province took has been realized. It was announced that the object of the road was to develop the country from the Pacific to the Atlantic, and this road is a portion of the line that will gather freight in the orient, take it to its terminus on the Canadian Pacific coast and will then carry it to the eastern portions of Canada as well as gathering up the wheat in the great rich fields of the west. At the same time, as I see it the development of this country of ours is just as important as the transportation question and in our venture to spend money on transportation it certainly is incumbent on us to see that we spend it where the country will be developed. We are therefore spending this large sum of money by aiding the Grand Trunk Pacific and by building a portion of the road on our own account. We are spending money where the country is not now developed, and in doing so we will materially advance the interests of our country because increased population will come in and then farmers at a distance from the present railways will be enabled to market their grain at an advantage, and as population is pouring into the country at the present time I am sure our hon. friends will not say the venture was started any too soon, that they will admit it was not in the interests of the country that these operations should have been put off as they suggested at that time. I think, in view of the contracts that have been let, that the optimistic view taken by the government of this scheme has to that extent been realized. I see that the contracts have been let at a less cost than was estimated by the engineers.

I have mentioned the development that will probably take place between the Pacific coast and the southern borders of the province of Quebec. When we leave Quebec we pass along the borders of the state of Maine until we reach Grand Falls and from that point there are two routes, one down the St. John river, and the other a direct route to Chipman. By following the back route from Grand Falls to Chipman you are going through a country that is capable of great development. By referring to the interim report of the commissioners, you will find that the engineers state that the lands they surveyed are capable of cultivation, that there are well wooded lands for as much as 15 miles on either side of the railway; they especially mention birch trees of more than the ordinary size. We have in the town of Newcastle a firm manufacturing chairs for the European market out of birch and if this railroad goes through this well wooded country, with timber suitable for the manufacture of furniture for export, it will surely give an impetus to the starting of manufactories in that district, and then on the main line they will be able to have cheap transportation to the sea-board. It seems to me that these are reasons why that part of the country should be used rather than the St. John river which is already developed and has not this wooded land that I speak of. The important part is that it is possible to have the proper gradients, the proper grades and curves by the centre route. If these were not available, if the matter were now in doubt as it was two or three years ago when this Bill was introduced into the House, the situation might be different, but the report of the engineers verifies the statement that not only is it possible to have these gradients of four-tenths going east and six-tenths going west, but that the grades have been found. The grades are available.

Therefore if the back route from Grand Falls to Chipman is the more direct route and if it passes through a country capable of development and at present without any railway facilities whatever, is it not the duty of this government to see that this part of the great transcontinental railway is built through this country which is capable of development, which has resources behind it, and has no railway facilities. I think there can be hardly any question as to the duty of the government in this matter. The report of the Railway Commission is certainly most favourable to the back route. My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Stockton) asks me to which report I refer. I am referring to the interim report of the commission. That report, my hon. friend says, the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) declares to be of no use. Well, I fancy that neither the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) nor the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Stockton) can possibly change the geography of the country through which the central route is surveyed. I say that the gradients necessary, according to the contract, have been found over that route, by taking which we pass through a land that is capable of great development and will have besides a more direct line. Therefore that route has considerable claims upon the government.

I want also to say something regarding the cost of hauling over the central route as compared with the route from Quebec to Moncton over the Intercolonial Railway, and I base my figures on the report of Mr. Butler, who was then the assistant engineer of the commission and is now the deputy minister. He makes a comparison based on ten fully loaded trains which the Grand Trunk Pacific can haul over the low grades set out in the contract as compared with the cost of hauling the same tonnage over the grades of the Intercolonial Railway. The annual net saving in favour of the trans-

continental railway, by following the low grades on the central or back route, Mr. Butler makes out will be $2,157,544.52 on operating expenses, which sum, capitalized at 3 per cent—that being the rate of interest which the Grand Trunk Pacific have agreed to pay on the cost—gives the fabulous sum of $40,453,959, while the cost of building the Quebec and Moncton section will be about $16,000,000, on which sum the Grand Trunk Pacific are to pay an interest of 3 per cent, or an annual expenditure under that head of $480,000. So that by an annual expenditure of $480,000 for interest or rent, they are enabled to save $2,157,544.52 yearly on the operation of ten fully loaded trains per day from Quebec bridge to Moncton. Yet the Conservative press say that the road will not be built to New Brunswick and others say the Intercolonial Railway should be used.

Mr. DANIEL. What Conservative newspaper of New Brunswick says that the Transcontinental will not be built through that province.

Mr. LOGGIE. If the hon. gentleman will refer back to the files of the St. John papers during the Dominion election of 1904, he will find that the St. John 'Telegraph' sent out that statement from one end of the country to the other. I have stated what I believe will be the annual saving to the Grand Trunk Pacific by using the back route as compared with any other route of the same length with the grades of the Intercolonial Railway; and in consideration of the importance of cheap transportation from the rich wheat fields to the sea-board and the practicability of hauling wheat for export all-rail to the sea-board in competition with the lake and rail route, there ought to be no difficulty in deciding what is the best route. And it is encouraging to believe that this all-rail haulage can be successfully done if the low grades such as are set out in the contract are available over the whole line. For example the cost per ton on the Intercolonial Railway from Moncton to Quebec is seventy-three cents as compared with the cost over the Grand Trunk Pacific to New Brunswick by the back route, with the low gradients found there, of forty-three cents. So that it will cost about 75 per cent more to haul over the Intercolonial Railway gradients than over the Grand Trunk Pacific gradients, and it will also cost less to haul passenger trains over the Grand Trunk Pacific gradients as you will find set out on page 77 of the commissioners' report, which refers to the saving as between hauling freight over the Intercolonial Railway gradients and hauling freight over the Grand Trunk Pacific with the gradients required by the contract.

I want to say a word or two about the advantage of the back route as compared with the river route. The engineer's letter to the department, dated I think, in April, 1905, shows the value of the back route over the river route to be $3,896,252.75. My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Stockton) says that is where they say it is all mountain. I did not see that in the report. Perhaps he will tell me where he found it. But let me tell you what the report says, for I have it here. What the chief engineer says is this :

> Comparing the two routes, the route via St. John river will cost $1,500,000 more than the central route.

That is accounted for to some extent by the fact that two very large and expensive bridges will have to be built over the St. John river. Then the engineer computes that there is a difference of some 17 or 28 miles, and he goes on to show that there will be a saving caused by not having to operate this difference in mileage of $95,-850.11 per year which, capitalized at 4 per cent, will amount to $2,396,252.75, and to this you must add the $1,500,000 which the road will cost via St. John river over and above what it would cost via the back route. Therefore there will be a saving to the country in this way, and if there is any question as to the Grand Trunk Pacific being able to carry out its part of the agreement, this will enable it to meet its obligations to the extent that by using the back route it will save annually in interest and operating expenses an amount equal to interest on $3,-896,000, which will make it more easy for it to comply with its contract.

Again what does the letter say ? It says that the back route opens up a new country well adapted for settlement and at present without transportation facilities. Then again :

> The river route is already supplied with railway facilities and will in all reasonable probability be connected with the Transcontinental Railway at a number of points.

Then he unhesitatingly recommends the adoption of the back route with a grade of four-tenths equal to 21·1 feet per mile, rising eastward to a grade of six-tenths, equal to 31·6 feet per mile as the preferable line. When my hon. friend from St. John talks about an honest survey, I would like to know how it is possible to have a better one.

Mr. STOCKTON. My hon. friend is mistaken, I was not saying that. It was the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) who was asking for an honest survey.

Mr. LOGGIE. Well, my memory perhaps is not as good as my hon. friend's, but I thought that he not only said that, but reiterated his own wish that we should have an honest survey.

Mr. STOCKTON. I certainly do.

Mr. LOGGIE. Then it is not necessary for the hon. gentleman to say that he did not say so, that is the point I make.

Mr. STOCKTON. You must settle that with the member for Carleton, N.B.

Mr. LOGGIE. Now I want to read what the Railway Commission have to say about that:

> In the past all the information has been impartially given to the public, and we propose adhering to this policy in the future in order that no undue advantage may be accorded any one, but that all competitors may have exactly the same chances so far as the department and the commission are concerned.

I say it is hardly fair to assume that there has been any dishonest survey. We are sure of this, that the gradients that are claimed to have been found by the back route are there, or they would not be put in this report in such emphatic terms. If they are there, and the contract can be carried out by that route, and it is a shorter route, and develops a new country, and fulfils the understanding we had in 1904 that it would follow the direct route if these gradients were available, then that part of the question is a matter beyond dispute at the present time. It seems to me that all the advantages I have mentioned are available, and the Grand Trunk Pacific gives us the assurance that they will be able to carry out their proposition. Now what do we hear heralded? We hear it heralded that the Grand Trunk Pacific will never pay their interest. And what can we do about it if they do not pay their interest? I think there is everything to encourage us to believe that they will be quite able to pay their interest from the saving they will make on the road with such gradients as have been found. Then again as to the reason why we should select the back route instead of the river route—when the road reaches Grand Falls, which is a common point to both, it runs along the St. John river, paralleling the Canadian Pacific Railway for some 70 miles, one road on one side of the river and the other on the other side, almost within a stone's throw of each other. Therefore what freight it gathers will be freight that naturally belonged to the Canadian Pacific Railway. We are really serving territory that has railway facilities already, and we are leaving off serving a territory that has not railway facilities and will not be able to secure railway facilities unless it be a portion of some through line like the present one. Perhaps it is possible within the very near future that we may have another transcontinental line, and in that case that route might be served, if you do not serve it now, and instead go down the St. John river. Then after it leaves Woodstock, there is the Canadian Pacific Railway on both sides of the river. That I admit is back somewhat from the river.

Mr. CARVELL. Thirty miles.

Mr. LOGGIE. Thirty miles in some places I suppose. I congratulate my hon. friend from Carleton, N.B., on the very able speech he made the other night. I have no doubt thirty miles is the furthest point. I wish the hon. gentleman would tell us now the nearest point. I do not know myself, perhaps it would not be thirty miles.

Mr. CARVELL. Twenty-five.

Mr. LOGGIE. Well, that is better. I would like also to say that from Woodstock to Fredericton we have already water facilities for a certain portion of the year, in the spring season, and also water facilities during the autumn months.

Mr. CARVELL. Last year it was fifteen days.

Mr. LOGGIE. Well, probably it was a very dry season in that part of the world. At any rate, we have at the present time railway facilities for seventy miles of the route within a stone's throw of where they wish to put this Grand Trunk Pacific line, and then we have two lines of railway from Woodstock to Fredericton and more or less water communication. The country is all opened up, all the lumber has been taken off, whereas the country along the back route is a forest, with a large quantity of birch, and those who are acquainted with birch know that it is a heavy timber that cannot be sent down the stream by water because it becomes water logged and sinks. Therefore that country is not capable of development unless you give it railway facilities, and with the quantity of birch and other wood on it that is useful for manufacturing furniture, I should think there would be considerable development of that section in the way of the export of lumber to Europe.

Now Mr. Speaker, it does seem to me that everything points to the advisability of the government selecting the back route as the most direct one having the light grades and curves necessary for cheap transportation.

Although the back line does not touch my county, it comes near the borders of it. I am not personally interested except so far as my constituents are concerned, but I am intensely interested from a New Brunswick standpoint that our province should be given necessary railway facilities where development of the farm and forest is dependent upon transportation. I think there is a good deal in what my hon. friend from Victoria, N.B., (Mr. Costigan) said to-night, that our friends from St. John should consider the fact that the road taps the Intercolonial west of Boiestown and brings them by forty miles into Fredericton. I suppose they can get right of way over the Canadian Pacific Railway, and then they have another outlet via the Canadian Pacific Railway into St. John on the west side of the harbour. I

think the geography of the country gives St. John the advantage over any other port in the Dominion of Canada as a winter port for heavy freight. I would not like to see anything whatever done that would interfere with the prosperity of the great winter ports of this country. I am quite willing to endorse everything that has been said in favour of St. John, and making it a free port. I think that of all those ports that have been mentioned, St. John is the one that should first receive consideration. Quebec and Montreal are further inland and there is not the same competition. But when you carry grain from St. John you have to compete with Portland, New York or Boston, and I think anything the government can do for the port of St. John deserves our endorsation.

Mr. G. W. FOWLER (King's, N.B.). It strikes me that the question under discussion should not be approached from a partisan standpoint, politics should not enter into this discussion at all. We settled the political end of the question at the elections of 1904. We on this side who belong to the opposition were opposed to building what is known as the Quebec section of the Grand Trunk Pacific. We thought that improvements could be made in the Intercolonial Railway which would obviate the necessity of building a new line from Quebec to the Atlantic coast. But the government did not take that view, and the people, speaking at the polls, have sustained the government in the attitude which they took upon that question.

Now, the question to be settled is which is going to be the better route. It seems that we are bound to have this new Grand Trunk Pacific line from Quebec to the Atlantic and the question now before the House is as to which is the better route. We should lay our politics aside and strive to get a route which is going to be best from the commercial standpoint. This road is not to be, as I understand it, a colonization road at all. My hon. friend who has just spoken has argued very strongly in favour of what is known as the back or central route on account of the advantages in opening up that section of the country. I want to say just now to my hon. friend that I am opposed to that route altogether and in favour of what is known as the valley route. All portions of the province of New Brunswick are not alike fertile. The fertile portions of our province lie in the valleys of the rivers and the section of the country that will be traversed by the Grand Trunk Pacific, if it goes by the central route, will be a section which is not good for cultivation, but a section that is to-day valuable by reason of the immense forests that grows upon it, the value of which will be destroyed if it is opened up by this railway. It will be a very serious loss to the province of New Brunswick because our forests are of great value to us and if this road goes by way of that central route it will open up this country and destroy a very valuable asset of the province. As I said, I think this question should be approached aside from politics altogether, but the hon. gentleman who has just spoken has not felt himself to be under any such obligation and he has found it necessary to bring in the political question. He spoke of the most optimistic dreams of the gentlemen who advocated this line as having been realized. I wonder what he meant. I wonder if it was the presentment of the case made by the right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) or of that of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) in which he stated that the total cost of this road would be only $13,000,000. We let a contract the other day to the lowest tenderer for only one-sixth of the distance and it is costing us over $19,000,000. Is that what the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Loggie) meant by the most optimistic dreams of the originators of this road having been realized? Perhaps he has reference to the statement made by the right hon. the leader of the government that the construction of this road would shorten the distance by 140 miles by taking the central route, when as a matter of fact we find by the report of these very engineers whom he eulogizes so highly—his opinion is not shared by the hon. member for Carleton, nor, let me tell the hon. gentleman, is it shared by the great majority of the people of New Brunswick—that this route will be about 21 miles longer than that of the much abused Intercolonial Railway. Is that then another of the optimistic dreams that have been realized according to the statement of my hon. friend here? He also speaks of the Conservative press, and attacks it in general terms, not specifying or particularizing what newspaper it was in which he saw these articles. Then, when pinned down, he says it was the 'Telegraph.' I would like to ask my hon. friend or any other hon. member when the 'Telegraph' became a Conservative newspaper.

Mr. LOGGIE. At the last election.

Mr. FOWLER. Any one who knows the circumstances knows it was nothing of the sort. It had been for years a supporter of the Liberal party, but it became shortly before the election an independent paper and has been maintained as an independent paper ever since.

An hon. MEMBER. Oh, oh.

Mr. FOWLER. My hon. friend may laugh. It is the sort of laugh that sounds like the crackling of thorns under a pot. In so far as the paralleling of the Canadian Pacific Railway by the valley route is concerned, that surely would not give my hon. friends very much concern, because by this

Grand Trunk Pacific Railway they are paralleling for many miles the Intercolonial Railway, a railway which belongs to the people of the country, and still while they can do that with impunity they now hesitate about paralleling a road owned by a corporation and not owned by the people at large.

Mr. LOGGIE. What part of the Intercolonial Railway will it parallel ?

Mr. FOWLER. A very considerable part. This is a matter of very great concern to the people of New Brunswick and to show how the people feel upon it I will mention that of the thirteen members from the province of New Brunswick eleven are in favour of the valley route. One is in favour of the central route. One, following his usual course, straddles both routes. That would give some indication, it seems to me, and a very strong indication of the feeling of the people in respect to this matter. As far as my constituency is concerned, it does not make a hap'worth of difference to them which of these routes is adopted. In either case the railway will go to Chipman and will go from Chipman through by King's county, a portion of the constituency which I have the honour to represent, to St. John. Therefore, in reference to this matter I speak without prejudice, without partisanship or without bias in any way. I voice the opinion which I have in respect to what is going to be the best for the province at large, the best for the country, the best for the Grand Trunk Pacific if it is to be made the great commercial road that we hope to have it. There is just one suspicious circumstance in connection with this whole matter, and it is this: The Grand Trunk Pacific promoters are men of intelligence, are men of ability, are railroad men who know what is the right thing and what is the best thing in their own interest and in the interests of their road. If they were honest about desiring this outlet for the products of the great west, if they were honest in their intention to carry these products through Canada and to serve Canadian ports you would find so strong a protest from these gentlemen against the central route that the government would not dare to build the road by that route. But what is the suspicion in respect to the matter? It is that they are glad to see the wrong route adopted; they are glad to see a route adopted upon which they will not be able to get the grades that they are supposed to require and that they do require in order to make this road a commercial success and they will make the excuse that they have to take the products of the west by way of Portland over the Grand Trunk system, the very thing that they desire to do. Therefore, the Canadian ports will not receive the benefit of having the products of the west exported through them to the countries of the old world. That is the view I take of this and I say it is a matter of very grave importance not only to the province of New Brunswick, but that it is a matter of very great importance to this all Canadian line, and I trust that when it comes to the selection of this route the government will select the route by way of the valley of the River St. John.

Mr. J. W. DANIEL (St John City). Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to weary the House by any relation of a technical nature in regard to this matter or to go over to any extent tables of distances and things of that kind, but merely to refer to one or two points which most hon. members who are very directly interested in the question would consider to be practical points. I think that my hon. friend from York, N.B. (Mr. Crocket) might very well be congratulated on the care and ability which he manifested in bringing this matter so ably as he did to the attention of this House. The hon. member for Carleton, N.B., (Mr. Carvell) too, has certainly agreed with the hon. member for York to a very large extent in the way in which he treated the question, and has really backed him up in a very large degree as to the contention that the surveyors who have been sent to survey the Quebec-Moncton section have not paid so much attention as they should have paid to the valley route of the St. John river as compared with the attention they have given to the back or central route.

The hon. member for Carleton, N. B. (Mr. Carvell) expressed surprise that the hon. member for York, N. B. (Mr. Crocket) should go out of his way as he said, to suggest that this line should be run down the valley of the River St. John to the harbour of St. John at the mouth of the river. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Carvell) said : The agreement is signed, the bond is made, the law is there, the line must go to Moncton, and what is the use of talking about running it down the river valley to the harbour ? But, Sir, I contend that this matter is not settled by running the line to Moncton. The true object of the Bill as contained in its preamble if given effect to, renders the argument of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Carvell) ineffective, because if you build the line to Moncton you do not comply with the declaration of the preamble, which says :

> Whereas by reason of the growth in population and the rapid development in the productiveness and trade of Canada and especially of the western part thereof, and with a view to the opening up of new territory available for settlement, both in the eastern provinces and in the west, and the affording of transportation facilities for such territory and for other reasons, the necessity has arisen for the construction of a national transcontinental railway to be operated as a common railway highway across the Dominion of Canada from ocean to ocean and wholly within Canadian territory.

Mr. FIELDING. Read on, the preamble specially mentions Moncton. The hon. gentleman has only read part.

Mr. DANIEL. The agreement says the road shall go to Moncton.

Mr. FIELDING. The preamble distinctly says Moncton is the objective point.

Mr. DANIEL. I am not saying that Moncton is not the objective point in the agreement, but I do say that to make Moncton the objective point does not carry out the object of the Bill as set forth in the preamble.

Mr. FIELDING. The preamble distinctly says that the line shall go to Moncton.

Mr. DANIEL. The preamble says the line shall run from ocean to ocean.

Mr. FIELDING. It says it shall run from Moncton to the Pacific.

Mr. DANIEL. The copy I have here reads that the line shall run from ocean to ocean.

Mr. FIELDING. If you will read further you will find it says distinctly that the line shall run 'from the city of Moncton in New Brunswick, to the city of Winnipeg.'

Mr. LOGGIE. But previous to that it says from ocean to ocean.

Mr. FOWLER. Moncton is not on the ocean.

Mr. FIELDING. Moncton is particularly referred to in the preamble.

Mr. DANIEL. I will read the remainder of the preamble :

> And whereas an agreement has been entered into bearing date the 29th day of July, 1903, between His Majesty the King of the first part, and Sir Charles Rivers Wilson, G.C.M.G., C.B., and others representing therein and acting on behalf of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. A company incorporated by an Act of the parliament of Canada passed at the present session thereof making provision for the construction and operation of such railway ; and whereas it is expedient that parliament should ratify and confirm the said agreement and should grant authority for the construction in manner hereinafter provided of the eastern division of the said railway between the city of Moncton in the province of New Brunswick, and the city of Winnipeg, in the province of Manitoba.
>
> Therefore His Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows :

I repeat that the line in going to the city of Moncton does not carry out the object of the Bill as stated in the preamble, which is to build a railway from ocean to ocean, because no one by any stretch of imagination could make Moncton an ocean port.

Mr. TAYLOR. Or Winnipeg either.

Mr. DANIEL. Winnipeg is not intended to be.

Mr. LENNOX. The Minister of Finance was trying to argue that it was.

Mr. DANIEL. The hon. gentleman from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) brought out that point very clearly in his speech when he said :

> I regret to say that in the distances which are given in the discussion to-night and also in the newspaper press, the objective points are taken as Quebec and Moncton, whereas I contend the objective points should be Quebec and tidewater, no matter where it is.

My hon. friend (Mr. Carvell) is right when he says that the line should run from ocean to ocean, and not to an inland point. I take it that railway enterprises are a matter of business, and whether this railway is built by the river route or by the central route to Moncton, it will certainly be taking away from the only port in Canada fitted to do an export business in winter whatever chance it may have of ever doing that business. Remember our competing point is not Halifax, or any other port in Nova Scotia; our competitor is Portland in the state of Maine. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Carvell) gives us the distance of the shortest line from Quebec to St. John as 475 miles compared with 317 miles from Quebec to Portland. But he pointed out that the grade from Quebec to Portland is a one per cent, and that it would be necessary to add 83 miles to the 317 to get a four-tenths grade the same as the grade on the new transcontinental road. That would make the relative distance from Quebec to Portland 400 miles as against 475 miles from Quebec to St. John, and 75 miles added on to a long transcontinental railway haul would not be an insuperable objection. Let me point out that from Quebec to Moncton by the shortest route given in Mr. Lumsden's report, it is 514 miles. Now, suppose we were to carry this freight to Halifax, the Cobequid mountains would have to be crossed. The distance from Quebec to Moncton is 514 miles, and thence over the mountains to Halifax, 189 miles, or a total of 703 miles from Quebec to Halifax. But the grade across the Cobequid mountains by the Intercolonial Railway is actually over two per cent. I would propound this arithmetical calculation to my hon. friend (Mr. Carvell). If it takes 83 miles in a distance of 317 miles to reduce a one per cent grade to a four-tenths grade, how many miles will it take to reduce a more than two per cent grade in a distance of 189 miles down to a four-tenths grade. I find it will take about 100 miles, so that according to the calculation of the hon. gentleman (Mr. Carvell) in order to get the true railway hauling distance from Quebec to Halifax, we must take the following figures :

	Miles.
Quebec to Portland..	400
Quebec to St. John..	475
Quebec to Halifax..	803

That is the legitimate conclusion from my hon. friend's argument.

Mr. CARVELL. I do not want to interfere with my hon. friend's argument, but I certainly must object to his conclusion if he places these words in my mouth. If he takes those figures as his own I have no objection but, for Heaven's sake, do not put them in my mouth.

Mr. DANIEL. I have no doubt the hon. member for Carleton may be a little startled at his argument being carried out to its full and legitimate conclusion, but as a matter of fact I have given the sum, which I ask him to do for himself, and if he can find any other result I shall be very glad to accept it. I believe the result I have given is absolutely correct, according to the railway arithmetic and the reasoning of my hon. friend from Carleton. It is just such thoughts as these that gave the people of the constituency I represent a great deal of food for thought. They felt that it was not right on the part of this government to take away so far as they seemingly could from the only port which was calculated to do this business to advantage, the chance of getting that business.

I would like also to call the attention of the House to the fact that my hon. friend from Carleton referred to the political aspect of the matter, so far as my constituency is concerned. He stated that the Conservatives down there had opposed the building of this line. I take issue with him there. I am not aware of any Conservative having taken any such stand. The stand we took there was the stand taken in this House by the leader of the opposition and by the members of the Conservative party standing back of him ; that is, that as the government had undertaken to guarantee nine-tenths of the cost of this line, it was better for them to assume the whole cost and own and control the road. In addition to that, we had other and possibly more important objections to the agreement that was made. One was that there was no clause in it compelling the Grand Trunk Pacific to carry freight to Canadian ports at all. I would like to make that perfectly clear, because I think it is one of the most important reasons that have given rise to the feeling of opposition where it exists to this contract with the Grand Trunk Pacific. The section which relates to this matter is section 42, of the Act of 1903, which says :

It is hereby declared and agreed between the parties to this agreement that the aid herein provided for is granted by the government of Canada for the express purpose of encouraging the development of Canadian trade and transportation of goods through Canadian channels. The company accepts the aid on these conditions, and agrees that all freight originating on the line of the railway or its branches, not specifically routed otherwise by the shipper, shall, when destined for points in Canada, be carried entirely on Canadian territory or between inland Canadian ports.

What is the fact with regard to the railway haulage of freight ? Mr. Loud, representing the Grand Trunk Railway Company, a short time ago gave testimony in a court of law to the effect that ninety out of every hundred shippers specifically routed their own freight ; so that as a matter of fact under this very agreement we cannot hope to have more than one-tenth of this freight, supposing the shippers decide to route it in accordance with the probable wishes of the Grand Trunk people, so that they would take it to their nearest port of shipment ; because here is where the second part of the provision comes in :

And that the through rate on export traffic from the point of origin to the point of destination shall at no time be greater via Canadian ports than via United States ports, and that all such traffic not specifically routed otherwise by the shipper shall be carried to Canadian ocean ports.

So that we could only get that amount of freight that was not specifically routed otherwise, for our share of the business ; and, in order to make it sure that the Grand Trunk Pacific would haul their freight by its shortest line to the nearest port, it was provided that they should not charge any more for carrying it to a Canadian port than they could get by hauling it to their own foreign port. In other words the company will get just as much for its shorter haul to Portland as it will get for its longer haul to Canadian ports. These things all taken together made the people in my constituency feel that the bargain the government was making for the transcontinental railway, was not at all events favourable to the city of St. John.

My hon. friend from Carleton also referred to what he called, forcibly enough, though perhaps not very elegantly, the Portland howl. Now, Sir, there was a Portland howl, but it came after the day of the election, and it was a howl of delight. I will give you just a sample of the headliness of one or two of the New England papers on the day after the election. The Boston 'Journal' said : 'The Portland boom is assured by the Canadian verdict.' The Boston 'American' : 'Canada's vote gives a boom to Portland ; a Liberal victory assures the new road and the Maine City a big business.' Portland 'Argus' : 'Decisive victory for Laurier, the Grand Trunk, and Portland.' Now, I will just give a sample or two in endorsation of the statement of my hon. friend from Carleton that there was a Portland howl, and it was a howl of delight. On election day the Biddeford, Maine, 'Journal,' said :

Portland has almost as much at stake in the Canadian election as she has in our own presi-

dential election in the United States. If Sir Wilfrid Laurier's government is continued in power, the Forest City will get most of the benefits of commercial annexation with few of the responsibilities that would accompany actual annexation.

The day after the election the same paper said :

In view of the result of the Canadian election, Portland would seem to be fully justified in burning a little red fire, and putting a little more carmine in the municipal paint.

That is not bad for a prohibition state where they call upon aldermen, in ordinary parlance, to paint the town red.

I shall now give the closing part in this connection of an editorial from the Boston 'Daily Advertiser'. I may say that the editorial contains throughout rather sarcastic references to any attempts on the part of the eastern provinces to obtain or control any great amount of this eastern business, but this is the way it closes.

The export business is not a matter of sentiment. The very fact that no contract has been made binding the Grand Trunk in the future is a pretty good sign that the Canadian government is building the new eastern line rather to catch votes than with much idea that the export business will be taken away from the ports of this section for very long.

While the council of the board of trade of Portland say in their report :

Our city is to be congratulated on the result of the recent victory of the promoters of the Grand Trunk Pacific, for the completion of this great system should mean more to Portland than almost any other point reached by the Grand Trunk road. Although it is impossible to estimate actual results, we feel safe in predicting that it will be the making of this port——

That is the port of Portland.

—from a commercial point of view.

I have no objection at all, I would rather endorse the action of the government in reducing in any way, the distance between Quebec and Montreal and the port of Halifax or any port in Cape Breton or in the extremest part of Nova Scotia. I have no objection to that. I think it is right and certainly I for one would not be disposed to go against anything of that kind, but where a Bill is passed for the express purpose of building a line from ocean to ocean and it purposely side tracks the only place that is in a position to do that business successfully on the Atlantic side, then I think we have a right to protest as earnestly as we possibly can and certainly that is the position I take with regard to that.

As regards the two routes I think that when we take into consideration the fact that under the most favourable circumstances export business can only be done about five or six months out of the year and that for the rest of the time the road must depend on its local business for money to keep it going then I take it that from that view of the case there is no comparison in so far as I am acquainted with the country as between the valley of the River St. John and the central route. We have had it explained to us by men who have been over that part of the country that in one section there is a large well being population, a prosperous people, and in the other a simple wooded country, a large part of which will never be fit for settlement at all, and here is a railway to be built through it which for the greater part of the year will have to depend on local business for its sustenance. The idea is apparently, if possible, to take it out through the centre of the unproductive part of the province rather than running it down into the part where it would be productive.

I did not intend to take any part in this discussion and would not have done so had my own constituency not been referred to so frequently, and I may say to the members who have spoken that I certainly return my thanks to them as representing St. John for the kind words they have given that port and harbour during the discussion. I have never seen as much justice extended to the port of St. John as during this discussion from members sitting on both sides of yourself, Sir. I thank the members for that and I may say that their statements are absolutely justified from the fact that during this past winter the harbour of St. John has done a winter port business with only the one railway helping it to any extent, of over $20,000,000 worth of exports, an increase of over $7,000,000 over last year and the winter is not yet ended. The fact is that the business there is only bounded and confined by the facilities which the port has for doing business and in that connection the Bill which the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) referred to to-day in connection with nationalizing the port of Montreal will receive a great deal of attention from me, more especially when it is taken in connection with the report of the transportation commission recommending that a number of the harbours of Canada should be looked after in that way by the general government. I certainly would cordially support any such idea as that because I believe the business of the port and harbour of St. John is getting beyond the capacity of the corporation of that city to attend to as it should be looked after. Therefore I am in hopes that in the near future this matter will come up in such a way that it may be dealt with. Meanwhile while the government see fit to build their line to Moncton for the purpose of making as short a line to Nova Scotia ports as they possibly can, to which I have no objection, if they are going fully to carry out the purpose of this Bill as it is laid down in the preamble I hope they will build as short a line as can be built down to the port and harbour of St. John, the port that will be able to

compete to some extent under favourable auspices with our great competitor the port of Portland in the state of Maine.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). This motion calls for papers in relation to the railway surveys. I do not understand that we are called upon to discuss the general question of the Transcontinental Railway; that was fully discussed in the past. Perhaps we may have to discuss it again, but I do not think it is necessary on a motion dealing entirely with this question of surveys, to enter into a general discussion of that great question. Rightly or wrongly the matter was threshed out in this House several years ago; parliament adopted the policy the government had proposed, and I am justified in saying the country generally accepted and ratified that policy. We are therefore now dealing purely and simply with the location of the road in the province of New Brunswick, and I venture the statement that there is no question in that calling for an extended debate. Parliament has settled practically the question we have been discussing by inserting in the Act a declaration that the eastern portion of that road should be constructed from the city of Moncton through the central portion of the province of New Brunswick and through the province of Quebec to the city of Quebec by the shortest available line. That is an engineering question; we have had to discuss political questions in connection with this enterprise in the past and this is not the moment to discuss them again. The question as it is presented to the House by the quotation I gave you from the Act of Parliament makes the matter simply an engineering question.

The policy of the government as laid down in this House,—which this House approved and which the country approved—was that there should be this great national transcontinental railway constructed from ocean to ocean, or from Moncton—the point where we are brought in connection with existing lines of railway running to our ocean ports, for nobody supposes you want to duplicate any line of railway unnecessarily—the policy was to build from Moncton to the Pacific coast an all British line; and as respects that particular section of New Brunswick, there are the words set forth in the Act of Parliament that the location shall be from the city of Moncton through the central portion of the province of New Brunswick and through the province of Quebec, to the city of Quebec, by the shortest available line. There is no longer therefore any political question in connection with this matter. If there was any such, it was settled, wisely or unwisely, long ago. So that all that remains is purely the engineering question. My hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell), the other day, referred to the importance of having a proper survey. He said that he thought that further surveys were necessary and urged on the government the importance of making them. That was a fair and reasonable request, and it has been met to some extent. Further surveys will be made, every reasonable effort that can be made by competent engineers will be made, to ascertain what is the shortest available line between the two points. Whether that will serve St. John or Fredericton or Halifax must be a minor question. The statute has laid down the policy, and it is laid down in the general interests of the Dominion and what we believe to be the general interests of the maritime provinces. I therefore do not want to discuss the merits of that question, but simply draw attention to the fact that parliament has settled the political question and that nothing remains but the purely engineering question—the question of ascertaining what is the shortest available line.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What has been discovered in the last two and a half years?

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend has the reports which are before the House. He is aware that there was a preliminary report, and such later information as has been obtained has been brought before the House, and no doubt we will have further information. There is therefore no longer a political question, but simply the question of ascertaining from the reports of the engineers what is the shortest available and best possible line. I trust that hon. gentlemen will agree that parliament having declared its policy, it is the duty of the government to see that proper surveys are made. If adequate surveys have not been obtained, let us have further surveys. Let every reasonable effort be made to ascertain what is the shortest available line, and that line should be adopted in the general interests of Canada, and on that line the government will build the road.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am sure the remarks of the hon. the Minister of Finance must be especially refreshing to those who have listened to the elaborate calculations which were indulged in by him and his colleagues during the debate we had three years ago. I venture to say that any hon. gentleman in this House who listened to that debate will agree with me that the Finance Minister was then able to speak with ten times more confidence regarding that line through New Brunswick than he now ventures to do. He was then able to calculate its length to the mile. I very well remember one speech in which he discussed all the calculations as to the saving in distances. He cautiously took off a few miles here and added a few miles there, and was able to come down to an absolute saving of 79 or 80 miles between Quebec and Moncton. But now, when I ask him what infor-

mation he has obtained in the last two and a half years, I am referred by the Finance Minister of this business government to documents which have been placed on the table within the last two or three days. Eighty miles was the very lowest calculation made by the most cautious of all the ministers of this business government, the Minister of Finance, as to the saving in distance, and that hon. gentleman does not know apparently that the calculations made by his own engineers, the engineers of this commission, show that instead of a saving of 80 miles there is an actual lengthening, as compared with the Intercolonial Railway, of about 21 miles. I do not know whether my hon. friend the Minister of Finance is aware of that or not.

Mr. FIELDING. What has that to do with the subject under debate? We are not discussing the general question of the Transcontinental. The question now is how this survey will run. Suppose it proves that the length is much greater, that does not alter the fact that the survey must follow the line laid down in the statute.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not surprised that my hon friend should thus desire to evade any discussion of the question although his own supporters have been discussing it for hours during the debate we have had on this motion. A very prominent supporter of the hon. gentleman, the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) discussed it at very great length and made elaborate calculations to throw discredit on the survey that had been made, and pronounced emphatically in favour of further surveys before any proper, reasonable conclusion could be come to on the subject. But compare for a moment the attitude of these gentlemen a few years ago with their attitude now. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister and the hon. the Minister of Finance, brought down to parliament, after nearly five months of the session had elapsed, a measure which resulted in the resignation of the Minister of Railways of that day (Mr. Blair), and they told us that the urgent necessity for then introducing that measure was because time would not wait. We had the Prime Minister telling us that it was not a question of a day, of a year, or two years or three years, of any time in the future, but a question of that very day, that very hour, that very minute. He then said:

> This is not the time for deliberation, but for action. We cannot wait because time does not wait, because in these days of wonderful development, time lost is money lost. Our duty is immediate and imperative. It is not of to-morrow but of this day, of this hour, of this minute.

When we asked: Why do you rush into this matter? Why do you not wait until another session? Why do you not obtain some information? What was the answer of the First Minister and the Minister of Finance? Their answer was this: We have mountains of information, we know all about this. The Finance Minister himself told us that he had surveys which amply demonstrated that it would be the easiest possible thing to obtain a line through the centre of New Brunswick which would reduce the distance from Quebec to Moncton by 80 miles. But to-day when I ask him: what information has this business government obtained with regard to that very line through the centre of New Brunswick during the last two and a half or three years, during which time could not wait, during which time lost was money lost, what is his reply? He tells me: We may find it necessary to make some further surveys. To-day that is the position taken by this business administration. That is the attitude of the Minister of Finance, who is leading the House to-night. He deprecates any discussion whatever of this important subject which was declared by him to be all pressing and all urgent only three years ago. Well, I venture to think that the people of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, who have been deliberately deceived in this matter, will not be ready to accept such excuses of the Minister of Finance as he has given the House to-night. Further surveys are necessary, after two and a half or three years have elapsed, is all the answer which he has to give to the criticisms and suggestions made, not from this side of the House, but by his own prominent supporters respecting the policy which is being carried out and as to the extraordinary operations which have been carried on by this administration through its engineers whose work has been so fiercely criticised by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell). I think, Sir, it is well indeed that my hon. friend from York (Mr. Crocket) brought this matter to the attention of the House, and I venture to think that if the government does not desire to make a more pitiable spectacle of itself with regard to its pledges concerning this railway than it has in many other matters that might be alluded to, it will see that these surveys are no longer neglected, that the work is pressed on, that some decent pretense at least be made of carrying out those pledges so copiously poured out three years ago by the gentlemen who sit on the treasury benches.

Motion agreed to.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all reports regarding the Riding Mountain timber reserve, since January 1, 1900, by any officers of the government.—Mr. W. J. Roche.

For a copy of the specifications for the Victoria Memorial Museum, especially that portion thereof showing the kind, quality and dimensions of stone to be used by the contractor in the exterior walls of the same. Also for a copy of all correspondence regarding stone for the said building between the government, or any department, minister or official and every person or corporation, including the contractor, Mr. Goodwin, and the owners or lessees of the Read, Battery, River Philip, and other quarries.—Mr. Perley—by Mr. Sproule.

For a return showing all coal lands leased, sold or otherwise disposed of during each year from 1896 to 1905, inclusive, giving the area disposed of, the party to whom, the consideration therefor, the assignments made, if any, and the date thereof, and the name of the assigneee in each case.—Mr. Foster.

For a copy of all letters, correspondence and communications between the Minister of the Interior or any department of the government and the superintendent under the Children's Protection Act of British Columbia, respecting the sale and slavery in British Columbia of young girls for immoral purposes. Also a copy of all reports and communications from the agents of the Indian Department in British Columbia with respect to the matters aforesaid, and all replies and communications from the department to such agents.—Mr. R. L. Borden.

For a copy of all petitions, memorials, reports, letters, documents, correspondence and papers, setting forth or relating or referring to the necessity of improved aids to navigation and of the life-saving vessels or appliances on the Pacific cost.—Mr. R. L. Borden.

For a copy of all applications from C. F. Caldwell for himself, or by C. F. Caldwell on behalf of any clients, together with their names, or by any other person or persons, together with copies of all correspondence or other papers in connection with permission to purchase coal mining lands in the province of Alberta.—Mr. J. D. Reid.

For a copy of all reports, findings and recommendations of any officer, court of inquiry or commission, respecting the loss of any steamship or vessel on the Pacific coast during the past six years, except such as have already been published in the annual report of the Department of Marine.—Mr. R. L. Borden.

For a copy of an order in council passed on or about July 27, 1900, re certain lands in Alberta and Athabaska, referred to in a question asked by Mr. Lefurgey, of the Ministry, on April 9, instant, together with official plan or map showing lands referred to, and all other correspondence and papers in reference thereto, between the government or any person acting in its behalf, and others, up to the present time.—Mr. Lefurgey—by Mr. Taylor.

For a copy of all contracts made between the government of Canada and any trans-Atlantic steamship companies wherein any subsidies were granted by the government.—Mr. E. D. Smith—by Mr. Taylor.

ADJOURNMENT—NORTH ATLANTIC TRADING COMPANY.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) moved the adjournment of the House.

Hon. GEORGE E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Before the House adjourns, I wish to give notice to the Finance Minister and to the government that at the earliest possible opportunity, I suppose on going into Supply, I intend to move the following motion:

That the contracts entered into by the government of Canada with the North Atlantic Trading Company were made without the authority and knowledge of parliament.

That the engagements thus undertaken cover a possible period of nearly thirteen years and involve the payment by the country of about one million dollars without any reasonable compensating advantages.

That the contracts were made under a pledge not to disclose the personnel or agents of the alleged company who are either unknown to the government, or if known to the government have not been disclosed to parliament notwithstanding various attempts to secure the information.

That it does not appear that the alleged Trading Company has any corporate existence, any recognized headquarters, any known directors or officers, that it has any vessels afloat, or possesses any trading or operating facilities of any kind or any agents or agencies effective or otherwise.

That no evidence has been given to parliament of the plans and methods of operation, or that it has been primarily instrumental in sending one single immigrant to Canada and all efforts so far made to discover its workings have proved unsuccessful.

That the conditions of the contracts are injurious, improvident and absurd.

That immediate steps should be taken to terminate the existing contract.

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

Mr. FIELDING. First the Bill standing in the name of my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick), and then, if there be time, supply. I may say to my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) that I understand that my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) has some information touching that question which it is his intention to present to the committee to-morrow in response to a request from the committee. However, as he is not present I just mentioned that as likely to engage the attention of the committee to-morrow.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What department will be taken up in supply?

Mr. FIELDING. Marine and Fisheries and Justice.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.15 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THURSDAY, April 19, 1906.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 125) respecting the Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Dyment.

Bill (No. 126) respecting the Thorold and Lake Erie Railway Company.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 127) respecting the Farmers' Bank of Canada.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 128) respecting the Puebla Light and Power Company, Limited, and to change its name to the Puebla Tramway, Light and Power Company, Limited.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 129) to incorporate the Winnipeg Trust and Loan Company.—Mr. Lefurgey—by Mr. Taylor.

Bill (No. 130) respecting the Grand Valley Railway Company.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 131) respecting the Royal Bank of Canada—Mr. A. K. Maclean.

Bill (No. 132) respecting the Ontario Northern and Timagami Railway Company.—Mr. McCool.

Bill (No. 133) respecting the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 134) respecting the Toronto and Hamilton Railway Company and to change its name to the Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway Company.—Mr. Guthrie.

Bill (No. 135) respecting the Empire Trust Company.—Mr. Northrup.

Bill (No. 136) respecting a patent of the Cyclone Woven Wire Fence Company, Limited.—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill (No. 137) respecting the city of Toronto.—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill (No. 138) respecting the Toronto Union Station Company, Limited.—Mr. Macdonell.

Bill (No. 139) respecting the Northern Commercial Telegraph Company, Limited.—Mr. German.

Bill (No. 140) respecting the Southern Central Pacific Railway.—Mr. McCraney—by Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 141) respecting the Quebec, Saguenay and Gulf of St.Lawrence Railway Company.—Mr. Girard—by Mr. Geoffrion.

Bill (No. 142) to repeal the Act respecting annuities for certain privy councillors.—Mr. U. Wilson.

Bill (No. 143) to amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.—Mr. U. Wilson.

QUESTIONS.

THE RAY AND BRONSON MINING CONCESSION.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

1. What was the date of the grant of the Ray and Bronson mining concession, and to whom was it made ?
2. What were the conditions as to rental and development of the property imposed by the lease ?
3. What has been expended upon the concession for each year since the date of the lease in respect of (a) rental ; (b) development ; (c) machinery and plant ?
4. For what years have exemptions from the conditions of the lease been granted, and on whose application and recommendation ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. The lease is dated the 3rd day of November, 1899, and was issued in favour of the Honourable E. H. Bronson and C. C. Ray.

2. The lease provides for the payment of a yearly rental of $375, also that the lessee shall have sufficient hydraulic or other machinery on the location, within one year from the date of the lease, to permit of active operations being commenced for the efficient working of the rights and privileges granted, and that if during any year of the term of the lease the lessee shall fail to expend in such mining operations in, about or upon the location the sum of $5,000, of the fact of which failure the minister shall be the sole and final judge, the lease shall become and be utterly and absolutely null and void, unless the minister shall otherwise decide.

3. The amount paid for rental between the 3rd of November, 1899, and the 3rd of November, 1902, is $1,125, being $375 for each year. Since that date the rental has more than once been tendered by the lessees but has been refused by the department, as it was decided not to take any action with respect to the leasehold which might waive any right of cancellation the government might have in respect of the lease.

The requirements of the lease in respect of machinery and expenditure were suspended up to the 2nd of June, 1902. In July, 1903, affidavits were furnished to show that $6,029.84 had been expended in, about or upon the location, and that $3,053.66 had been expended on machinery. The assistant gold commissioner, therefore, issued a certificate of work for the year which ended on the 3rd of November, 1903. Affidavits were subsequently submitted to show that an additional expenditure of $6,652 had been incurred during the same year.

In August, 1904, affidavits were furnished to show that the lessees had expended at least $5,000 in mining operations on the

location during the year ending the 3rd of November, 1904, and the government mining engineer reported that he considered the work done involved the above expenditure. In September, 1904, an affidavit was submitted to the effect that $5,500 additional had been expended on this location during the same year. The government mining engineer reported that $4,700 of this amount was expended in hydraulic operations.

On the 6th of November, 1905, the government mining engineer reported that the lessees had expended in hydraulic mining the sum of $5,089, and in placer operations the sum of $6,130 or $11,219 in all on the location during the year which ended on the 3rd of November last.

4. Exemption from certain conditions of the lease was granted from the 3rd of November, 1899, to the 2nd of June, 1902. Application for such exemption was made by Messrs. Bronson and Ray. There is nothing to show on whose recommendation this exemption was granted.

THE SASKATCHEWAN VALLEY LAND COMPANY.

Mr. FOSTER asked :

Is the government aware that the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, or its successors, purchased the rights in certain lands possessed by the Canadian Northern Railway Company, earned as railway subsidy ? What was the date of such purchase, and of the transfer to the former company ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The government is not aware of any transaction of the nature referred to.

TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Mr. MORIN asked :

1. What is the amount of the construction contract of the new transcontinental line for the construction of that part of the line running from Quebec westward ?

2. What is the amount of the contract for the same line for the construction of the section from Winnipeg eastward ?

Hon. HENRY R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways). There is no contract for the construction of a new transcontinental line or any portion of it as yet entered into. Any contract which may be entered into would not be for a bulk sum, but would be based on schedule prices and be governed by the extent of the work done.

MAIL SERVICE, PRINCE ALBERT.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE asked:

1. Were tenders called for during the past twelve months to carry the mail between the Canadian Pacific Railway station and the post office at the town of Prince Albert, Saskatchewan ?

2. If so, how many tenders were received, who were the parties tendering, and the amount of the respective tenders ?

3. Did the lowest tenderer receive the contract ? If not, why not, and who was the successful tenderer ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Postmaster General):

1. Yes.

2. Three tenders were received and are under consideration.

3. No contract has yet been entered into.

PIERREVILLE, YAMASKA, WHARF.

Mr. BERGERON asked:

1. What is the cost of the wharf built by the government at Pierreville, in the county of Yamaska, Quebec ?

2. What has been the revenue from such wharf ?

Hon. CHARLES S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works):

1. Total expenditure for wharf at Pierreville, $12,181.52.

2. None.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—PROPERTY AT HALIFAX.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN asked :

1. Has the government acquired for the purposes of the Intercolonial Railway the property on the west side of Water street, lying between North street and Cornwallis street, in the city of Halifax ?

2. Has any portion of such property been acquired by the government ?

3. If not, is it the intention of the government to acquire such property ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. Yes, the government has acquired for the purposes of the Intercolonial Railway all the property on the west side of Water street, lying between Cornwallis and North streets, Halifax.

2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.

TRACHOMA HOSPITAL, HALIFAX.

Mr. U. WILSON asked:

1. Has the government established, acquired or taken over a hospital for trachoma patients at Halifax ?

2. If taken over or acquired, from whom was it taken over or acquired, at what date, at what price, and for what consideration ?

3. What was the value of the property taken over by the government for this purpose, and by whom was such valuation made ?

4. What were the arrangements between the government and the person or persons from whom the said hospital was taken over or acquired ?

5. Under what arrangement with the government was the hospital originally established, if it was established in the first instance by private persons ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior) :

1. Yes.

2. A building rented from A. M. Bell by Dr. Dickey who has been using it for some months as a trachoma hospital was taken over March 1, 1905. The rent before such taking over was, and it is now, $50 per month. There was no other consideration.

3. The property has not been valued by the department, as its use is temporary until the hospital building now under construction is completed.

4. The arrangement with Dr. Dickey was that his equipment be taken over at 75 per cent of the invoice value of the different articles.

5. There was no arrangement between the department and Dr. Dickey regarding the original establishment of the hospital. It was a purely private enterprise of Dr. Dickey's, who was paid by the steamship companies for treating detained immigrants.

LETTER CARRIER UNIFORMS.

Mr. TAYLOR asked :

1. From whom were the uniforms for letter carriers purchased for city post offices, amounting in all to $8,461.20, for the following places : Brantford, $136.75 ; Halifax, $347.75 ; Hamilton, $670 ; Kingston, $219.75 ; London, $484.45 ; Montreal, $1,984.05 ; Ottawa, $489.25 ; Quebec, $390.85 ; St. John, $360.55 ; Toronto, $2,466.60 ; Vancouver, $217.20 ; Winnipeg, $694 ; as shown in the Auditor General's Report for 1904-5, pages S—54 to 59 ?

2. Were these uniforms and supplies purchased by public tender ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Postmaster General). Uniforms for letter carriers are not purchased ready made, but each carrier in the service throughout Canada is furnished with a uniform made to order.

Each garment of the uniforms is made at a price fixed by contract.

The contractors are the Crown Tailoring Company of Toronto, and the W. E. Sanford Company of Hamilton.

The contracts were entered into upon tender in each case.

ONTARIO COUNTY COURT JUDGES.

Mr. LENNOX asked :

1. Are sections 5 and 6 of chapter 54 of the Revised Statutes of Ontario, regulating the number of county courts judges (a) still in force ; (b) have they been repealed in whole or in part ; (c) or amended ?

2. If repealed or amended, by what statute ?

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). I do not think my hon. friend should press for an answer to this question. He asks for an expression of opinion which would certainly involve the solution of an abstract legal question, and I doubt very much whether it would be of very much value to my hon. friend.

Mr. LENNOX. I anticipated that difficulty but I thought the hon. minister would give an answer as to the matter of fact, and that is as to the repeal.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I have asked one of my officials to prepare a memorandum which I shall be glad to furnish.

THE SAN FRANCISCO DISASTER.

Mr. D. W. BOLE (Winnipeg). Before the Orders of the Day are called I would like to ask my hon. friend the First Minister if it is the intention of the government to officially notice the great calamity which has overtaken the city of San Francisco? Should the government feel disposed to make a substantial contribution to the sufferers, either in cash or kind, the Canadian people, I am confident, will support it in such action.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The government, in common with everybody else, have learnt with the deepest concern the great calamity which has happened to this large city. So far, however, we have not yet considered it advisable to offer any contribution, either in money or otherwise, as we do not know the full extent of the calamity or whether or not the resources of the great nation to the south are adequate for the purpose.

HIGH COMMISSIONER AND MESSRS. PRESTON AND GRIFFITHS—CORRESPONDENCE.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to call the attention of the government to an order moved for by my hon. friend from Lennox (Mr. U. Wilson) on the 14th March last, which asked for the correspondence between the High Commissioner of Canada and Mr. Preston as well as the correspondence between Mr. Preston and Mr. Griffiths. I recently requested the Minister of the Interior, when the estimates of this department were under discussion, to consider as added to that motion, on my own account, all correspondence between the department and these gentlemen or between the department and the high commissioner in connection with the subject matter of these communications. A period of about five weeks has elapsed since that correspondence was moved for, and one would suppose that unless it be very voluminous it might have been brought down before this. Might I ask the First Minister or the Minister of the Interior to give to the matter such expedition as may be posible.

Mr. OLIVER. The correspondence is not yet ready for presentation to the House, and

of course the additional request made adds very considerably to the delay in placing the return upon the table.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Perhaps the return might be brought down in two parts. That called for by the former motion might be brought down and the other portion brought down separately.

Mr. OLIVER. All right.

POSTMASTERS IN PEEL COUNTY.

Mr. BLAIN. Might I ask the Postmaster General when we may expect the return to the order I moved for on the 28th March last relative to postmasters, &c., in the county of Peel ?

Mr. AYLESWORTH. The papers are in course of preparation.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In view of the fact that arrangements have been made to allow members to present their respects to Prince Arthur in the other Chamber and in view of the numerous other functions which take place to-day, I beg to move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. SPEAKER. It has been suggested that all those who desire to be presented to His Royal Highness had better be here at four o'clock when we shall go to the Senate Chamber, where the presentation will take place.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What business to-morrow ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Bills, and then Supply of the departments of Justice and Marine and Fisheries.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 3.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, April 20, 1906.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

THE SAN FRANCISCO CALAMITY.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are proceeded with, I beg with the consent of the House, to present a matter which hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, I am sure, will regard as one of urgency. Reference has already been made in the House to the disaster which has come upon one of the great cities of the neighbouring republic. I think the information which has now reached us through the public press is sufficient to give assurance that that disaster is of a very widespread character, and that there will be need of generous asistance from the liberal-minded people not only of the United States, but of other parts of the world. At all events, I am sure that this parliament, representing the people who inhabit the northern portion of this continent, will be glad to share in the opportunities of ministering to the comfort and the welfare of their afflicted brethren in the great republic to the south. I propose, therefore, at the conclusion of any observations which any other hon. member may desire to make on the subject, to present in the usual form a message from His Excellency the Governor General recommending this House to grant the sum of $100,000 as a contribution of the people of Canada to the afflicted people of San Francisco.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is any hon. member of the House who would not cordially support the government in this proposal. The disaster which has overtaken the city of San Francisco is one which almost staggers our belief—one which we can hardly understand or imagine without actually seeing it. We have had substantial proofs in the past of the sympathy of the people of the United States in times of disaster to Canadian citizens. In the presence of an appalling calamity such as this, and for the purpose of rendering aid and succour to those who are in distress, the two nations are one.

Mr. FIELDING. Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a message from His Excellency the Governor General.

Mr. Speaker read the message as follows:

GREY.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons, further Supplementary Estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion for the year ending on the 30th June, 1906, and in accordance with the provisions of "The British North America Act, 1867," the Governor General recommends these Estimates to the House of Commons.

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,
OTTAWA, 20th April, 1906.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, the said Message and Further Supplementary Estimates were referred to the Committee of Supply.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I wish to rise to a question of privilege ; but I will ask the indulgence of the House for a moment or two, because it will not be very apparent at the beginning how the matter of privilege affects me. In the Toronto 'Daily Star' of Wednesday

last, there appears a report of the parliamentary proceedings, which, I may say, deals very nicely with the proceedings of parliament throughout, and I take no exception personally to the item which I am about to read. That item is as follows :

The others, excepting Bennett, of East Simcoe, were seen, not heard. Bennett constituted himself chief inquisitor on the Railway Bill for the evening sitting. Bennett was full of interrogation, but he failed to embarrass the Hon. Mr. Emmerson a little bit. He, however, seemed more interested in striving to impress his importance upon the members of his own side. He moved an armful of papers down to a front row. This was Bennett's chance. He was on his feet continually. His questions may have been pert and pregnant with sharp criticism, but he has two serious defects. He lacks voice and personality. Bennett has a feather-weight voice and a school-boy delivery. There is absolutely no eloquence in the man. He chatters along in a dull monotone, and his points—if he has any, and I understand he has some—are lost in the monotony of his utterance. But for a queer habit of pausing and peering over his glasses, Bennett is entirely wooden when he is on his feet. Bennett is ambitious, but he will never rise in the party. He is a faithful committeeman and never misses a caucus. He always has much to say, but simply cannot impress himself upon either the rank and file or his leaders.

So much for William H. Bennett, of the East Riding of Simcoe.

That is a very good sermon : I do not object to a word of it ; I believe it all applies, and I think I know very well the gentleman it was intended for. As a matter of fact, the moment my attention was directed to it, I was told for whom it was intended. It is all right as a sermon ; it is only the text that is wrong. I do not want to be robbed of any of my glory. I want it to be understood that every word of that article applies to the member for South Simcoe, and not to the member for East Simcoe. I have had laurels from the same source before, and I look for them again. I hope it will continue in the future as it has been in the past.

CANADA EVIDENCE ACT AMENDMENT.

House in committee on Bill (No. 68) further to amend the Canada Evidence Act.—Mr. Fitzpatrick.

On section 1,

1. Section 4 of the Canada Evidence Act, 1893, is repealed, and the following is substituted therefor :

4. Every person charged with an offence, and, except as hereinafter provided, the wife or husband, as the case may be, of the person so charged, shall be a competent witness for the defence, whether the person so charged is charged solely or jointly with any other person: provided, however, that no husband shall be compellable to disclose any communication made to him by his wife during their marriage, and no wife shall be compellable to disclose any communication made to her by her husband during their marriage.

2. The failure of the person charged, or of the wife or husband of such person, to testify, shall not be made the subject of comment by the judge or by counsel for the prosecution in addressing the jury.

3. The wife or husband of a person charged with an offence against any of the sections of the Criminal Code, 1892, mentioned in schedule 'C' to this Act, may be called as a witness either for the prosecution or defence and without the consent of the person charged.

4. Nothing in this Act shall affect a case where the wife or husband of a person charged with an offence may at common law be called as a witness without the consent of that person.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice). I beg to move that the words 'in addressing the jury' be omitted from subsection 2.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. Do I understand the hon. minister proposes to take away the privilege, which has been granted the accused person, of giving evidence in his own behalf and of preventing counsel from referring to his failure to give such evidence ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The statute at present provides that no comments shall be made in addressing the jury. This is to prevent any being made whether in adressing the jury or otherwise.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In the Bill as introduced, provision was made that no comments should be allowed, in addressing the jury, on the failure of the prisoner to testify. But one can easily imagine that it would be possible for counsel to comment on this at other times, and the amendment is to prevent any such comments being made at all.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In this respect the statute now is exactly as it is in Great Britain. There was, however, a subject mentioned when the Bill was in committee before. The amendment takes a step which seems to me a little retrograde. The English statute is very much the same as the one now proposed, but there is this to be observed. In 1891 we took a step in advance when we enacted legislation which permits the husband or wife to be called for the prosecution but does not make either a compellable witness. We are now preventing either from giving evidence at all. Each one ceases to be a competent witness against the other for the prosecution. We are therefore going back practically to what the English legislation of 1898 enacted. We were in advance of English legislation when we passed the Act of 1891, and I am not quite convinced that there is any good reason for our going back. I gave an illustration to my hon. friend when the Bill was before the committee the other day, but I think I can give a better illustration

now. Suppose for example that the husband were guilty of cruelty to his children. Under the proposed amendment, the wife would not be even a competent witness for the prosecution, although in all probability she would be, the only witness available to give evidence of the offence. It may be however that the point I am making is covered by some other provision of the Criminal Code to which my attention has not been directed. The illustration which I gave the minister the other day was, as he truly remarked, a case which would very seldom occur, but the one I am now giving might very often be expected, in a great country like this, in the ordinary operations of the criminal law. Are we wise in going back in that respect and providing that the wife can not be a competent witness for the prosecution in such a case. Might I also ask whether the practical operation of the statute, as we have had it since 1891, has been found to result in any injustice or difficulty. Is there any good reason, from our experience of fifteen years of the practical operation of the statute of 1891, to justify our going back to the English legislation of 1898 ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The amendment is made absolutely necessary because of a judgment rendered by the Supreme Court in the case of the Queen and Gosselin, where it was held that either the husband or wife was a compellable witness, the one against the other. That was a case of murder. If that judgment be pushed to its logical conclusion, the result would be that not only would the husband or wife be a compellable witness, the one against the other, but it would be possible for the Crown to take the prisoner out of the dock, put him in the witness box and examine him with respect to matters connected with the offence. In consequence of that judgment, this amendment is necessary. The amendment makes the husband and wife competent witnesses for the defence, and I do not think it would be proper to go further. If the relations between the husband and the wife be good and proper, it would be an act of atrocious cruelty to put the one or the other in the box to testify in a case in which the life of the accused might be involved. On the other hand, if the relations be improper, we should not place at the disposal of the one or the other such an instrument of attack.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not quite concur in that view. It was because of such reasons that for hundreds of years in Great Britain no party who had an interest however slight or indirect was allowed to give evidence. If in the most indirect way a man had an interest even to the extent of one penny, in any civil controversy, he was not allowed to give evidence. We departed from that long ago, and adopted another principle, which is, that, whether a man is interested or not, he should be allowed to testify, and it should be for the jury, or the judge as the case may be, to estimate the extent to which his evidence might be affected by that interest. Now, that is a reasonable basis upon which to rest the law of evidence. It seems to me that when you say that except in certain specified instances a husband or wife shall not be even a competent witness the one against the other, you are making an arbitrary distinction, which, if carried to its logical conclusion would send us to the old principles of the common law. I am not disposed to controvert what the Minister of Justice has said as to husband or wife being a compellable witness against the other. But the decision in the case of the King vs. Gosselin does not touch upon what I have said. Of course, I have not seen the case, but I am taking it from what my hon. friend the Minister of Justice has said. The decision in that case enabled the prosecution to require the husband or wife to give evidence against the other. I concede that we should take away the power of the prosecution to compel the husband or wife to give evidence one against the other, but I submit that we should leave each a competent—not a compellable—witness against the other. You may say that if the husband and wife are on good terms there would be cruelty in this, and, if not, there would be an interest. But, if they are on good terms, the husband or the wife, under my proposal, is not obliged to give evidence. If they are not on good terms, it is for the judge or jury, after argument by counsel, to weigh what effect must be given to the circumstance that the husband and wife are not on good terms. I seek to retain in the law the principle that has been recognized by the parliament of this country since 1891. I state the matter as it strikes me. It seems to me that there is greater danger of a failure of justice if we amend the law in the direction pointed out by the Minister of Justice than if we simply amend the law so as to make the husband or wife a competent but not a compellable witness.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) is of course, aware that the English Act makes the husband or wife a competent witness for the defence only.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understand that.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. So the principle we are adopting is the principle of the Engdlish law.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Quite so.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I am certain that it can be fairly said that those who introduced the amendment into this Act on which this decision in the case of the King vs. Gosselin

is founded never contemplated a possible construction of the Act such as was put upon it by the Supreme Court.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I dare say. I recognize the fact that the English statute does not permit the husband or the wife to give evidence the one against the other. But I do not know that we are necessarily controlled by that. In 1891 we took a step in advance. The English parliament, in 1898, followed that step to a certain extent. We now, in 1906, are going back to the effect of the English statute of 1898. And I must confess that, for my part, I do not think we ought to go quite that far.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I would like to suggest that we amend subsection 3 of section 4 so as to make it read :

Subject to the provisions of subsection 1 of this Act, the wife or husband of a person charged with an offence against any of the sections of the Criminal Code, 1892, mentioned in schedule 'C' to this Act, shall be a competent and also a compellable witness for the prosecution without the consent of the person charged.

This would make them compellable in the case of examination under schedule (c).

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is for uniformity.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I would suggest to the Minister of Justice consideration of the question whether this Bill should not be further amended by the introduction of a clause similar to that in the English Act which would prevent any cross-examination of the accused on the witness stand as to whether he has previously been convicted of an offence. This provision is as follows :

A person charged and called as a witness in pursuance of this Act shall not be asked, and if asked shall not be required to answer, any question tending to show that he has committed or been convicted of or been charged with any offence other than that wherewith he is then charged, or is of bad character, unless—

(1) the proof that he has committed or been convicted of such other offence is admissible evidence to show that he is guilty of the offence wherewith he is then charged ; or

(ii) he has personally or by his advocate asked questions of the witnesses for the prosecution with a view to establish his own good character, or has given evidence of his good character, or the nature or conduct of the defence is such as to involve imputations on the character of the prosecutor or the witnesses for the prosecution ; or

(iii) he has given evidence against any other person charged with the same offence.

I submit that the true theory, the true principle of adjudication as to the guilt or innocence of any accused person should be that that guilt or innocence should be determined solely by the evidence as to whether he is connected with the particular crime with which he is charged, that the mind of the judge or jury should not be influenced in any way by evidence of previous acts committed by the accused, for which he might have repented or for which there might have been some explanation, and which is given in evidence under conditions where the mind of the court would be injuriously affected in determining the one question submitted for their consideration, namely guilt or innocence in regard to that particular crime. In the United States, I think, the rule which I submit is the fair one and which I would like the Minister of Justice to consider, is the same as in England and it seems to me that in dealing with this whole question it would be wise for the minister to also look into the question as to whether or not all such evidence as now can be received and as is submitted by prosecutors generally as to the character of an accused person should only be received in evidence and only considered after the guilt of the person charged with the offence has been determined. We have no system under our jurisprudence in this country whereby it is open to a judge, in determining a sentence to be imposed, to inquire by legal evidence into the previous record of a criminal. This principle obtains in many of the United States, particularly I know in Massachusetts, and I submit it would be fair and proper to make an amendment to this Bill which would take away from the Crown the right to cross-examine as to character, except under the conditions provided in the English Act, and to institute a system of procedure by which evidence of that character can be heard after the guilt of the party accused had been determined. There is also another question which I would like to submit for his consideration, that is a question which is liable to arise at any time in the courts, which has occurred in my own practice, as to the right of the Crown to cross-examine an accused person who is giving evidence as to whether or not he had made certain statements which had previously been offered in evidence on behalf of the Crown which had been excluded by the court on account of the fact that this statement or confession had been made not in a voluntary way. A learned judge in Nova Scotia in a case of that kind ruled under the law as it stands to-day that it was not open to the Crown to cross-examine an accused person as to whether or not he had made statements to an officer or person in authority. It seems to me that the true rule in regard to that would be to permit the cross-examination of an accused person, to ascertain whether or not such statements had been made, giving the prisoner the full power to explain if they were not made or as to the circumstances under which they were made.

Mr. STOCKTON. They might not be relevant to the charge ?

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. They must necessarily be relevant. In the case I was referring to, the case in which the Crown proposed to give evidence of statements made in reference to the particular crime with which the prisoner is charged but which had been excluded by the court by reason of the fact that they had not been made in a voluntary way.

Mr. FOWLER. Or the Crown cross-examined.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. The case was where the Crown would proceed to cross-examine an accused person giving evidence in his own behalf as to whether or not he had made a statement offered in evidence by the prosecution and excluded. It is a nice question as to what is the proper rule to follow. I think there is a clause in the English Act dealing with the question and I would like to submit it to the minister with a view to offering some solution as to what is the proper rule to follow. As I say it was ruled that as such a confession was not receivable in evidence on account of not being voluntary it was not open to the court by cross-examination to endeavour to get those facts in evidence. It was urged, and this is a fact which should be considered in determining this matter, that the policy which underlay the legal principle in the exclusion of confessions at common law, was that these statements made by an accused person should not be received in evidence on account of the fact that the mouth of the accused was closed, but as that principle has been done away with and as it is now competent for the accused to testify, the justification for the exclusion of that class of evidence is also done away with, and it is now open to the accused person to explain the circumstances under which the alleged statement was or was not made. These are questions which have arisen in regard to the interpretation of our Evidence Act and I submit to the Minister of Justice that they should be considered in connection with this Bill.

There is another matter which might not seem to be of so much importance but which is also dealt with particularly in the English Act; that is that an accused person who proceeds to give evidence on his own behalf without going into an elaborate defence by calling other witnesses, does not disentitle his counsel from the right to reply in closing to the jury which he would have if he had not put the prisoner on the stand on his own behalf.

Mr. FOWLER. He has not that now, if the Attorney General or Solicitor General appears.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. That depends of course to some degree on the procedure in the particular province. It may be a matter of procedure which is not germane, although I think it is, to the jurisdiction of this parliament. It does seem to me that these are matters of serious importance and I would like to submit to the Minister of Justice the wisdom of considering them in connection with his Act.

Mr. FOWLER. I think so far as the right of reply is concerned that is decided by the Code, where the Attorney General or Solicitor General appears, or any one acting on behalf of the Attorney General or Solicitor General, they have the right to reply no matter whether the defence called a witness or not. So far as the amendment of my learned friend is concerned, it seems to me that would be a very unfair thing indeed. Here is the so-called confession excluded by the court and then he would seek to get the advantage of that by having it brought before the jury under cross-examination. If it is improper to have the confession before the jury as evidence why allow it to be put in by cross-examination? The thing would appear to be absurd.

The only objection I have to this Bill is that I do not quite understand why a distinction should be made in different classes of cases, and that a husband or wife should be compellable in one case and not in another. My own opinion is that in no case should the husband or wife be compellable, and that the gravity of the offence should make no difference. The question is not one of the gravity of the offence but of the guilt or innocence of the accused and therefore it seems to me that all these different offences, no matter how grave or light, should stand on the same basis, and that in no case should the husband or wife be compellable to give evidence.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Dealing with the suggestions of the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) I would like to say the intention of this Act is to make the witness competent when he goes into the witness box, that he should then become subject to all the same conditions as are applicable to any other witness. I can see no reason why, because a man happens to be accused and takes advantage of the Act to go into the box to testify in his own behalf, he should be exempt from cross-examination in respect to his previous character. Why should he be placed in a more favourable position than any other witness? The witness ought to be put in the same position as any other witness if he chooses to exercise the privilege given to him.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I must confess that I do not quite appreciate the effect of section three up to this time. If it is intended to make the husband or wife a compellable witness in a very long series of offences

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, that was the old law.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It was the old law. I would like to see some intelligible basis upon which we are to amend this law if it is to be amended at all. I will take one of the twenty illustrations I could have chosen from schedule (c). If the husband fails to provide necessaries for his wife or children the wife is not only a competent but compellable witness. If, instead of doing that, he is guilty of the most atrocious cruelty to his wife or children the wife is not even a competent witness much less a compellable witness. That does not seem to be based upon any principle which would appeal to our sense of the justice or fitness of things.

Mr. STOCKTON. I understand the Minister of Justice intends that she shall be a competent witness but not a compellable witness.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Oh, no, that is not the case.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. For the defence.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am using the word 'competent' in reference to the prosecution. She may be a competent witness in all cases for the defence as I understand the effect of the statute. The effect of the legislation proposed by the Minister of Justice is this—I will take one illustration out of many that I might take from schedule (c): If a husband fails to provide the necessaries for his wife or family the wife is not only a competent but a compellable witness for the prosecution. If the husband is guilty of the most unheard of cruelty to his children his wife is neither a compellable nor competent witness against her husband. I cannot understand the principle upon which you make that distinction.

Mr. FOWLER. There should be no distinction at all.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is that distinction in the law as proposed by the Minister of Justice. In section 174 and the other sections enumerated in schedule (c) there is a long series of offences in respect to which the wife is not only competent but compellable as a witness for the prosecution. Outside of these offences the wife is neither competent nor compellable.

Mr. STOCKTON. I understand you want to go a step further and remove the limitation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not say that the wife should be compellable but I am suggesting that the wife and husband should be competent.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. As the law will be if this amendment is adopted, the wife or husband will be competent for the defence exclusively, not compellable for the defence, but competent. The suggestion of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, as I understand it is, that the wife or husband should be made competent not only for the defence but competent absolutely for the prosecution and for the defence. That is the difference between us in respect to that particular point. Then, my hon. friend goes on to draw attention to the fact that under the law as we would have it if this amendment is adopted the wife or husband will be competent for the defence but that in respect to a certain number of cases which are enumerated here and referred to as part of schedule (c) in the Criminal Code, they are competent witnesses for the prosecution or for the defence.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And compellable.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. And compellable—and that as a result of that a husband or wife might be obliged to go into the box and give evidence, for instance, in support of the prosecution, in the case of the abandonment of a child, refusing to provide necessaries, &c., but that if the father or mother is guilty of a gross act of cruelty, for instance, by striking a child with a weapon or with the fist, the husband or wife shall not be competent. My hon. friend says that there is no reason for that distinction. My hon. friend is perfectly well aware that the lack of logic of a great number of provisions of our rough and ready Criminal Code is well known to those who practice in the criminal courts. There is no logic in the Criminal Code at all. It is simply a series of enactments that have been prepared at different times for the purpose of providing for cases as they have arisen. But, in so far as the logic of this distinction is concerned it is that in all these cases where, as the result of the relations between parent and child or husband and wife, cruelty occurs such as the abandonment of a child, or when an improper act is committed on the part of the husband, these particular relations are relations which involve, almost of necessity, the absence of witnesses, or if there is a witness that witness, of necessity, will only be in one case or the other the husband or the wife and it is because of that fact that in the cases mentioned in schedule (c) where it is presumed there are no other witnesses available the husband and wife are made compellable.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would that not apply to a case of assault? Would not that reasoning apply to what I have mentioned?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It might or it might not.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It might in some cases.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It might.

M. R. L. BORDEN. In some of them. In a good many of them there might be other evidence.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is possible.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is just as likely to be a failure of justice for lack of other evidence in a case of cruelty to a child as in the case of certain other offences which are enumerated in schedule (c). Therefore, it does not seem to be based on that principle. I would not be disposed to go quite as far as the Minister of Justice in saying that the Criminal Code is absolutely illogical. I think the endeavour at least has been to base the provisions of the Criminal Code upon some principle. In so far as the present amendment is concerned it should be based upon some intelligible or reasonable principle and the principle to which I have referred is an intelligible and not unreasonable principle, namely, that you should not make the wife a compellable witness against her husband or the husband a compellable witness against the wife, but you should render the husband or wife competent witnesses for the prosecution as well as for the defence not only in respect to the cases enumerated in schedule (c) but in respect to all criminal offences. That is a plain principle and it seems a reasonable principle and a principle which is likely to lead to a better administration of justice than the provision which is sought to be substituted for that now in force.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The principle for which my hon. friend contends is absolutely in advance of anything that is to be found in any country where the English criminal law is adopted.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. We went in advance of it in 1891.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We went unwittingly in advance of it in 1891. I am quite satisfied that there was not a man in this House at that time who took any part in the consideration of that legislation who ever had in his mind the idea that the husband or wife should be compelled to go into the witness box and do that which the wife was obliged to do in the case of the Queen vs. Gosselin in a murder case ; that is to give evidence against her husband.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not referring to that case. I mean that we went in advance by providing that a person charged with a criminal offence could give evidence in his own behalf. We went in advance of British legislation in that by seven years. I am not afraid to go in advance of British legislation if you can show me any principle upon which to proceed.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I would be quite willing to march on myself if I were sure that we were going in the right direction. This Bill is intended to carry out the legislation of 1891 except in so far as the statute has been found to contain a very unnecessary hardship such as we found as a result of the case of the Queen vs. Gosselin.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You not only do away with the effect of that decision by providing that the husband or wife shall not be compellable witnesses, but you go further and say that they shall not be competent. I still fail to see any intelligible principle which will justify us in passing such a provision.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. Has any reason been given why the Act should be extended further than to put the law in the same position as we thought it was before the Supreme Court decided that case ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The intention is to endeavour to make our law conform to the law as it is in England, and in doing that I think we are moving in the right direction.

Mr. CLARKE. In glancing over the exceptions in schedule (c) they do not seem to include the case of a common assault by the husband on the wife. In a case of that sort the wife ought certainly be competent to give evidence against her husband. Under the common law, I do not understand that even in such a case the wife could give evidence against her husband. One of the first statutes enabling the wife to testify was in the case of assault by the husband but it does not seem to me as if that could be done under this amendment.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Under what clause of the Criminal Code is the wife enabled to be a witness in the case of assault by the husband?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The Evidence Act without this amendment would permit it.

Mr. CLARKE. I do not remember the exact clause, but I do know that originally there was an express provision for that.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Except it is under the Act we are amending, I do not think the husband or wife would be competent even in a case of assault, except at common law.

Mr. CLARKE. In a case of common assault?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE. One of the very first provisions of the Evidence Act was to extend the right of the wife to protection by giving evidence in a case which she herself brings for assault.

Mr. FOWLER. As a matter of fact they do not give evidence ; if you look at the police court records of any city you will find that such is the case.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I am not asking as to whether they can or not; I am asking as to whether there is a provision in the law.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In reference to the point raised by my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke), I suppose it was not necessary so to provide in the Criminal Code because under the Evidence Act the husband could give evidence against the wife or the wife against the husband; but if you alter the Evidence Act so as to render the wife incompetent in any case to give evidence against her husband, then you bring about the exact result which was pointed out by the member for Essex (Mr. Clarke).

On section 2,

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. With regard to the right to cross-examine the accused party as to previous conviction did I understand the Minister of Justice to say that he thought it would be unwise to make such an amendment, or did he merely say that the provision as to the competency of a witness necessarily involved the right to cross-examination along these lines as well as with regard to an alleged conviction.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If a witness is put in the box for the purpose of giving evidence and goes there of his own accord, he must take all the consequences which may result.

Mr. STOCKTON. But not when he is compelled to go into the box?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Not when compelled; that would be a different story. When he goes into the box voluntarily he should have no privileges which other witnesses do not enjoy. The hon. member for Essex (Mr. Clarke) asked me with respect to the case of assault, and I asked him for the provision in the Criminal Code which made the wife or the husband competent the case of common assault. There is no provision in the Code with respect to that, but the law remains the same as it was heretofore in subsection 4 which provides for the case of witnesses who give evidence under the common law; the case comes under the common law.

Mr. CLARKE. If it comes under the common law that answers my objection. I do not understand that under the common law the wife could give evidence against her husband in any case.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In case of an assault.

Mr. CLARKE. Under the old Act the wife was competent in any case as a witness against her husband, if she chose. If you look back to the compilation of the criminal laws prior to the Code, I am satisfied from recollection you will find there is an express provision that if the wife is assaulted she is a competent witness. Of course when the Criminal Code was brought in there was no necessity for that express provision, because the wife was competent in every case. It was not expected at that time that the principle went as far as the courts interpreted it in the Gosselin case. I always understood that under the Evidence Act a wife was competent either for the prosecution or for the defence, and therefore there was no occasion for an express provision in case of assault. If my interpretation is right, then under this amendment a man can beat his wife black and blue and she cannot give evidence against him to prove it. It ought to be made plain that provision is made for such a case. If it is, there is no objection to it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend is aware that the Evidence Act was enacted long after the Criminal Code, and I remember that many years ago, when I began at the bar, the competence of a wife or husband to give evidence in cases of assault was never doubted.

Bill reported.

JUDGES OF PROVINCIAL COURTS.

Bill (No. 83) respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts—Mr. Fitzpatrick—read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Mr. GALLIHER. In British Columbia there are cases in which the travelling expenses of county court judges exceed the maximum amount fixed here. Do I understand that the intention is to confine judges to a certain specified amount for travelling expenses in each year ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The object of this amendment is to remove the limits fixed by the statute of last session with respect to travelling allowances. That statute provided that each judge should be entitled to $6 a day, in addition to his moving expenses, but in the case of county court judges there was a limit fixed of $200 which was not to be exceeded ; so that one judge whose actual expenses might exceed that amount would not get more than $200, whereas the judge who spent less would get his actual travelling expenses.

Mr. MONK. Under the wording of this section, a judge attending in Montreal or Quebec, for the sittings of the court of review, in making this declaration as to his travelling expenses, is obliged to go practically to his own colleague, the Chief Justice, and get him to certify his account. I presume that these judges are called to Montreal or Quebec upon a letter of the Chief Justice. Would not that letter be sufficient, without requiring that their expenses should be certified by the Chief Justice ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. This provision, as my hon. friend is aware, is not new at all. It has been on the statute-book for several years. My hon. friend will remember that it was alleged that certain judges charged for expenses for the total number of days in the year, though they were actually residing at home in the country. This is merely to provide that when a judge is summoned from a country district to take the court of review at Quebec or Montreal, he is to produce the letter of the Chief Justice summoning him to attend that court, and also the certificate of the Chief Justice that he has attended for a certain number of days. This provision has been in the statute for several years, but I am quite willing to consider whether or not it should be amended. No complaint has been made by any of the judges that it imposes undue hardship upon them. If a judge has been summoned to attend a court, I do not see why the Chief Justice who summoned him should not say: 'He attended at my request, and attended for so many days.'

Mr. MONK. I think there is a little distinction. Of course, this legislation is not very old, because it was introduced after I came to this House. My hon friend knows that in the province of Quebec certain judges, who were named for other districts, sat in the cities of Montreal and Quebec, and gave as a reason that their services were required in these cities, particularly in Montreal where there is always more work than the judges can get through with. But this is the case of judges coming to Montreal for specific purposes—not called in to assist other judges but to sit in the court of review. When making a claim for the ordinary allowance, they not only had to forward to the Justice Department a letter summoning them to Quebec or Montreal but in addition a certificate by the Chief Justice that their services were necessary. Some of the judges find that rather hard and it is not exacted in the case of ordinary civil servants.

Mr. FOWLER. Why should the judge of a district court in the province of Ontario get an extra allowance?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I am not very familiar with their duties, but they have a much larger area to cover than the county court judges. Some of my hon. friends from Ontario would be able to give a fuller explanation.

Mr. FOWLER. I asked one of them in particular and he did not know that there were any district judges in Ontario.

Mr. SPROULE. These judges have to travel through the newer districts of the country and have to cover large areas where the roads are bad and the expenses very great. They have always hitherto had an allowance made to them for that purpose in addition to that given other judges, but by an oversight it was left out of the present statute.

Mr. BOYCE. As representing a constituency, in which there is a large unorganized district, I can say that there is a great deal of difference between the work which has to be done in those districts by the district court judges and that allotted the county court judges in the settled portions of Ontario. The former have to travel over a large area which involves heavy expense and considerable hardship. In 1898 an allowance was made to these district court judges to cover this additional expense to which they were subject by reason of the distance they have to cover and the increased number of courts they have to preside over, but by an oversight that $500 allowance was not included in the measure passed last session. The effect of that omission was to deprive these judges of the increase which parliament intended they should have. And in consequence of that extra $500 having been taken away, the extra salary given only leaves them $100 better off than they were formerly. I might point out that their jurisdiction under chapter 109 of the Revised Statutes of Ontario, is practically the same as that of a judge of the High Court, and that their expenses are so much greater that to place them upon the same basis as regards travelling expenses is simply to subject them in the exercise of their jurisdiction, to very great financial loss.

Mr. FOWLER. It seems to me that this extra increase is entirely unnecessary. So far as my experience goes, there is scarcely a county court judge throughout the country who earns his salary. There are altogether too many of them in some counties. I believe that in Ontario some counties have three of these judges and a great many have two, a senior and a junior judge, one of which at least must have very little to do. If a county court judge is paid $3,000 a year, he is getting a pretty good salary and can afford to travel over some of these wide districts, such as are represented by my hon. friends from Parry Sound and Algoma. As far as I am concerned, I protest against the increase.

Mr. L. G. McCARTHY. I have no hesitation in disagreeing with the hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Fowler). There cannot be any doubt that the judiciary at present administering the law in the districts of the northern part of Ontario are entitled to a considerable increase for travelling expenses above what the ordinary county court judges receive in counties where railway communication is perfect and there is no difficulty in a judge getting to his destination and sitting a day in court and then getting back to his home. But in districts, such as the district of Nipissing

and Algoma, the conditions are entirely different, as the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Boyce) has pointed out. By reason of the Act of last session, the district court judges were deprived of the allowance they hitherto enjoyed, and consequently did not get the increase in salary which it was intended they should receive. This section therefore merely places them in the same position as that in which they would have been, but for this omission by inadvertence.

Mr. FOWLER. I may say that the Supreme Court judges also lost their travelling allowances. The Supreme Court judges of the province of New Brunswick always had an allowance of $100 travelling expenses for each circuit and as far as the Equity judge is concerned, his allowance amounted to $1,400 a year, so that by the increase of $2,000 he only gains $600 per year. These district court judges get an increase of $600 and lose their travelling allowance of $500, so that they have a net increase of $100. Well, since they took these positions at $2,900, surely they would be willing to take them at $3,000. The government can have no difficulty in filling the vacancies, but no doubt have difficulty in making a choice among the numerous applicants when a vacancy does occur. In my opinion a salary of $3,000 a year is considerably above the average income of a lawyer even in the province of Ontario, and I think it is a pretty good salary for the work which a county court judge is called upon to perform.

Mr. BOYCE. I do not think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) has put the case very clearly. This is a question as the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy) says of putting the district judges back in the position in which they were before the passing of the Bill of last session under which, by inadvertence they were deprived of the increase of salary which it was intended to give them. Assuming that the district judges are a class of judges whose work is as important as that of the county judges, ought they to be placed in a worse position than the county court judges? I think it is only common fairness that this amendment should be made.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. The hon. member for King's and Albert (Mr. Fowler) may be familiar with the requirements and the practice of the province of New Brunswick, but certainly he is not familiar with the condition of affairs in Ontario. I would remind the hon. gentleman that the judges whose salaries are being added to by this travelling allowance of $500, practically exercise a high court jurisdiction as well as a county court and division court jurisdiction. Their duties are performed in the northern part of Ontario, and the area covered by them extends in some cases as much as a thousand miles from east to west. Their travelling expenses are very heavy, for travelling in that country is very expensive. In some cases there is no railway accommodation, and so the judges must hire conveyances or have other means of getting about from place to place to hold court. I can assure the House that the $500 provided for in this Bill is not more than sufficient to pay the bare travelling expenses of these judges. If a smaller allowance were made, these judges would be just that much short in the salaries which they honestly and faithfully earn. I think that the Bill merely remedies an error of last session and is in the right direction.

Mr. FOWLER. I guarantee that the travelling expenses of these gentlemen would not amount to half of this allowance.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. Oh, oh.

Mr. BOYCE. I beg pardon—

Mr. FOWLER. My hon. friend is very positive on this subsection. I do not know whether he is looking forward to occupying one of these positions or not. I know something of travelling, having travelled, perhaps, as much as some of these district judges, and I do not believe that these gentlemen would spend anything like this amount in travelling expenses during the year. I think the salary is quite sufficient.

Mr. INGRAM. I take advantage of this opportunity to back up the hon. member for King's and Albert (Mr. Fowler) in what he has said about the number of county judges. In speaking on this subject, of course, I confine myself to the province of Ontario. I may say that, so far as the district judges are concerned, I think this amendment is only doing justice to these judges, and I am prepared to support it. Speaking of the county judges of the older part of the province of Ontario, I am bound to say that there are more judges than are needed. The right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier shakes his head. Well let me give proof of what I have said. Take the case of my own county of Elgin. We have there two judges. When the senior judge was superannuated, the junior judge came to Ottawa and saw the Minister of Justice. He told the minister that if he were appointed senior judge he would be able to perform all the duties of judge for that county, so that it would not be necessary to appoint an additional judge. This is the statement of the judge himself. Still, notwithstanding his statement, the government in their wisdom appointed a new senior judge. I wish to congratulate the government upon the selection they made of senior judge, for he is a first-class good man and fills the position well. I have no fault to find with him. But I do find fault with the number of judges, because the government are paying two judges where one would be quite enough. Of course, what I

say about the junior judge could not be regarded as an attack upon a political opponent, for the judge is a Conservative like myself, and was appointed under a Conservative government.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. You are not a Conservative.

Mr. INGRAM. Perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fitzpatrick) would say I should call myself a Tory. Still I may point out that the chief duties performed by the junior judge are playing golf in the summer and curling in the winter. There are too many such cases in Ontario. If the county court judges are receiving less than they ought to receive I would not object to paying them more money but it ought to be accompanied with a reduction in the number. I think I have proven my case out of the mouth of the junior judge himself, and I am sure the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) will not dispute the statement that was made to him, and now given by me.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I shook my head when my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) made the statement that there were too many county judges in the older part of Ontario. I took the liberty of dissenting from that statement because I could not but believe that if there were too many judges the new government of Ontario would soon reduce the number. We have nothing to do with fixing the number, for that is done by the local legislature.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am glad that the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) makes such a distinction between the new and the old government of Ontario. I do not doubt that he would readily believe that an evil of this kind would remain unredressed by the old government; and that he also believes that if there is an evil it will be redressed by the new one.

Mr. INGRAM. I wish to uphold what the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) says. The government in Ontario have already inaugurated many reforms. I am satisfied that they will take the first opportunity of reducing the number of judges and so bring the opinion of the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on this subject into accordance with my own.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. But, until that is done, my hon. friend (Mr. Ingram) will not find fault with me if I side with the Ontario government against him.

Mr. FOWLER. I understand that, in addition to the salaries received by these district judges there are certain fees, which bring their remuneration up to a very respectable figure. I would like to ask what fees they receive and what they amount to in the course of a year.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I am not in a position to state what the fees amount to in any particular place. But I may be able to indicate it by stating that in a few of the large cities, like Toronto, Hamilton and Ottawa, they were commuted. In Ottawa, I believe, they were commuted at $1,000 a year.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. For what were these fees given?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. For work in connection with the Surrogate Court. This is a system of which I am absolutely ignorant. But I understand that the practice existed in Ontario of giving the county court judges remuneration by way of fees for surrogate work. These fees they received from the litigants or from the province.

Mr. MONK. We are discussing the question of salaries for indemnities, which is always a delicate matter. I would like to call the attention of the Minister of Justice and the Prime Minister to an omission which, I think, was made last year. This is in regard to the circuit court judges of Montreal. I hope my right hon. friend will not shake his head at the suggestion that these salaries ought to be increased proportionately. As the Minister of Justice is aware, these men are very much overworked. There are only three of them and their jurisdiction extends over a very important range of subjects. They are kept busy from one end of the year to the other.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. All of them?

Mr. MONK. The three of them, oh, undoubtedly. We have not had the advantage in the province of Quebec of having an improved government such as they have had in the province of Ontario; we find their number insufficient. Seriously speaking I do not think there is any doubt whatever but they should have participated in the general increase. The position they occupy is an important one and I think figures have been sent to the Minister of Justice showing that the work they do keeps them extremely busy. The cost of living has increased in Montreal and it is impossible for a circuit court judge to live there on a salary under $4,000 a year. I believe the Council of the Bar of Montreal have had this matter under consideration quite lately and have forwarded a memorial to the Minister of Justice and I hope the Department of Justice will see its way clear to give these judges an adequate remuneration which they certainly deserve.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. My hon. friend is aware that the jurisdiction of the circuit court judges of Montreal is not as great as that of the county court judges at Toronto, and the salary paid at Toronto to county court judges is the same as that paid to circuit court judges in Montreal.

Mr. MONK. Do they spend all of their time in the performance of their duties in Toronto?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I understand in Toronto their time is fully occupied in connection with their duties. Of course I understand that at St. Thomas the golf links may be exceedingly attractive, but other means may be found to restrict that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. They do not get travelling expenses to the golf links.

Mr. MONK. I have always maintained that when we increase the salaries of judges we should take into consideration the cost of living in the locality where they exercise their functions. Although I do not suppose there is much difference in the cost of living in Toronto and Montreal still I think any person who takes the trouble to investigate will come to the conclusion that a judge having the jurisdiction that our circuit court judges have in Montreal cannot, in view of the greatly increased cost of living there within the past few years, live in a proper manner with the salary they are now allowed. I believe the police magistrates in Montreal, I would not be quite positive—are better paid than these judges.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They get $4,000.

Mr. MONK. Under $4,000 it is impossible for a judge in Montreal to maintain the dignity of his station.

Mr. FOWLER. I understand that in addition to the surrogate fees the judges in these district courts have a considerable addition to their income from revising the lists, that they act either as revising barristers or, at any rate, derive a considerable income each year from the revision of the lists. I would think that, added to the fees they get would give them nearly as much as the salary of a Supreme Court judge in one of the eastern provinces.

Mr. BOYCE. These duties under the Act do not necessarily fall on the district judges. In some of the unorganized districts there are stipendiary magistrates, and in Muskoka, Algoma, and I think in Nipissing the duty of revising the lists does not fall on the judges, a stipendiary magistrate is appointed for that purpose, and under the Act if a stipendiary magistrate is appointed then these duties are to be performed by the stipendiary magistrate, so it cannot be said in all cases that the district judges receive this. I think, in most cases the fees go to the stipendiary magistrate.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I would like to ask the minister why he makes an exception in subsection 2 of this Act in regard to the province of Nova Scotia as to the judges of the Supreme Court receiving travelling allowances. There is no provision under the Provincial Act there by which a judge is compelled to reside in Halifax, and as a matter of fact there have been judges who reside in important centres outside the city of Halifax. I do not think there is any reason why the country bar in that province should be inconvenienced by reason of a penalty placed on a judge residing in other parts of the province. The courts in Nova Scotia sit in the winter time mostly and for about three or four months in the year the judges are compelled to be there. With the exception of that time the court does not require the attendance in Halifax of any particular number of judges because under the rota which has been framed there, by the judges themselves, each sits in chambers for two months. It seems to me if we have judges in that province who are residing and have resided ever since they went on the bench in other portions of the province than Halifax, the bar who reside in the counties where they do or in close proximity to them, should not be denied the advantage of approaching these judges at any season of the year as they have in the past. The effect of this Bill will be to deny them that advantage because no doubt these judges will move to Halifax if their living in the country is to be penalized in this way. I do not think there is that limitation in New Brunswick. There the court sits in Fredericton and there does not seem to be any suggestion that because a judge lives anywhere in the province other than Fredericton he should be deprived of the same emoluments that apply to judges in other provinces. It seems to me that distinction in our province is an unfair one. I am not speaking so much for the judges interested as the country bar, who should surely have the right of approaching a judge who lives in the country as they now can under our practice. This change will force us to utilize Halifax counsel at all times, and the judges who live in the country will be compelled to go to that city.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Does not the statute as at present tend to operate in rather the reverse way ?

Shall not receive any travelling allowance for attending courts or chambers held at the city of Halifax.

Therefore he would be likely to hold chambers where he resides in the country. If you give him a travelling allowance he will be more likely to go to Halifax.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I understand the judges when in Halifax have received some allowance but it has been intimated that it will not be paid to them if they live in the country and therefore they go to Halifax.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I say the effect of the law will be to establish the practice of holding chambers in the country where the judge resides. He is not allowed travelling expenses for going to Halifax and therefore he will hold chambers in the country where he resides.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. My hon. friend knows the practice. There is a rota of judges under which each judge alternately

takes his turn at holding chambers in the city and I do not suppose they would agree to new rules.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. These rules are entirely under the control of the judges themselves, who can amend them and provide that a judge may hold chambers in the country at the place where he resides.

Mr. FOWLER. There is another matter in connection with these allowances to the district judges.

In the province of New Brunswick county judges, outside of the judge of the county of St. John, have more than one county under their jurisdiction, and therefore they had a circuit allowance for each court held in the county in which they did not reside. They had no allowance for the county in which they resided but for the county in which they did not reside they had the usual circuit allowance. The allowances to these county judges were cut off when the salaries were raised. What is fair to one should be fair to the other. I do not think this increase should be given as a matter of fact. I do not think these district judges should get this increase. I think there is less reason for their getting it in the province of Ontario than there is in the province of New Brunswick, because it is a fact that the county judges in the province of Ontario have their salaries increased by reason of the fees they receive for performing duties outside of their duties as county court judges. In the province of New Brunswick the county court judges simply have their straight salaries of $3,000 a year. Some county court judges in the province of Ontario have salaries, I understand, by reason of these fees, equal to the salary of a High or Supreme Court judge. But, as I understand, it is different in the case of our county judges. If you think as a matter of justice and necessity that the district judges should get this increase be fair to the judges of New Brunswick and give these county judges their travelling allowances as they had them before. They get now only $6 a day. These district judges will get their allowances and the $6 a day that they get at the present time, will they not ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They get $500 additional and then the $6 a day.

Mr. FOWLER. Well, that makes it all the $6 a day also ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes, that is according to the old provision of the Act.

Mr. FOWLER. Well, that makes it all the worse ; I do not think this extra salary should be given.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. Judging from the remarks of the gentleman from New Brunswick (Mr. Fowler) I think it can safely be said that he must be looking for a post in New Brunswick to which this increased fee is to be attached. The districts that are covered by these district judges in the province of Ontario are larger than the whole province of New Brunswick put together. You could lose two or three New Brunswicks in the Algoma district alone. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fowler) knows nothing about this matter because if he did he would not make the observations he has made in respect to the expense of travelling in that country. The expenses allowed under this Bill to these district judges will be all required by them in the way of actual disbursements in attending their courts in that district. Regarding the fees or other emoluments to which my hon. friend has referred, if they do receive any, none are received from this government. Whatever surrogate fees are received by them are received from the provincial government. The fees which they receive for the revision of the voters lists are received from the municipalities, but, as has been mentioned by the hon. gentleman for Algoma (Mr. Boyce), these voters' lists are not as a rule revised by the district judges but by the stipendiary magistrates.

Mr. FOWLER. My hon. friend (Mr. Macdonell) who has just spoken is forgetful of the fact that the best parcels are always put into the smallest bundles and that it is the quality of New Brunswick that counts and not the quantity. It seems that these judges are still to receive the travelling expenses.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I was in error as to that. If my hon. friend will look at the section he will find that it reads :

> There shall be paid to the judges for travelling allowances the sums following, that is to say :
>
> (a) To each judge of a Superior Court, each local judge in Admiralty of the Exchequer Court and each judge of a county court, except as herein otherwise provided, in addition to his moving or transportation expenses, the sum of six dollars for each day.

In addition to that we make special provision for the district judges.

Mr. E. M. MACDONALD. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Justice what interpretation he puts on subsection 3 as to the term 'county town of the county or union of counties,' does that mean that the judge for a district composed of two counties shall not receive travelling allowance if he officiates in a county in his district other than that in which he resides or has it some other meaning ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In the county town or the town of the union of counties.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I confess that I understand the objection which my hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) raised but I do not understand the answer to it. What is the county town of a union of counties ? I do not understand that there

is any town in Nova Scotia that answers that description.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. In Ontario particularly.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is nothing of the kind in Nova Scotia. In Nova Scotia a judge is appointed for two or three counties. For instance, take Digby, Annapolis and Yarmouth ; the county of Digby has a county town—in fact it has two—the county of Yarmouth has a county town, and the county of Annapolis has a county town, but there is no town which answers to the description of a county town for these three counties and there might be the difficulty which my hon. friend from Pictou has referred to in so far as this Act would have application to the province of Nova Scotia.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. The union to which reference is made here will be found in the province of Ontario where there are municipal unions of several counties and where there is for each of these unions a county town.

Mr. COCHRANE. For Northumberland and Durham the county town is Cobourg.

Mr. FOWLER. Why do you leave the travelling expenses to the Governor in Council in the case of the Yukon Territory ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Because it is practically impossible to make any provision in respect to the Yukon Territory. They have very little travelling there. I think that altogether during last year the travelling expenses amounted to $200 or $300. We have thought it convenient to do it in that way and I can see no good reason why we should not exercise our judgment in respect to a particular case which arises. The amount of travelling there is practically nil.

On section 2,

For the purpose of authorizing and ratifying the payments heretofore made for travelling allowances to judges of the county courts in the provinces of Manitoba and British Columbia, this Act shall be deemed to have come into force on the twentieth day of July, one thousand nine hundred and five, and shall be deemed to be sufficient indemnity for all payments made to those judges under any order in council passed after that date.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. This is too indemnify myself practically. After having discovered how the Act of last session operated in respect to Manitoba and British Columbia where judges are expected to travel very great distances and seeing that one of them, at the end of one trip through his district had exhausted the total amount that I, under the law was permitted to allow him, I had to ask my colleagues to pass an order in council authorizing us to make provision in respect to these judges in Manitoba and British Columbia who were placed in this exceptional position so that they might be indemnified to the extent of their actual out of pocket.

Mr. FOWLER. That only relates to what you have already done.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Yes.

Mr. FOWLER. What about the future ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. For the future the Act applies—$6 per day.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Justice if it is a fact that under the legislation passed last session the senior county court judges in such cities as Halifax, Sydney, St. John and Toronto receive as salary $3,500 per annum while the senior county court judge in the city of Winnipeg only receives $3,000 per annum ? I should think that in a growing populous city like Winnipeg where the duties of a judge are much more onerous than in some of the other places I have named, the salaries of the judges should at least be equal to the salary received by the senior county court judges in these other places.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We have had it on the statute-book for years that the senior county court judges of Toronto the judge of the county court of Halifax, the judge of the county court of the county and city of St. John, N.B., and the judge of the county court of Queen's county, P.E.I., should receive $3,500.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. It may be a time honoured custom, but does not the Minister of Justice think it is an unjust discrimination against the senior judge of such a city as Winnipeg ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. If my hon. friend insists on having my personal opinion I would be disposed to say that in so far as the judges of the province of Manitoba are concerned their case for an increase is a very deserving one ; I am now expressing my personal opinion.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE. I understand the judges of the superior courts may retire on full pay at the age of 70 years, and that a county court judge cannot retire under similar conditions until he is 75. Is it because of the superior mental qualifications of a county court judge that he is retained five years longer ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. County court judges have always been dealt with exceptionally with respect to the retiring allowance. I do not know there is any reason at the present time to change the legislation in that regard.

Mr. BOYCE. Will this apply to the travelling allowances last year of the district judges ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. No. It is intended to make it retroactive with respect to the

county court judges of British Columbia and Manitoba, whose cases were in my opinion of exceptional hardship. With respect to the county court judges in the other provinces and with respect to the district judges of Ontario, the Act will be applicable from the date of its sanction.

Mr. FOWLER. Last year these district judges got travelling expenses and $6 a day ?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. They got travelling expenses and $6 a day up to $200.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS ACT.—AMENDMENT.

Hon. CHARLES FITZPATRICK (Minister of Justice) moved second reading of Bill (No. 97) to amend Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.

Mr. GILBERT H. McINTYRE (South Perth). The subject of this Bill does not call for any lengthy remarks, but there is a point of view to which I would call the attention of the Minister of Justice. On the introduction of this Bill the Minister of Justice stated that it was due to an oversight on his part that provision had not been made when the Bill passed last session, for an allowance to members of the House who were absent owing to illness. I have no doubt that was the case, and had this provision been inserted in the Bill last session no doubt it would have been carried in the ordinary course. But that oversight may not have been considered by some as an actual oversight; the omission may possibly have been considered as intentional just as the dropping of the mileage allowance to members was intentional. I am not prepared to say whether that was the case or not, but I can see a line of argument under which it may reasonably be thought so. Under the old arrangement this allowance was made to members who were sick at Ottawa during the session, and it appeared to be reasonable when you consider that the indemnity at that time was not specially large; that indeed it was considered by many members to be entirely too small. It would not be unreasonable to suppose that when the indemnity was increased it was not considered any longer necessary to make this allowance in case of illness. Now, however, the Minister of Justice has introduced this Bill which again gives an allowance for illness. Whether or not it is the intention of the government to further amend the Act and reduce the indemnity to members, I do not know. I personally wish the government would do so, but I do not know what the attitude of the government may be. In saying this I am taking my share of the responsibility for the action taken by parliament last year in increasing the indemnity. I may say that I was not aware until I was actually in the election contest what indemnity a member of parliament got, but like many others I realize that in entering public life and coming to this House, great loss is entailed by members of parliament, and indeed in many cases financial ruin. After my first year's experience here, after indeed receiving the $2,500 instead of the previous indemnity of $1,500, I found myself as possibly many others have found themselves, worse off than I would have been had I not entered political life. When the indemnity question was being discussed among us I listened with a good deal of interest to the various arguments used and taking the general feeling throughout the House, it did seem to me that the old indemnity was not sufficient. It is not an easy matter to fix the exact amount of the indemnity which a member of parliament should be paid. With 215 members coming to this House under very different circumstances, making very different sacrifices to come here living under great expense and different amounts in different cases; it is not at all easy to estimate the exact sum that would be right. We realize that at the very best it must only be an approximation, and it was evident that all the House could do in fixing a sum would be to get an approximate sum. When it decided that this approximate sum should be $2,500 it did not mean that $2,500 must necessarily be the exact sum—$2,400 or $2,300, or $2,250 might equally have been chosen. It must be remembered that the amount of the old indemnity was variable according to the mileage payment that came attached to the $1,500. However, the amount having been placed at $2,500 the mileage was dropped and there was also this unintentional, let us say, dropping of the allowance for illness. The Bill in that form passed virtually with the entire consent of this House. It was a government measure for which the government naturally had to assume some responsibility, but not the ordinary responsibility which the government assumes in initiating legislation; the responsibility in this case being endorsed by the whole House. If that legislation of last year had received the actual sanction of the people of the country, it would have been well. But we have returned to our constituents in the interim. Many of the members of this House do report that there is no criticism of that Bill; I must report for my part that I find it otherwise. This is not in itself a question that involves a very great principle, because the principle of the payment of members is acknowledged, and so it devolves itself into a question of judgment as to what the amount of that payment should be. I find that it is necessary always to keep in touch with the peo-

ple of the constituency which one represents.

I find that in my own riding the feeling is very strongly adverse to the change made last session. It is possible that in many cases there is not due and sufficient consideration given to the expenses attending the position of a member of parliament or to the changes that were made, in the cases of many, in connection with mileage or other allowances; but we have to recognize the fact that that feeling does exist. If the principle were really an important one, which you felt you must either insist upon or withdraw, one's course might be clear; but it is so evidently merely a matter of judgment, and that judgment touches a salary pertaining to oneself, that one should hesitate very much before insisting that one's own judgment should be taken. As a representative, then, of a riding which is strongly adverse to the change made last session, I hope the government will see its way clear to further amend the Act by modifying the indemnity clauses. I have not taken any previous opportunity to express that opinion on the floor of the House. Others have done so. Others have introduced Bills for that purpose. If those Bills were introduced from correct and proper motives, and without the intention of placing members on record or establishing a sort of political black-list on the question, as has been announced it would have been well; but in this case I think it entirely fair that the government should take the opinion of the House in some form —not perhaps by an actual vote—so that they themselves might act, instead of leaving the initiative to be taken by a private member, whose action I fear will be attributed to a desire to make political capital at the expense of other members of this House. That is a position I would not take, and it is only in obedience to what I consider a mandate from the constituents whom I represent that I speak at this time in this way. This feeling, like many other feelings expressed in a country riding, is of course of a mixed nature, and it strikes more strongly at some features of the Act than at others. Some of that feeling springs, I believe, from direct political antagonism; in other cases it springs from motives that are not at all creditable; but I realize also that a large proportion of the best people of the riding manifest it strongly. These are the people whom I am proud to represent, and whose feelings in a matter of this kind I must defer to, I therefore hope that before this Bill passes its second reading, we may have an expression of willingness on the part of the government to modify the provisions of the Act of last session.

Mr. H. H. MILLER (South Grey). Mr. Speaker, since this matter has come up in the way it has, I think we must all admit that there has been some opposition to the Act by which the indemnity of the members has been increased. We have all had evidences of that to a greater or less extent in our constituencies, and have seen it expressed by the newspapers of the country; but notwithstanding the opposition, I believe the indemnity has not been placed at too high a figure. I believe the opposition to it has been mainly due to the fact that the indemnity was increased by our own act; but the fact remains that there is no one else by whom that could be or ought to be done, or by whom salaries must be regulated. I believe we have the same right to regulate our salaries properly as we have the right to regulate the salaries of any other persons whose salaries we do regulate. I believe we have a right to be just as liberal—not more liberal—as we are in other cases. I believe we have a right to be just as fair and honest to ourselves as we are to others. We have a great country to be developed—

Mr. SPROULE. I rise to a point of order. I wish to ask your ruling, Mr. Speaker, as to whether this discussion is in order just now, seeing that there are two Bills on the paper on which this discussion might properly take place? As this Bill makes no reference to the indemnity of members, this discussion is out of place. A good many members wish to speak on the question, and I think it would be better that all the speaking on it should be done at the same time.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think that a general discussion on the indemnity question is hardly germane to this Bill.

Mr. MILLER. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the question of whether an allowance should be made to members who are ill and who are compelled to absent themselves through illness, depends to a great extent on whether the indemnity of $2,500 is adequate or more than adequate. In that regard, I thought I was in order. However, if you rule that I am not, I certainly have nothing more to say.

Some MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. MILLER. I was about to say that Canada was a very great country, a country that must be developed.

Mr. SPROULE. Chair.

Mr. MILLER. We have institutions to be established and maintained, laws to be made, laws to be revised, for the protection of life and property, and the well-being, comfort, and success of every Canadian citizen. We have an annual revenue to raise and an expenditure of from $70,000,000 to $90,000,000, and I think that $2,500 per annum is not too much for a man of the ability and the character which a man ought to possess to properly represent any

constituency in Canada, and to take his place among the 214 or 215 members by whom that business must be conducted and Canadian affairs managed. It has been urged that $2,500 is too much for some men in the House, while not too much for others. I take it that the Canadian public have a very mistaken idea of the earning powers of a very large majority of the men who sit in the Canadian House of Commons to-day. I think a very large proportion of the members on either side of the House are men who, in their own callings and occupations, have earned and are still able to earn at least $2,500 per annum. I think also that the increase of the indemnity to $2,500 will make it possible in many instances to secure the services of better men in the constituencies. It may be that there are in this House some odd cases of men who are not able to earn $2,500 in their own calling. It may be that there are some constituencies which are not properly represented in this House. If that is true, what is the trouble ? It may be that there are better men in the constituencies whose services could be secured for $2,500 which could not be secured at the smaller sum. Further than that, I think that the same man is likely to do better work for a constituency if he is paid $2,500 than if he is paid $1,500. Not that the man receiving $1.500 shall not be disposed to do the best he can; but it is not possible for him to give the best of his time to the interests of his constituency while he has at the same time to provide for the maintenance of himself and his family and others dependent upon him. Other countries recognize this. Other countries recognize that it is not economy, but parsimony, to ill-pay their representatives.

In the United States, I am given to understand, that members of the American Congress receive $5,000 a year and an extra yearly allowance of $1,200 for the employment of a secretary. And I have been told that there is a movement now in the United States—whether following Canadian example or not I am not able to say—to increase the indemnity to $7,500. It has been urged that the United States is a richer country than Canada, that it has larger resources and population, but I will say this—though it might be better for some one else to say it—that the members of the Canadian House of Commons will compare very favourably in ability and character with those of the American Congress or House of Representatives, or perhaps with those of any other governing body in any other part of the world. It cannot be said that the Australian commonwealth is more wealthy than the Dominion, yet the members of the parliament of that commonwealth are receiving to-day $2,500 a year. And in Britain, where for so long no salary has been paid to members of parliament, it is now understood that the new government is likely to introduce such a measure and that it will be popular and well supported in the country. You may prefer to call the sessional payment to members an indemnity, but I do not know that it matters whether you call it an indemnity or a salary, and I do not know that there is any great principle involved in what particular name you may give it. But it may be said that if the salary be left at a smaller figure, many more of the constituencies will be represented by wealthy men. Well, there is more than one disadvantage in having a large majority of the constituencies represented by men of wealth. In the first place these men have not the same sympathy with the working class and the poorer classes and do not come so intimately in contact with them as would less wealthy representatives. They have not the knowledge of the labouring people and the earning and industrial people of the Dominion that members who have no great wealth are possessed of. But a still greater reason why I think that wealthy men are not the best representatives of the constituencies is this: The very businesses in which they have made their wealth and accumulated their fortunes they are still connected with, and their business interests loom up before them much more largely than their parliamentary interests and duties. There are many constituencies represented in this House by wealthy men who, if they were able to give the same personal attention to their parliamentary duties that they do to their business duties, would be very able representatives, but because of their large business and great wealth this they are unable to do.

It is very easy, Mr. Speaker, to arouse prejudices among the working men and to stir up feeling among the labouring classes in opposition to the payment of $2,500 a year to members of parliament. It is very easy to make the working man pause and consider how long it takes him to earn $2,500. But that is not an argument founded upon any good reason. The working man may have the same prejudice against the manager of a bank from whom he draws his $10 or the loan company from which he may borrow $100 or $1,000; but if he is a shareholder, if he owns one or two shares in the company, he knows, as does every shareholder, that it is poor economy to engage a manager simply and only upon the principle of paying him a small salary. Managers of loan, insurance and railway companies are receiving salaries of from $5,000 to $50,000 per annum. And in this there is no sentiment, there is no graft, but the directors, representing the shareholders, give these men large salaries because they know that men capable of properly and successfully carrying on the affairs of these companies are men able to earn and entitled to receive the large salaries paid them. I contend that the poorest workingman in Canada, the poorest labouring man in this country, is a shareholder in the Dominion.

He is interested just as are its more wealthy citizens in the success, progress and development of this country, and it does not pay the poor shareholders, any more than it does the richer shareholders, to employ members of parliament upon the principle simply of getting those who will work the cheapest. As for myself—and I may be pardoned mentioning myself as an instance, but I do it simply as an illustration and because I know more of my own case naturally than I do of the cases of others—in my own case I have to pay, on account of my attendance in parliament, $500 to $700 a year for additional office help. I represent as clean a constituency, politically, as there is in the Dominion, a constituency where votes are neither bought nor sold, and yet, be as economical as I reasonably and decently can, let me be as honest as it is possible for me to be—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MILLER. I do not place a limit—I cannot carry on an election at less than $1,200.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. MILLER. I know it costs some of you a great deal more. That makes an average of at least $300 for each parliamentary session of four years; and when I add to that the cost of my living in Ottawa during six months in the year and the contributions which every member of parliament is expected to make and the loss of business that one suffers from year to year—and the fact that at the end of his parliamentary career, be it long or short, he is likely to find his business gone or largely gone—$2,500 is certainly not too large a remuneration. I have spoken of the contributions one must make in his constituency. I have seen it urged in the public press that the contributions which a member of parliament makes for public purposes in his constituency are but bribes given simply to popularize himself and maintain himself in his position. I submit, Sir, that that is not the case. There are in every constituency perhaps as many men who have just as great ability as, and indeed perhaps more than, the one who happens to represent it in the House of Commons, yet the people by their votes have placed the man of their choice for the time being in a position of prominence and they expect him to be, and he ought to be, a public-spirited man. And it is right and proper that he should, as a public spirited man, contribute to the various public enterprises and undertakings that he may from time to time be called upon to contribute to in his riding, though in my own riding no unbecoming or unreasonable appeals have ever been made to me. Contributions are not asked or expected from the member as an individual, but simply as the public representative, and and such contributions are neither expected nor given nor received as a bribe. They are received from the member people knowing that whatever member may succeed him will contribut in a similar manner.

Another idea that prevails is that the member receives his indemnity for six months in the year. That, I submit, is far from being true. While the session may not last more than six months of the year, the time of a member during the other six months is largely occupied in attending to his political duties. A member of parliament must travel to and fro throughout his constituency. It is his duty to attend public functions and gatherings because if he is to properly represent his people he must know the people and study their condition and interests, and he cannot go among them without spending time and money. He has besides a great deal of correspondence to attend to—correspondence in every department connected with the government and the House. In his constituency he is in fact the intermediary between the government and the people, acting for the time being as the agent of all the people. Whether they be Conservative or Reform, whether they agree with or differ from him in politics, he is the representative of all the people, and is, or ought to be, at their service, and if he is performing his duty he is spending a large part of the other six months in the service of the people.

Let me point out that in the Ontario legislature the members' salaries have been increased lately in exactly the same percentage as we last session increased the indemnity of members of this House of Commons, and no complaint has ever been made. I claim that to-day a member of the Ontario legislature is being better paid at $1,000 than is a member of the House of Commons at $2,500. Their sessions are very much shorter. The members of the Ontario legislature are but a short distance from their homes; they have telephone connection; most of them can receive and answer a letter in a day, and they get home at the week-end. They can keep a grip upon their business, their business does not slide from them as it does and must in the case of a member of the House of Commons at a greater distance from the seat of government.

There has been a good deal of criticism of this indemnity of $2,500, but I believe that that criticism is directed not so much to the amount as to the manner in which it was given. And I have a word to say as to that. It would be strange if the people should make very great objection to the increase of $1,000 in the member's indemnity, seeing that—though I know that this is not a sufficient argument the extra burden imposed upon the people of Canada is from 10 cents to 15 cents per annum for each voter or 3 cents

or less for every citizen of Canada. While that is not a sufficient argument, the question really being whether the indemnity is too much or not, still the fact remains that the burden upon the country is not a large one. Now, I have said that the greater part of the objection taken is not to the amount that is paid so much as to the manner in which the legislation was put through the House. Prof. Goldwin Smith has said—and I notice that some of the newspapers have taken up the argument and repeated the statement—that the increased indemnity was given as a bribe to members to induce them to support legislation which went through last session, known as the Autonomy Bills. Now, we on either side of the House held different views upon that legislation, and most of us, I think, were honest in the views we held, however opposed one to the other. I am sure, however, that there is not a man in this House, on either side, who will rise in his place and say that there was any hint upon the part of any one that the increase was given to induce him to support the legislation. Notwithstanding, and with all due deference to the great learning of Prof. Goldwin Smith, I think that argument was simply ridiculous and absurd.

It has also been urged that it was not a manly thing that the legislation giving this increased indemnity should be introduced as the result of the signing of a round robin, and that the signing of a round robin was scarcely the right way for such legislation to be gone at. I do not wonder that criticism is made, for I admit at first sight that the signing of a round robin, would seem, to be not a manly way to seek this end. At the same time, I consider that, when the subject is properly regarded, it will be seen that there is nothing unmanly nothing dishonourable, nothing that is not upright, in signing a round robin. It was simply a written statement that the salary was not sufficient and a request that it be increased; and it was made in the way it was made in order that there should be no shifting of responsibility, in order that no one should be able to say that he was less responsible than any one else, in order that no one should be able say she tempted me and I did eat. It is a matter upon which no party capital can be made; it is a matter on which no capital can be made against any individual any more than against a party. It is a matter in which all persons who signed the request intended to be, and were expected to be, equally responsible.

It has also been said that this should have been made a matter of campaign discussion. But I think that that is not a reasonable position and that it would have been a most improper thing to do. If we had made this a subject of campaign discussion, though it surely would not have been the largest issue before the public, at the time, yet, as all must admit, no other question, however intrinsically important, would have been discussed so much as this one. The effect of the discussion of this subject in the heat and excitement of a political campaign would have been to hide and smother every other issue before the people. The matter of the salaries of the judges has been discussed here this afternoon. I think that the Canadian people generally desire that our judges shall be paid reasonable and proper salaries. I think that is the desire of the people at large as well as of the people in this Chamber. Yes, I venture to say, that if, during any election campaign the matter of the judges' salaries were introduced, it would influence a very large number of votes, that a large number of people in the heat and excitement of the campaign, would oppose an increase in the salaries of the judges. So, I believe that if this had been made a question at issue in an election campaign, it would have received an undue attention and would not have been discussed in the way in which such a question ought to be discussed.

Again, it has been urged that it may have been right to pass this legislation, but that it should have applied to the next succeeding parliament and not to this. That also, I think, is an improper stand to take. Either the increase of the indemnity was right, or it was wrong. If it was right, it would have been an unfair thing, and an improper thing to delay it for four years; if it was wrong, it could not be made right by deferring the execution of it for four years.

It has been urged that the legislation was hasty and that it was not considered properly. Whatever the people in the country know or think, every man in this House knows that the legislation was thoroughly considered so far as the increase in the members' indemnity was concerned. Everybody knows that there was no piece of legislation put upon the statute-book last session of which the members had more notice, concerning which there was more talk and discussion, than this. It is an unmanly thing and an unfair thing, for any member of this House to pretend that there was no proper discussion of this measure.

I would point out, Sir, that there has not only been the increase of the indemnity, but there have been other changes in relation to the indemnity as well. For instance, the mileage has been cut out. It has been urged by some hon. members that this was not reasonable. I know that some hon. members from the far west and some members from the far east say that an injustice was done them in cutting out the mileage.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MILLER. Some of them say 'hear, hear.'

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. MILLER. And again they say 'hear, hear.' And yet I think that that feature of the legislation was just as proper and just as right as the increase of $1,000 in the indemnity. We sympathize with our members from the west and from the east who lose the mileage, but that loss is one of the many disadvantages they suffer from living in the wild and woolly west. The cutting out of the mileage lessened the payment to the members on the average, by, I should think, $150, thus reducing the increase from $1,000 to $850. A member's transportation is provided him by Act of this parliament without cost to himself, however far he may live from the seat of government. I think it is not right that a member of this House should have free transportation, and at the same time, be allowed the mileage.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS (Yale-Cariboo). Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Miller) allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. MILLER. Certainly.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Does the hon. gentleman think it fair that we should spend at least six days in coming here without pay and six days in going back without pay, while he can come here in five or six hours?

Mr. MILLER. I will answer that by saying that I do not think it is exactly fair. But I think the unfairness can best be overcome, not by re-introducing the mileage, but by making a per diem allowance to the hon. member for the time he is on the way coming to Ottawa and returning to his home.

Then I would point out that the legislation provides for the retention of $15 for every day the member fails to attend. This is a very good thing in many ways. I was somewhat amused to receive a letter from a candid voter who stated that he thought the business of the House would be expedited, and that it would be a good thing, if half the members remained away from parliament the whole time. There may be some truth in that; yet I think that the absence of members from parliament often delays the business of the House and prolongs the session.

It seems to me that when we deduct the mileage, when we deduct the $15 a day, the total expenditure will not be very much greater than under the old Act and that we will have a very much better attendance of members, an improvement in the public service and do very much better work. The Bill we are discussing to-day involves the question as to whether an allowance should be made for members who are ill and unable to attend to their parliamentary duties because of illness. If $2,500 is not too great an indemnity then I think sickness should certainly be allowed for. The life of a member of parliament is rather fruitful of illness and ill health, and here I want to point out that the newspapers and the public generally have got rather into the bad habit of criticising the life and character of members of parliament. As I said a few moments ago, perhaps such words would come better from some one else than from a member of the House of Commons and yet I think I would be corroborated by all men who are not members of the House of Commons, who, by residence in Ottawa, in the discharge of their duties about the House as reporters or otherwise, have an opportunity of observing, when I say that I do not know where you will find anywhere 214 or 215 representative business men of better lives or cleaner conduct than you will find the members of the Canadian House of Commons on both sides of the House. There are many things in connection with the life of a member of parliament that I am sorry to say are conducive to ill health. One of these is the late hours that attendance on the House of Commons entails, and when I have urged that matter in the constituency I have been met with the statement that the hours should not be so late, that the work should be done earlier in the day. But this I feel is an impossibility. We have our committee meetings in the forenoon. Some have said: Why not hold committee meetings at night? But that is impossible because many persons, the public, at least the interested public are entitled to attend the committee meetings and that makes it inconvenient if not quite impossible, to hold these meetings in the latter part of the day. That then makes it necessary that the sessions of the House should be continued late into the night. The late hours mean and result in an irregularity in the taking of our meals. The duties of the House prevent the taking of proper exercise, and whatever care may be taken to ventilate this Chamber, with so many men spending the day in the Chamber, the atmosphere is never just what it ought to be, and the fact remains that we have always, during every session, at least some of our members off through ill health. I fear that it is true that many a good man has lost his life and come to a premature death because of exposure in attending to his duties as a member of the House of Commons. I think there is no reason why this Bill should not become law or why the Act of last session, increasing the indemnity should be disturbed.

I may have a word to say at another time as to the pensions to ex-cabinet ministers and the allowance to the leader of the op-

position and other matters but they do not relate to the Bill now before the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I do not propose at this stage to enter upon the discussion of the merits or demerits of the legislation of last session, but I may be permitted to say that perhaps the strongest criticism which has been or can be made upon that legislation is based on the fact that it was passed in the closing hours of the session. Now we have had two Bills introduced by hon. members of this House which will afford an opportunity for full discussion. I had been in hopes that these Bills, one of these Bills at least, would have been brought on for the second reading before this.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear!

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The delay was unavoidable owing to domestic affliction in the family of the hon. member who introduced that Bill. All I desire to say at the present moment is that there should be a full and complete discussion of those measures at the earliest possible moment. I would deprecate most strongly the suggestion that the discussion should be postponed to any later stage in the session. It should have taken place last session when the Bills were first introduced. Those Bills should have been introduced at a much earlier date in the last session than that at which they were first brought down by the government. Some five or six weeks of the present session have already elapsed and I trust that the hon. gentlemen who have those Bills in hand will see to it that that discussion is not longer postponed; and if they do not see fit to bring these Bills forward for discussion next week, I venture to think that it is the duty of the government to have the Bills placed upon government orders for the purpose of expediting that discussion which I think should take place without delay.

I do not propose to enter into a discussion of the merits of those Bills at this moment because it does not seem to me that it is the proper time or the proper occasion, when the present Bill is being considered upon its second reading. I think it might perhaps be said that there has not, in some quarters at least, been a very fair or a very adequate statement or representation of the full effect and terms of the measures in question by a portion of the public press of the country. Those measures should be open to the fullest public criticism. They have been criticised very fully and in some instances very severely. No one of us objects in the slightest to that. The public acts of public men must at all times be subject to the strongest possible criticism, to the severest possible criticism that they seem to merit but the line should be drawn at that. There should not be any misstatement and there should not be any misrepresentation. I think it is desirable, not only in the public interest but in the interest of every man in this House, that that full and free and open discussion should take place in this House at the earliest possible moment. If these measures or any of these measures or any portion of these measures cannot be justified, then it is desirable that the measure as a whole should be repealed or that it should be modified so as to make it right. It is beyond doubt that one of the measures referred to was perhaps rather hastily prepared and not very fully considered and it must not of course be forgotten that the members of the House occupy a certain position which renders them vulnerable in this respect because they are legislating with regard to a matter which is of personal, pecuniary interest to every one them. That has to be considered and for that reason, as well as for the others to which I have alluded, I trust, and indeed, insist, that there should be at the earliest possible moment, that discussion of these measures which I have just now suggested.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I quite agree with my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) that there should be at the earliest opportunity a discussion of the principle involved in the Bill introduced some time ago by the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean). If the discussion has not taken place it is not the fault of any one but the hon. member for South York. The hon. gentleman has had an opportunity four or five times during the present session of introducing it and inviting a discussion upon it. He could have done it not later than last Wednesday or last Monday. I do not intend to discuss the reasons why he has not done so. Some of them are domestic matters as to which we can only have sympathy and respect. But the hon. gentleman has been in the House and for reasons peculiar to himself he has let the opportunity pass on one or two occasions to have this matter discussed. I do not agree with my hon. friend that the government should place this Bill upon government orders.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I said if there were any further delay.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Well, even if there were any further delay the hon. gentleman who introduced this Bill should have a chance to move it and he should move it or drop it, but if anything is to be done in a matter of this kind I think the government should take the responsibility of it. It should not be left to any member. If there is any thing to be done in regard to the legislation which was introduced last session, which the government introduced, and for which they stand responsible, they must again take the responsibility and if the hon. gentlemen who have introduced Bills upon this subject do not take the opportunity of doing so it will be the duty of

the government on their own responsibility to give an opportunity to the House of discussing the whole principle involved in that legislation.

In regard to what was said by my hon. friend from South Perth (Mr. McIntyre) I have simply no exception to take to the manner in which he has stated his views. Nothing could be fairer, more moderate or more reasonable than the views he has presented from his own point of view. I have only to observe this in regard to the Bill we have before us at the present time that if the principle be granted, as to which no exception has been taken and will not be taken, that it is fair and reasonable that in a country like this there should be an indemnity paid to members of parliament, whether the indemnity be $2,500, or $2,000, or $1,500, or $1,000, it should be accepted by every one that if a member is prevented by sickness from attending the House of Commons he should not lose his indemnity. That was the old law and I think every one will agree, even though he may think the indemnity is too large, that there should be no such a distinction as that. I think every one is well satisfied with the discussion that has taken place. There will be another discussion, and if so it is desirable that we should have it at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. HENDERSON. I was one of those who last session thought that when the provision as to sickness was removed the increase of the indemnity to $2,500 was intended to cover this and all other contingencies that might occur. I took that view of it and I made that argument with my people in the country in justifying the increase in the indemnity. I desire to refer to another matter and I shall do so in a moment before the House rises. Even if it is desirable to pass this legislation I would much rather that this Bill had not been introduced at the present time. I would rather that we had allowed ourselves to have an experience of a year or two under the arrangements which we made last year, and then if we found that any great hardship existed we could bring in a remedy. My impression is that the Bill will hardly cover what is even now intended. What are we to understand by sickness? If an hon. member should be unfortunate enough to sprain his ankle, but is able to attend to his business in his house, would a medical man say that man was sick? I doubt very much whether he would. Well, that is a case we would desire to cover. Then the clause in the Bill says:

> Provided that each day during the session after the first day on which the member attends as aforesaid, on which the member is in the place where the session is held, but is prevented by sickness from attending any such sitting as aforesaid, &c.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

That only applies after a member has actually been in the House. If a member has not been in the House, but has been ill for six weeks or a month, he would not get the advantage of this clause. I may be wrong, but I draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) to that point. I think there are one or two cases at the present session that ought to be included, that the Bill should be made clear so that it would include the cases of two hon. members who were not here the early part of the session and who would not be able to take advantage of this clause.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 71) to incorporate the Calgary and Fernie Railway Company—Mr. Galliher.

Bill (No. 78) respecting the Great Northwest Central Railway Company.—Mr. W. J. Roche.

Bill (No. 73) respecting the Boundary, Kamloops and Cariboo Central Railway Company.—Mr. Duncan Ross.

Bill (No. 77) respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—Mr. M. S. McCarthy (Calgary).

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 110) respecting certain Patents of the Toledo Glass Company.—Mr. Stewart.

Bill (No. 111) respecting the Lake of the Woods Milling Company, Limited, and the Keewatin Flour Mills Company, Limited.—Mr. Adamson.

Bill (No. 112) respecting the Huron and Ontario Railway Company.—Mr. Ratz.

Bill (No. 113) respecting the Great Northern Railway of Canada.—Mr. Dubeau.

Bill (No. 114) to incorporate the Canadian Lloyds, Limited.—Mr. Bickerdike.

Bill (No. 117) to incorporate the Erie, London and Tilsonburg Railway Company.—Mr. M. S. Schell.

Bill (No. 118) respecting the South Shore Railway Company and the Quebec Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Devlin.

Bill (No. 119) to incorporate the Vancouver and Northwestern Railway Company.—Mr. Macpherson.

Bill (No. 120) to incorporate the Fort William and Port Arthur Terminal Railway and Bridge Company.—Mr. Macpherson.

Bill (No. 121) respecting the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—Mr. Watson.

Bill (No. 122) respecting certain Patents of Franklin Montgomery Gray.—Mr. Campbell.

Bill (No. 123) respecting a Patent, Number 69140, of the Underwood Typewriter Company.—Mr. Campbell.

SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS ACT—AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 97) to amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons—Mr. Fitzpatrick—read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. It is my intention, when we resume the discussion of this Bill in committee, to move to substitute for the proviso to clause 1 the following :

Provided that any member who is prevented by sickness or illness from attending during a session or part of a session of parliament shall not for that cause forfeit any part of his sessional indemnity, but the days on which the member has been unavoidably absent owing to sickness or illness shall be allowed on production with the statement hereinafter mentioned of a medical certificate verifying the cause of such absence.

This is to make the provision as we have it applicable to a member who may be prevented by illness from attending on the opening day or during any portion of a session. I intend also to move another subsection to the following effect :

Any member residing at a greater distance than four hundred miles from Ottawa may commute such travelling allowance, receiving in lieu thereof an allowance of eight dollars per day for each day necessarily occupied in travelling between his place of residence and Ottawa, going and coming, once each way, the day of departure and the day of arrival being counted each as a full day.

So as to save a member from the necessity of keeping a record each day of his petty cash expenditures.

Mr. GALLIHER. The Minister of Justice has covered an amendment which I intended to suggest, except that instead of the word 'eight' I think he should insert the word 'fifteen.'

Mr. FOSTER. Make it a multiple of eight.

Mr. GALLIHER. For this reason. Every day that a member is absent from his duties in the House, unless he is absent through sickness, $15 per day is deducted. Now, a member living, in the far east or far west as members do, at a considerable distance from Ottawa, is necessarily absent from his home a greater length of time than a member resident at hand, by the days it takes him to go from his home to parliament, and from parliament to his home again. He is as much engaged in the service of his country from the day he leaves home till the day he returns as the sitting member for the city of Ottawa who comes here on the opening day ; and after he comes here, the law as amended last session provides that for every day he is absent $15 shall be deducted. Well, it seems to me fair and reasonable that if $15 is to be deducted for his absence for a day during the session, the same amount should be allowed in lieu of travelling expenses for the time occupied in coming here and in returning to his home.

That, I think, is but fair. I quite approve of the principle adopted last year in cutting off the mileage. When in 1903 we made it compulsory for railway companies to give members of parliament transportation free, there was no excuse for the payment of mileage, although I do not think that what was termed mileage was really intended, in the first place, to be in lieu of what was paid for railway fare but was rather intended to be some compensation that would equalize the position of members living at long distances with that of members living close by. However be that as it may, I think it was wisely cut out entirely by our Act of last year. But, as I have said, the far distant members were not placed on an equality with those living in the vicinity of the capital. I might quote, for instance, a case even more striking than that of any other member, the case of the member from the Yukon. Certainly in his case, while the sitting members for the city of Ottawa and those close by would pactically be receiving the full benefit of the increase of $1,000, to that gentleman the addition meant only the increase of a few dollars. Not only that, but the nearby member has the advantage of being able more or less to attend to his business while attending parliament, while the member at a great distance is practically disconnected from his business during the whole time that parliament sits. I think this will be regarded by the House and country as a fair proposition ; and while we are not asking to be restored financially speaking, to the amount we received as mileage under the old law, yet we are not asking too much if we suggest to the Minister of Justice that he should change that $8 per day to $15 and give us that allowance for the days spent travelling from the time we leave home until the time we reach home again, in view of the fact that, on the other hand, when we are absent from parliament a day that same amount of $15 is deducted.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. We will carefully consider that suggestion between this and the next sitting of the committee. I wish to add something to the statutory declaration to the effect that absence was caused through illness whenever such is the case. I would ask leave therefore to submit the following amendments :

3. Section 31 of said chapter 11, as said section is enacted by section 8 of said chapter 43,

is amended by adding at the end of subsection 1 thereof the following words :

And in case days are included on which the member has been prevented from attending by sickness or illness, setting forth that fact and that his absence was unavoidable.

I also propose to submit the following amendment :

And by adding at the end of subsection 2 thereof the following words :

And if the member has elected to commute his travelling allowances under subsection 2 of the next preceding section, a statement of the time necessarily occupied in travelling to and from Ottawa as provided in said section.

Having given this notice I move that the committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY—THE NORTH ATLANTIC TRADING COMPANY.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) moved that the House go into committee of supply.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). In as brief a manner as possible, consistent with clearness, I wish, Mr. Speaker, to trace the history and the attendant circumstances of a transaction which is one of the most singular that I have ever met with in my parliamentary experience. I refer to the transaction which is well known as the North Atlantic Trading Company contract. I noticed during last session, and have remarked on several occasions during the present session, that more than once an assertion has been made with the evident intention of throwing the responsibility of this contract upon Lord Strathcona, the High Commissioner for Canada. In fact the hon. the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), last year, in some explanations which he gave of it, expressly asserted that the first contract or arrangement was made by Lord Strathcona. I do not think, Sir, that he should do that injustice to our Canadian High Commissioner. So far as I have been able to get at the history of this transaction, as revealed in the papers, and so far as knowledge has come to me from other sources, which I am not at liberty to state tonight as being proceedings in another part of this House, I do not believe that Lord Strathcona is responsible in the least for the transaction. I do find that he raised the question as to whether or not it was possible to enter into that transaction in countries whose legislation was hostile to the work of soliciting and directing emigrants from them to a foreign country. That, I think, was the extent of his services in that matter, except that he was, to a certain extent, the supervisor and head of the offices in London at that time.

This transaction bears all the marks of a Siftonian deal. Every birth mark is clearly defined. The supreme disregard shown for the significance and direction of a parliamentary appropriation, the utter contempt shown for such a thing as parliamentary authority, the entire ignoring, of the assent and confirmation of his colleagues as given by order in council, the lavish hand with which the expenditure was made, seemingly without regard to any but the beneficiaries of the stream of money which was to be poured out—all these have, as I have said, the true Siftonian marks which make me believe that this transaction had one origin and one only.

In August, 1899, the Deputy Minister, Mr. Smart, a Siftonian, went over to London for the express purpose of conferring with Mr. Preston, the Commissioner of Immigration, another Siftonian. And the two of them, as a consequence of repeated conferences, journeys to Europe and reports of the results thereof to Mr. Smart in London, reached a basis and made an arrangement to the extent that it was approved by both and forwarded for the sanction of the minister. This first arrangement—I will call it a contract, although it was not confirmed by order in council has not been placed before the House up to the present time. It was not among the papers laid before the House. The papers asked for and promised to be brought down were contracts and orders in council authorizing them. I think it is well to read this contract to the House as being the first contract or arrangement made by the department and without the sanction of order in council. On October 20, 1899, the following letter was written :

Dear Sir,—In view of our frequent consultations, we have the honour to submit the following proposal to the Canadian government. We will undertake to bring Canada to the attention of people residing in continental European countries——

Mark the words 'we will undertake to bring Canada to the attention of people living in continental European countries.'

—and, in answer to queries, furnish reliable information regarding the climatic conditions and resources of Canada, and, where it is the intention to emigrate, to point to Canada as a desirable field for settlement, upon the following conditions :

1. That the government will expend £500 in printing suitable literature as recommended by me——

The personal equation comes in there.

—placing the printed matter at our disposal.

2. That we shall receive from the government upon all emigrants from these countries for Manitoba and the Northwest Territories, over twelve years of age, as registered at the ports of Halifax, St. John, Quebec and Montreal, via these ports or via Portland and New York in the United States :

17 shillings and 6 pence sterling per capita on any number less than 10,000 in each year ;

20 shillings sterling per capita on any number between 10,000 and 15,000 in each year ;

25 shillings sterling per capita on any number exceeding 15,000 in each year.

3. That each head of a family shall be possessed of at least $100, or, where there is a community of families working together, they shall average an amount sufficient not to become public charges.

4. That this provision shall apply only to emigrants who are agriculturists or who intend to settle on agricultural lands.

5. The acceptance of this offer is to be for a term of five years, and may be subsequently cancelled by notice three months prior to the 1st of October in any year.

An essential condition of this offer is that by our action we shall not violate or contravene any law now, or which may hereafter be, in force in any country from which inquiries may be made or from which persons may emigrate to Canada.

Awaiting your reply, we are, dear sir,

Yours truly,

THE NORTH ATLANTIC TRADING COMPANY.

W. T. R. Preston, Esq.,
Office of the High Commissioner for Canada,
London.

To this the following reply was sent, dated Berlin, November 4th, 1899 :

To the North Atlantic Trading Company, Amsterdam—

My Dear Sirs,—I have the honour to acknowledge receipt of your letter of 20th ultimo, and have carefully noted its contents.

Then follows a recital of his conferences with the High Commissioner and with the Minister of the Interior, and the authority under which he is now acting. And then goes on to say :

I now, on behalf of the Department of the Interior, accept your offer with the conditions attached thereto in connection with emigration to Canada from continental Europe. I only desire, in accepting your proposals, to accentuate the last clause in your letter providing that on your part there shall not be any contravention of the laws of European countries in carrying out your proposition.

Hoping you will not lose any time in entering upon the programme you have outlined in the interests of emigration to the Dominion of Canada, which is hereby accepted as contained in your proposals in the letter of the 20th ultimo, referred to, believe me my dear sirs,

Yours very truly,

W. T. R. PRESTON.

That was a five years' firm contract, terminable thereafter on three months notice, entered into, on behalf of the Dominion government, by the commissioner, which agreed to, and as stated which was planned largely by the Deputy Minister of the Interior and which received the adhesion and assent of the Minister of the Interior. You will notice that the very smallest, most indefinite, duties possible are laid on the North Atlantic Company. They are to undertake to bring Canada to the attention of people residing in continental Europe. To what extent? To how many people? In answer to queries, furnish reliable information regarding the climatic conditions and resources of Canada, and, where it is the intention to emigrate to point to Canada as a desirable field for settlement.' But for covering that small, indefinite area of duties, the government is to give them £500 worth of literature printed as they wish it, and to pay them toll upon every emigrant from these countries for Manitoba and the Northwest Territories—(there is that saving feature in it)—over twelve years of age as registered at the ports named. This is restricted to agriculturists or those intending to settle on agricultural land. I believe this arrangement was without the knowledge of council, and certainly it was without the knowledge of parliament. With nothing but a general vote for emigration given from year to year, the minister and his two subalterns pledged this country to an unlimited, indefinite amount of money for five years at the very least. That is the first point which meets one in the history of this case. Now, Sir, this goes on from the 4th of November, 1899, when it became operative until the 31st of May, 1902, in the very face of council and of parliament. And yet I am certain, so far as we get it from the records as they are brought down, that neither the council of ministers nor parliament had the least idea that this contract had been made binding on Canada and that it was to run for five years.

On the 31st of May, 1902, some tremor of fear, some slight trepidation, perhaps, that it was being pushed a little too far, took possession of the department or of the Minister of the Interior and he came to the conclusion that he would get an order in council and so, on the 31st of May, 1902, an order in council was passed upon a report of the minister, and contract No. 2 was authorized and confirmed by the order in council. This was a contract with that same company, the Trans-Atlantic Trading Company, and it is peculiar that although the order in council was passed on the 31st of May the contract was dated back to have force from the 1st day of January, 1902. The second contract differs materially from the first. It is a contract wider in its extent, in most respects more favourable to the Trans-Atlantic Trading Company. It takes in a definite number of countries; the other was for continental Europe but this defines the area. It is to cover :

Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Russia, Germany, Austro-Hungary, Northern Italy, Luxemburg, Roumania, Bulgaria, Servia, Switzerland, Norway, Sweden, Finland, and any other countries which may hereafter be included in the agreement, France being omitted for the reason that the department is free under the local laws to maintain agencies in that country.

Now in this contract the main points

are these: First, what is the company to do?

The company shall undertake a systematic and persistent propaganda in the countries named, by which people in the agricultural districts shall be made aware of the advantages offered by Canada as a field for settlement.

Still indefinite. The specifications are very loose, they can scarcely be called specifications, but that propaganda is to be systematic and persistent whatever it is and is to be carried out by means of

Advertisements in the public press, pamphlets published by the company in the various languages and personal canvass.

All these to be approved if required by a representative of the department in advance of publication. In this contract the company binds itself to spend $15,000 per year for and in the purposes mentioned, advertisements, pamphlets, and personal canvass by representatives of the company. Then there is a clause by which if it undertakes a special work, the special work not being defined, in Sweden, Norway and Finland and expends thereon £1,000, the manner and method and quality of the expenditure not defined, the government shall pay it £750 per year for two years for that special work. There is to be a financial condition attached to a certain part of the settlers; $100 shall be in the possession of the head of a family, $25 for each of the children and $200 as a maximum for a family, no matter how many there are in the family. This contract is to extend for 10 years from the date of the contract which would be, having been set back, from the 1st of January, 1902, subject during the term of the contract to cancellation by the department if the company fails to carry out the conditions in any particular and also there is the right for either party to terminate the contract on two years' notice from the 1st of January of each year. Doing that this company is to receive for every person who may emigrate to and arrive in Canada being of the agricultural or domestic servant class—if of domestic servant class to be over 18 years—from the countries that had been named, a bonus of $5 per head.

These are the main points of that second contract. The onus is placed on the company to give proper evidence that it has expended the $15,000. Under the contract this bonus is to be paid on those who may emigrate from these countries and arrive in Canada, putting the onus on the company to show that these persons did emigrate from the country named and of course the proof was easy if they arrived in Canada under counting of the officers of the Dominion government. This contract goes on from January 1, 1902, the setback period, or from May 31, 1902, the period of the order in council, until September 20, 1904, and on September 20, 1904, when that contract had only run about 2 years and 6 months of its period, another order in council was passed and another contract based upon that order in council was entered into with the same company. Now when you come to examine that order in council you will find that in almost every instance the contract is changed in favour of the beneficiaries, the North Atlantic Trading Company and to the detriment of Canada, the other party to the contract. In the first place, here was a contract which had not yet been notified to parliament, a contract which had not been ratified by parliament, a contract entered into contrary to the spirit of parliament and contrary to the spirit of our administration and contrary to the law as well, for a period of ten years, and before it had run two years and seven months another contract is entered into under date September 24, 1904—that is the order in council and the cnotract thereupon is dated on the 28th of November, 1904—and by that contract the extension is for 10 years from that time, making an extension, added to the previous term of 10 years, of over two years thus making the whole contract period from the first up to the completion of the third contract period, 15 years and one month and at that time parliament had not been notified that there was any contract, any agreement, had made no appropriation therefor, and had not ratified the contract simply because, for one reason, the contract had never been placed before it.

Parliament had never been told and had never been asked whether it was in favour of it or not. Now, Sir, that is Siftonian in the highest and most absolute degree. Does the right hon. gentleman who leads the House subscribe to a doctrine of that kind? Did he know it? If he did not was he rightly treated by his minister? That is a question to be solved between the two, but we know the fact and I do not think you could find in all the annals of our parliament any such arrangement as that. The total amount of money which was involved, on a fair average of what has taken place in these three contracts, made without parliamentary appropriation, or authority, or sanction, was close to or a little over one million of dollars of the people's money. Now, I have said that this third contract was altered materially and altered in the interest of the North Atlantic Trading Company. In what way? In the first place, the work of the company is made, possibly, even more indefinite than it was before. Under this contract the company has to do what?

The company shall and will carry on an active educative work.

That is what its duty is. How definite! How delightfully specific that is! It shall

—carry on an active educative work by advertising by pamphlet and by personal canvass of the representatives of the company.

That is the full extent of the specification. I commend it to the other departments of government who wish to make a contract for the building of a bridge, the construction of a railway, the construction of a great public building. How much trouble it would take from their hands and from the minds of their architects and engineers if they would just simply say : Mr. So and So undertakes and is bound to build a building and to have it finished at a certain time ! That would be just about as definite as this. But, it goes still further. A certain number of countries were specified in the preceding contract. Four of these are cut out of this contract and three of them are the least profitable and the most difficult to be worked. That is in favour of the company again. The expenditures to be made by the company are exactly the same but the special work is extended for four years in addition and for that special work, undefined, the manner of carrying out which is not stated, and about which I cannot get any information, they are to be paid $15,000 more than was contracted for in the preceding contract. The bonus is to be paid not on every one who 'emigrates to and arrives in Canada', but mark it, the bonus is to be paid upon every one who arrives in Canada—not even upon every immigrant who arrives in Canada. It is not stated that they must emigrate from Europe and must arrive in Canada as did the preceding contract and therefore put upon them the onus of showing that the emigration took place by the effort of the company. It is simply that for every one of the agricultural class, man, woman and child, and for every girl of the servant class above 18 years of age who arrives in Canada $5 shall be paid as a bonus to the company. In the first contract a special stipulation was made that they should expend $15,000 and proof was required to be adduced to satisfy the government that that $15,000 had been spent ; therefore the department or any officer could ask for specific proof, could ask reasonable proof, could ask for sufficient proof before a cent of money was paid out as bonus. In the second contract an ingenious article was inserted for the expenditure of the $15,000 per year. It shall be sufficient for the company to send in at the end of the year their account for $15,000 and a receipted voucher for the same. Alongside of this are the words 'or other reasonable proof', but inasmuch as it was stipulated that that would be one proof that would be sufficient that is all that has ever been demanded from them and when you question an officer of the department as to whether they ever went behind that receipted voucher and made inquisition as to whether that $15,000 had been actually spent, as to whether the advertisements had appeared in the newspapers all through, as to whether the pamphlets were actually distributed, where they were distributed, in what numbers they were distributed, the officer turns upon you and says: No, I did not inquire into that because the contract does not require me to. The contract says that a receipted voucher is sufficient proof, I have the receipted voucher and I do not go behind it. More than that the contract which was to have run for ten years from 1902, two years and six months of which had expired, was extended to run for ten years from the 28th November, 1904, making, as I said, the whole continuation of the contract fifteen years and one month without the authority of parliament, without the knowledge of parliament, and without the ratification of parliament. Why, cannot one ask, was not the contract, if altered it had to be, allowed to run for the remaining seven years and four months of the contract period, and why was an extension of two years in addition made to this North Atlantic Trading Company's contract ? Is there any answer to that ? May be we shall have one. In all these contracts, first, second and third, there is a clause that the North Atlantic Trading Company binds itself to do nothing in contravention of any law now in force or which may hereafter be put into force in any of these countries in regard to immigration. That is important to remember when we come to discuss some other portions of this contract. The changes in brief, in the third contract in favour of the company over and above the conditions in the second contract are : less definite duties, fewer countries to work, three or four of the less profitable ones having been cut out, monthly payments instead of quarterly may be demanded, onus of proof is taken off as to emigration, as to the expenditure, as to the financial state. That is all swept away.

The contract was extended for three years ; the time notice was extended from two years to four years. Again may I ask: Why the minister, and the department, and the government did not keep at least the check it had in the two years option to determine the contract ; why did they extend it to four years ? In the first contract the minister or the deputy could have determined the contract for failure to carry out their obligations in any part ; in the third contract they could only cancel it for failure to carry out their obligations ; that is, their obligations in toto. And whilst two years of the £750 payment for special work was made in the first contract, four extra years are added in the third contract, or a total or $15,000 to the perquisites and payments to the company. Why was all this leniency to the company and against the country in the arranging of this third contract ?

For one moment let us make a recapitula-

tion of what this third contract actually meant, boiled down into as few words as possible. What was the company to do? It was to carry on an active educative work among the agricultural classes; to expend $15,000 yearly in pamphlets, advertising, and in personal canvass by representatives of the company; the proof of the expenditure to be sufficient when a receipted voucher was handed with the bill to the Department of the Interior; to expend $5,000 a year on the special work and to receive therefor £750 per year from the government. The government on its part was to pay $3,750 per year for the special work, (work not defined) and $5 per head for every man, woman and child of the agricultural classes and every servant girl over eighteen years of age arriving in Canada from the countries named. Now note this: That under that contract the company makes up no list of immigrants. I asked an officer of the department if he was assured that those who were counted and paid for were the product of the work of the company on the other side. What was his answer? His answer was: That was none of my business, I simply had to go by the contract and the contract tells me to pay $5 per head to that company for every single person of these classes that arrived in Canada. The immigrant need not stay ten days in Canada; he need not come to Canada as the result of their work at all; no matter about that, for every one that enters Canada from that cordon of countries $5 is to be paid to this North Atlantic Trading Company. There is no evidence to be submitted to the government by the company; there is no certificate required that a single immigrant came from that vast extent of Europe over which the company holds this power of levying toll. The company is asked for no list of its agents or of its canvassers; the seal of secrecy covers all. The company simply sends in its accounts with its receipted voucher and gets its monthly payments. No, it does better than that. It sends in its accounts and the receipted voucher at the end of the year for the expenditure of the $15,000; but for every month of the year it may get this $5 per head for every one of these immigrants that come into Canada. No examination is made by the department as to bona fides of the expenditure, of the work, of the advertising, of the pamphlet distribution, of anything at all. And when you ask the superintendent of immigration why not; he says: I am not compelled to do so by the contract, all I have to do is to count the heads, hear from them, or read from the ship's manifest that they come from one of these countries and then credit up the $5 each to the North Atlantic Trading Company. The government, however, is even more accommodating. It puts one of its paid men at every port in Canada for the especial purpose of conning the ship's manifest and finding out just how many step on Canadian soil. It sees by the ship's manifest, or it takes the word of the immigrants that they come from one of the countries within the line marked off for this North Atlantic Trading Company. And then with wonderful courtesy and wonderful good will this government makes up the accounts of the company and sends a cheque saying: This is your money. Just think of what it is—you draw a line around a certain portion of continental Europe; within that line is a broad field for work for any and every agency, to bring immigrants to Canada. But no matter how many agencies work, no matter what the local or general influences are that send people to Canada, when they come here, on every one of them the government says: we will pay $5 per head to the North Atlantic Trading Company. Mind you, it is not paid to the man or the agency who starts the immigrant and sends him over to Canada; it is paid to the North Atlantic Trading Company who has the delightfully specific duty cast upon it of carrying on 'an active, educative campaign' within the greater part of the continent of Europe. Now, will hon. members just for a moment take the map of Europe in view and see what this means. That cordon of countries which is marked off as the special tribute reserve of the North Atlantic Trading Company comprises a population of 240,000,000 more or less. You have Austria with 30,000,000; Norway with 2,500,000; Sweden with 5,000,000; Denmark with 2,500,000; Germany with 60,000,000; the Netherlands with 6,000,000; Switzerland with 4,000,000; and Russia with 108,000,00. I have been moderate—this contract takes in Russia from the Pacific ocean to the Baltic but I have kept it down to European Russia. This makes up altogether a population of 238,000,000. And what have you left in Europe? France is omitted from the contract, but France is not an emigrating country, and all else you have left are Spain and Italy. It will be therefore seen that you have blanketed all available Europe, placed it under the tribute power of the North Atlantic Trading Company and bound yourselves for fifteen years to pays to it $5 per head for every man, woman and child of certain classes that come to Canada from these countries.

Now, take those countries again: were they countries in which there was no freedom of change in population? Not at all. Those countries are the chosen recruiting ground of America for its new lands and its new areas. In 1901-1902, by the latest statistics that I have got on the subject, over 500,000 emigrants left that area and came to America and settled in America. It is no case of making an irruption on a closed country such as China was twenty or thirty years ago. Here was an open territory, the best recruiting ground for emigrants—nearly all the available recruiting

ground for emigrants in continental Europe —all bound up to this company. Ah, but, the government says, we wanted immigrants, and they would not come unless we employed this means. You did not employ this means with reference to Italy, and yet 4,445 Italians emigrated to Canada in 1903-1904, and about the same number in 1904-1905 ; which shows that there was a stream started, and that of those 500,000 emigrants a certain proportion were making their way to Canada and would continue to make their way to Canada. And yet you cordoned off that area, the great recruiting preserve of continental Europe, and you put it under the toll and tribute of the North Atlantic Trading Company.

Now, have regard to another consideration. In those countries there are locally the strongest incentives to emigration that can possibly be had. In parts of those countries you have grinding taxation, which tends to disperse its population to free countries and freer conditions. In those countries you have ferocity of religious and race persecution, which, rising into violence and even murder at times, sends waves of people out of those countries to seek an asylum in freer and better countries. In those countries you have tyranny of the strongest, you have persecutions of section and race of the strongest, you have poverty of almost the direst and most compelling. All of these are local conditions which tend to drive people out of those countries. And over and above all, in Germany, in Russia, in Austria, in other of those countries, you have a grinding and impoverishing military system from which people are fleeing, in so far as their circumstances allow them, and will continue to do so. All these are agencies which tend to throw out emigrants, and which tend to populate the American continent. More than that, you have in those countries other agencies at work ; but it matters not what agencies work or gather the fruit, it has to be paid for in toll to the North Atlantic Trading Company. What happened in 1901-1902 ? The Jewish Association, with the beneficent donations made by Baron Hirsch and others, undertook to bring a number of persecuted Jews from Russia and settle them in Canada. They subscribed their money, $40,000 or $50,000. They sent for the Jews, clothed them, fed them, brought them out, and set them up in Canada ; and yet for every one of the hundreds they brought out $5 per head was paid by this government to the North Atlantic Trading Company. Other men truly have laboured, but this fortunate syndicate enters into the fruits of the labours of other men. No matter what agency—information, internal pressure, the kindness of friends—operates to bring settlers from those countries and land them in Canada, not to those who bring them goes the $5 per head, but to the North Atlantic Trading Company. What more ? The most efficient immigration agency we have in this country are the settlers from foreign countries who, having made their homes here, and having found the country to be well adapted to themselves, send home to their friends letters, information and money by the hundreds of thousands of dollars, to bring their friends out. A calculation could be made pretty exact as to what was sent by settlers from that range of countries in hard cash last year to friends in those countries to bring them to this country. Take the minister's own report, and one of his own inspectors says :

> Ruthenians and Galicians.—A large number of this year's arrivals evidently received help from those already in Canada arriving frequently and passing through to their friends.

But it is not the friend out in the west who labours, earns his money, sends his hundred dollars to the friends at home, brings out two or three or four of them and lands them alongside of himself in Manitoba or the Northwest—it is not to him the $5 goes. The $5 goes to the mysterious North Atlantic Trading Company. This is the government and this is the department whose motto is " the land for the settler." That is the cry but here again you have the evidence that everything goes to the speculator and nothing to the real worker. Over there somewhere—who knows where ? in some spot—who can place it ? within some building—who has ever located it ? somewhere in space never yet staked out, there is a mysterious nondescript labelled the North Atlantic Trading Company, and to that company the tribute is to be paid, the $5 is to go. Last year they drew out $88,000 and expended $15,000. What they did nobody in the department of the Interior, nobody in the departments at Ottawa, no man on the ministerial benches, knows or has the least idea. What we do know is that they said they had expended $15,000, and they raked in $88,000. Pretty good business for a government whose motto is : down with the speculator, up with the settler. So much, then, in reference to that. When your immigration inspectors stand, some at Quebec, some at Montreal, some at Halifax, some at St. John, some at Vancouver, some at Victoria, and count the heads on which to pay the tribute to this nondescript, if any friend of Canada were there and ventured to put a question like this ; you are paying $5 to the company for that man ? Are you sure that that company had anything at all to do with sending that man from Galicia? That is not my business, would be the answer, I am here simply to count the heads. Suppose the friend of the country were to put another question : Do you know that that company canvassed these people and set them on their way ? The answer would again be : That is none of my business ; it is in the contract that

they get the $5 for every inhabitant from that certain place who sets foot on Canada, and all I have to do is count the heads and hand over the tribute. The friend of Canada therefore makes no headway with that officer or that department or this government.

Even as to the agricultural class part of the agreement, how does your counter at the seaport know that a certain man and his wife and family belong to the agricultural class? What evidence has he? None, absolutely none. But you say he has the ship's passengers manifest. And what is that? The purser goes to every passenger and asks him what is his name, where is he from, whither he is going, how old he is, and the like, and his replies are entered on the manifest. He is asked, for instance, are you an agriculturist? And whatever the passenger says in reply is put down—whether he is a labourer or an agriculturist or anything else. That manifest is scrutinized by the Canadian counter, the officer paid to count these heads, and he takes all these entries as being correct. But even should he be of an inquisitive turn of mind and seek to question the incomer, what evidence would he get? Is your name so and so? Yes. Are you from such a place? Yes. Are you an agricultural labourer? Yes. That ends it. But where is the proof? In the United States you make your agents there certify every man that they send over. When the agent is paid his bonus, the certificate is there in the man's possession that he has been started and canvassed by that agent. But no check, no evidence of any kind is required to show that these 40,000 or 50,000 who come from these countries have ever seen or heard of the North Atlantic Trading Company or any agent thereof.

So much with reference to that. Now I have a few general observations to make as to the whole scheme itself. As I have said, it was concocted by the Siftonians, unknown to parliament, without an appropriation, without the least authority, and carried on for two years and seven months in that way. Then put under contract, passed by council, with a ten years extension of time, still unknown to parliament, and without parliamentary appropriation, and afterwards, in September, 1904, the contract was extended a further ten years from that date, still unknown to parliament, and it only leaked out because of certain items in the Auditor General's book and thus became known to parliament last session and not before. When it became known to parliament and when my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Osler) queried the government about it and when my hon. friend from Lennox (Mr. U. Wilson) questioned the government concerning it and other gentlemen put their interrogatories, what happened? There was a flutter in the dove cots. No doubt about that. The contract was asked for, but was refused. The Minister of the Interior refused it, the Minister of Finance refused it, the First Minister himself refused it. They said: Yes, there is a contract, but we cannot make it public; we cannot show it to the House. In what age of the world, we may well ask, do we live? There was a time when kings and rulers had power over certain sums of money, called secret service money, in large amounts, and of that they gave no account to parliament. But even that has in these later days been brought under the scrutiny of a committee of both sides of the House, if I am rightly informed. But in a British colony, in a British parliament, in any constitutionally governed country to-day, what will be said of the government and the department which enters into a secret contract, without a shadow of authority or appropriation, involving a million of dollars of the people's money, and then, when the people's representatives sent here to guard their interests, ask to be shown that contract, meet their request with a blank refusal? And for what reason? Reasons of state forsooth. Prudential reasons. We will show it, they say, if you wish to the leader of the opposition. But, Sir, the leader of the opposition has no more rights, in one sense, in this House than any other member of parliament. The member for St. John, the member for Toronto, the member for York, reprensents his portion of the sovereign people. It is the money of the people that is being voted, and each one of these men has a right to that contract, and no man can long refuse it. But, as I am informed, the leader of the opposition refused to look at the contract when the offer was put in that way.

They come on to 1906, shuffling, evading, until the matter gets before a committee of the House, and that committee, after probing in every direction to find out who this company is, what it is, came up at last against the ex-deputy minister and put to him the final question: Do you know? Yes. Who are they ? He refused to answer. And then the chairman of that committee and the partisan majority of that committee, and I presume the government which has in charge these partisans and manages them most beautifully, all coincided in saying that that final question should not be answered. If ever there was a know-nothing society in the world it is the ministry on that side, backed up by the departmental officers of the Interior Department. Is there such an entity as the North Atlantic Trading Company? We do not know. That was the chorus from top to bottom. Who are its officers? Who are its directors? How much capital has it? Where does it live? Where does it do its business? To all these questions they answered: We do not know. Through the Auditor General's Department and the Interior Department there was

one continual 'we do not know,' in a sneering, laughing way. Who or what is it? We do not know. Nobody knows.

Well, here is the grave point of the whole thing. What officers had you? The Siftonian officers were Preston and Smart. It was these officers who made the arrangements. Over their own sign manual, they declared that the contract had been made with the North Atlantic Trading Company, with an incorporated company, with a company whose capital was $200,000, with a company which represented far more strength than indicated by its capital. The ex-deputy minister, Mr. Smart, said that. The commissioner, Mr. Preston, said that. The minister, Mr. Sifton, said that. He put in his report to council, and the order in council, the voice of the whole cabinet said the same thing.

And yet, Sir, to-day, when we have driven them out from every one of their subterfuges, and, before an awakened country, have demanded to know what this company is and who its shareholders are, and when we telegraph to Lord Strathcona—under orders of the Public Accounts Committee—we received his telegram, and what do we learn? That there never had been, from July, 1899 to June, 1905, any such entity or corporation as the North Atlantic Trading Company; that it has all been, from beginning to end, one transparent—no one concealed—falsehood. Nothing more and nothing less. Lord Strathcona said:

> The persons named as subscribers to the memorandum and articles of association of the North Atlantic Trading Company and holding——

Listen. Oh earth!

> —and holding one share each are: Edward Samsbury, hotel proprietor, London; Alfred H. Alexander, engineer; John A. Randall, articled clerk, both of Cheswick; Geo. T. Dourney, Palwell Park, East Sheen, solicitor's clerk; Henry James Whitman, builder, Cheswick; John H. S. Thompson, Epsom, chartered secretary; Charles Guy Underwood, Acton, solicitor's clerk. The solicitor of the company is E. A. Alexander, Essex street, Strand. The capital of the company is £3,000 sterling in 300 shares of ten pounds each. Am endeavouring to get list of shareholders and amount actually subscribed and paid up. Company was incorporated on Island of Guernsey, as North Atlantic Trading Company, Limited——

Very limited.

> —registered June 3, 1905. Memorandum of association states registered office company situate Island Guernsey; director, J. Gluck; managing director, H. Pheifel; secretary, N. Kohan; business office, 92 Damarack, Amsterdam. Memorandum of association will be mailed by 'Campania' 14th. (Sgd.) Strathcona.

Let us hope that the 'Campania' will be strong enough to bear that memorandum of association.

Now, Sir, I ask this parliament, I ask this House, if anything more absurd, anything more farcical, any thing more indecent in the transaction of public dealing has ever been brought out or could be brought out in any country. For, where is the responsibility? Your commissioner of immigration, your deputy minister and your Minister of the Interior went over to Great Britain, they made that contract, and, when they came back, they sent in, over their own hands, the statement that there was a company called the North Atlantic Trading Company and that they had made a contract with it. Were these men stupid? I do not think that you could count any one of them stupid or ignorant? Were they guilty of fraud? Were they guilty of deliberate deception? Which was it—ignorance, fraud or deception? It must have been one or the other. And when the minister sent in his report and said to his brother ministers: I want you to sanction an agreement with a corporation called the North Atlantic Trading Company—was it ignorance on the minister's part, was it fraud or was it deception. Which? I will not believe that the members of the cabinet as a whole were guilty of either one or the other of these things. It is for these three Siftonians to clear themselves of the charge of ignorance or fraud, or of deliberate deception in this whole business.

We have all read that interesting story Japhet in Search of a Father. But there is one more pathetic that, I hope, some historian of modern events will put upon the written and printed page. After the deputy minister had formed his contract with that company, after he had declared that it was an incorporated company, had watched over its interests, had paid it money for three years and a half—suddenly he was moved by a wave of idle curiosity to visit the head office of this company. He took passage for Europe, he landed in Amsterdam. He inquired of all and sundry where this great and mighty establishment called the North Atlantic Trading Company was to be found. Got no answer but 'nit.' He pursued his inquiries; he continued his toilsome march; he looked at every establishment as it loomed in the distance. and going up to it, anxiously read its sign: No trading company. At last he wanders into a by and forbidden street and there he finds a little faded building. Two stairs up he finds a room with a door, and on the door, 'North Atlantic Trading Company.' He is at his journey's end. He tries the knob, but it yields not to his hand. He bares his manly fist and knocks upon the door. But no answer comes. Tired and sore from his exertions he journeys mournfully down the two flights of stairs and resumes his peregrinations and inquiries. Do any of the neighbours know anything about it? At last he finds one poor Dutch-

man who tells him that that door is occasionally opened by a lone and hungry looking visitor, who enters with any empty bag in his hand and goes out a few minutes after with the bag well filled—supposed to be with the cheques from the Department of the Interior made out to the North Atlantic Trading Company and which at last have landed in an upper story in an obscure building in Damarack street in Amsterdam. If it were not so important a matter that is at stake it would be the most ridiculous comedy that ever a comedian set himself to play or a writer of comedies set himself to write. But it is serious.

Now let us come for a moment to another aspect of the case. What are the excuses of the government? The excuses of the government and of the Department of the Interior were: We wanted this immigration, we could not get it in any other way and we were forced therefore to employ this company. I deny that this is well based. In the first place we do not want any more of that indiscriminate immigrant class from a large portion of that territory. If any of it comes naturally, when it reaches our shores let us discriminate as to its reception but pay no man a bonus therefor. Other and reputable agencies had been at work in these countries, the best of them, for many years, and had every year been giving their quota to this country. The United States gathers the main part of more than a million immigrants a year from these areas of Europe. They spend not a single cent, they rather put their force in making it as hard as possible to enter the United States as an immigrant. But the government have another excuse. They say the government could not work in those countries because it was opposed to the law of the land. Mr. Speaker will you just pay attention to one or two questions as they are put on that point. Against the law of these countries to do what? To solicit or direct immigration from the country to Canada. Therefore we cannot do it. If it is against the law of a country that you cannot solicit or direct immigration from that country through your agent is it a law which is directed only against aliens or is it a law which is equally against the citizens of that country as well as the alien? If it is against the law for an agent of this government to go in and solicit or direct immigration, it is equally against their laws for a citizen of their country to go in and solicit or direct immigration from that country to a foreign country. And what is the dilemma of the government? Either that its excuse is paltry or else that it hires somebody else to do the illegal thing and it proposes to reap the benefit from the illegal act. Is that a dignified position for the government? But there is a second absurdity. They have put a clause in every contract obliging this company and its agents to do nothing against any law existing or that may be passed in these countries against the soliciting or directing of emigration. Is that an honest clause? If so, then you pay your money to a company for doing what you absolutely prohibit them from doing. Now in the name of common sense what do these men do that you could not? Advertise in the newspapers of these countries. Cannot you do it? Could you not make terms with these newspapers to publish an advertisement in description of Canada and pay them for it and know that they do their work just as well as this North Atlantic Trading Company can do it? Can you not stay outside that country, put a booklet in a letter and send it to an address in that country the same as these people? For that is the way they have to do it. An officer of your Immigration Department under oath said that what these men did was to distribute booklets under seal and that they had to send them from an outside country into the country where they were to be received by the persons to whom they were addressed. Could you not get a force of clerks and mail letters to people whose names you get easily, because these are not benighted and unregistered countries. Could you not do that as well as this company and at infinitely less cost and know exactly what is being done? You declare that this must be done in secrecy. One of the most remarkable things with reference to this whole contract is this that your deputy Minister of the Interior and your Commissioner of Immigration when they made the contract with the North Atlantic Trading Company pledged themselves absolutely not to reveal the names of any person in that company and when the deputy minister is called upon to reveal the identity of that company, asked if he knows any of them, he says he does. Asked if he will give the Parliament of Canada any of the names he says: I cannot give you any because I pledged my word of honour to these people that I would not ever disclose their names and therefore I will not. But there is one other factor to be taken into account with that. When Mr. Smart pledged himself to secrecy with regard to a company that never existed, with regard to the men who formed that syndicate, the identity of which he cannot show he admits another thing, that in 1901 he commenced private correspondence with one of the principal men of that syndicate in regard to matters of that company, which correspondence was maintained until it resulted in his being employed by that company. That is a nice condition of things, an officer of this department, in utter secrecy, makes a contract for a million dollars with a company that never existed but which he declared was a company and did exist, and after he has firmly settled that by a second order in council and fixed it, as he thought, for fourteen years, he makes

his preparation to slip out of the department and enter into official connection and lucrative employment with the very company with which, under secrecy, he made these ruinous contracts. Did his minister know it ? Did the cabinet know it ? We all wondered when Mr. Smart left the department why he left, we could get no reason. Now we see the reason. He prepared a place for himself and to the place he prepared for himself thither he went in due process of time, and for years, from 1901 to 1905, your deputy Minister of the Interior certified to the accounts, sent the cheques, managed the inquisition which amounted to nothing, managed it so that it should not be anything to the company with whom he was in secret correspondence, for a place and a participation in their business. Asked if that was private ? Yes. Asked if the correspondence had to do with immigration ? Yes, but there was nothing very important about it. Will you produce it ? No, he would not produce it. That is a state of things, that is what is going on in the Interior Department, in how many other departments we do not know. In the resolution that I intend to move I have declared that this contract is injurious.

It is. Read the comments of the British papers last year when the first news came out that this strange contract had been made. Pay for a British emigrant 7 shillings 6 pence per head and give to an unknown company without an entity $5 per head for European continental emigrants ! What has Britain done that it should be discriminated against ? That sentiment amongst business men on the other side of the water was wide spread and strong and is to this day. To-day on the streets of London where men congregate and in the clubs this mysterious contract is talked about, and the question is asked : What does it all mean ? A company that never was a company, when driven by force of public opinion, has at last to get a lot of grocer's clerks, hotel clerks and solicitor's clerks to make a sham memorandum of corporation in the Island of Guernsey. And this was a company formed by the foremost steamship men upon the continent, with $200,000 of capital and even much more financial strength in the individual worth and positions of the men who formed that syndicate. Is there any doubt that this is injurious to Canada ? My hope is that this contract will be immediately and absolutely cancelled and until that is done the injury works. I have said that it was an improvident contract. Is it not ? What do these men do ? From that side of the House and from this side of the House there can come no intelligent answer. The only thing we know is that they say they spend $15,000 a year and that expenditure is not looked into by a single officer of the department to see whether it is made or not and they scrape in from $75,000 to $85,000 a year. My belief is that it is an unmitigated fraud from A to Z.—an unmitigated fraud and a disgrace from A to Z. It is an improvident contract and I think I have said enough to show that it is an absurd contract.

What about this doctrine of secrecy ? It will be said—the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) has already said it—that it makes no matter whether these things are secret or not—none of our business who are the directors of the company, none of our business whether it is incorporated or not, we are too inquisitive. The only thing that it is necessary to know is : Do they do the work ? We do not know, we do not want to know whether they are a company, whether they are incorporated, or who is behind them or anything of the kind. That is not the work of this parliament. For the smallest steamship subsidy we give, a vote specially defining it, is passed by this parliament, we define the company, we know the company, we know its responsibility and we know if it is able to carry on the work. Unless we knew that we would not give the vote. We have tenders for the construction of a railway. What is all this pother about who compose the companies that tender, or their financial responsibility ? Yet, the hon. Minister of the Interior puts forth this doctrine :

> My hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) has intimated that we should not do business with a company unless we know who compose the company. That is a remarkable doctrine. We pay subsidies to steamship companies to the amount of many, many thousands every year and we never inquire who compose the companies.

That is not correct.

> It does not interest us who are the directors in the companies. We know with whom we do business and whether we get service or not, and that is all we require to know in the transaction.

Will the right hon. gentleman who leads the government subscribe to that doctrine ? There is such an Act as the Independence of Parliament Act. Take the doctrine of the Minister of the Interior and what would happen ? Every five members of parliament could form themselves into a company, keep it secret, refuse the names of their directors, the names of their incorporators and the like of that under the admirable and beautiful doctrine of the Minister of the Interior and every one of them could be up to the arm pits in contracts and business engagements with this government. Is not publicity the one thing that is required to-day and secrecy in public companies the one thing that is abhorred ? The whole of legislation, the whole trend of legislation, the whole trend of investigation is to bring out the responsibilities of the company by showing its men and showing its capital and holding it responsible. Who could you hold res-

ponsible now in this North Atlantic Trading Company ? The Minister of the Interior has been sitting there for six years and he has been checking out money all that time to a company that never existed. There is your Minister of Finance whose duty it is to keep the finances of the country and up to this date he has checked out $296,000 to a company that never existed. If you want to bring anybody to book whom will you bring to book ? The North Atlantic Trading Company ? It does not exist. It has no home, it has no body, it has no entity. Who is responsible ? Nobody, but the cheque goes out for $296,000 of the people's money and unless a change is made a cheque in the end to the amount of a million dollars of the people's money will go out. To whom? To the North Atlantic Trading Company of whom no man knows anything and which has been proved to have had, for six years at least, no entity, no existence and to-day when we get a shred of the truth we find a kind of clerk's association on the Island of Guernsey instead of the magnificent steamship magnates of Central and Northern Europe.

I do not propose, Mr. Speaker, to carry this much farther. I have simply tried to draw an outline of this most singular and remarkable transaction. I have done it imperfectly but I have done it in part. What I have left undone those who are to follow will fully amplify. I commenced by saying that this had all the birth marks of a Siftonian transaction. I think I have proved that and proved it to the hilt. it is all delightfully Siftonian, characteristic, full flavoured, all the marks of the Siftonian cult about it. In the Department of the Interior, which seems to be a fit temple for its votaries, the cult was established and there it flourished. It has its land marks, its milestones, its places of rest, from the frozen Yukon to the sunnier climes of middle Europe, studded all along the path of pilgrimage. Into this temple men come. Out of it men go, but how changed. Its priests primary and secondary seem to be giving us the rakes progress reversed.

They go in at their worst and they come out at their best. Or, it is a kind of a modern Pilgrim's Progress—not to a spiritual but to a material Paradise. Your novice enters it a pauper—he comes out a millionaire. He goes in a poor pilgrim, leaning on his staff and with modest garments, he comes out a pampered prince, clad in fine raiment, riding in liveried chariots. Whiskey permits, Treadgold concessions, claim lifting in the north ; land looting, timber, coal scrip, wire fence graft in the middle areas. Immigration frauds everywhere—crowned by a million dollar contract with a headless, houseless, homeless monstrosity, a sort of a fugitive maw into which the Siftonians pour Canada's hard earned taxes. And who takes them out ? An interrogation point may well be put after that query ? All this seems to happen through the wonderful working, changing power in that temple of the Interior. And after the high priests and the secondary priests have had their transformations, the acolytes spread over a wide range of country with patrimony and franchises and benefices scattered to them with a liberal hand, applaud the progress of the chief, and now mourn his departure. But we have no sympathy with the right hon. gentleman who leads this government. Your sins are now coming home to you with just retribution ; the chickens that you hatched out of these eggs are coming home to roost, as curses ; you brought this gentleman from the west here ; you upheld his hands, you made him powerful, you fed him, you established his cult, you put his acolytes around him, you declared that every tree he planted bore golden fruit. If to-night, these apples of Hesperides in your mouth become ashes—and bitter ashes—we deplore it but we do not sympathize with you ; not one little bit.

I beg leave to move as an amendment to the motion to go into Supply.

That the contracts entered into by the government of Canada with the North Atlantic Trading Company were made without the authority and knowledge of parliament.

That the engagements thus undertaken cover a possible period of over fifteen years and involve the payment by the country of about one million dollars without any reasonable compensating advantages.

That the contracts were made under a pledge not to disclose the personnel or agents of the alleged company who are either unknown to the government, or if known to the government have not been disclosed to parliament notwithstanding various attempts to secure the information.

That it does not appear that at the time these contracts were made the alleged Trading Company had any corporate existence, any recognized headquarters, any known directors or officers, that it had any vessels afloat, or possessed any trading or operating facilities of any kind or any agents or agencies effective or otherwise.

That no evidence has been given to parliament of the efficiency of its plans and methods of operation, or that it has been primarily instrumental in sending one single immigrant to Canada.

That the conditions of the contracts are injurious, improvident and absurd.

That immediate steps should be taken to terminate the existing contract.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Mr. Speaker, I am sure the House and the country are to be congratulated on the successful deliverance to-night of the remarks of the assistant leader of the opposition. For some time past we have been teetering as it were on the edge of an abyss. The air has been thick with rumours of what was going to happen when my hon. friend exploded his bombshell in regard

to the North Atlantic Trading Company. The business of parliament has been held up for two sittings awaiting the explosion of this supposed bombshell and a committee of the House has been sitting under stress for some weeks awaiting the same stupendous catastrophe. The only complaint I have to make is that in view of the information I will give the House before the close of my remarks, my hon. friend has placed the particulars of this contract before the House and country in such favourable terms that I am afraid the action which the department has found it desirable to take will not meet with that unanimous approval which I had looked for. There is one feature of my hon. friend's remarks which I may be pardoned for alluding to : I speak of that part of his speech which was essentially personal, in which he used the name of a member of this House who is not present.

Mr. LAKE. He never is.

Mr. OLIVER. This member of the House has been a member continuously for some ten years ; he has been subjected to attack, at rare intervals, to his face in the House, but never to my memory by the hon. the assistant leader of the opposition. If my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has so much to say with regard to the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) the late Minister of the Interior, it would be entertaining to this House, and I am sure my hon. friend Mr. Foster would get information and instruction that it seems to me he very much needs, if he were to await the presence of the member for Brandon and then use the remarks he has seen fit to use to-night. I have a little to say with regard to the discovery of the North Atlantic Trading Company contract. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) has informed the country that its existence was discovered last session of parliament. It was perhaps the misfortune of parliament and the country that my hon. friend was not present during some of the preceding sessions ; but if he had been present, or if he had followed the proceedings of the committees of the House, he would have learned that the existence of the North Atlantic Trading Company was known to members of this House and was discussed in a Committee of the House ; and if the same course was not taken then that has been taken by my hon. friend—that is to say, if the privilege of parliament and the authority of parliament were not then invoked to probe this matter to the bottom, as he phrases it—it was, I assume, because the gentlemen who were then aware of its existence, and who were then responsible for the conduct of affairs in parliament, were willing to believe that the best interests of immigration and the best interests of the country were better served by respecting the conditions which were said to attach to that contract.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What is the occasion to which the hon. gentleman alludes?

Mr. OLIVER. The investigation by the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. U. WILSON. What year?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot give the year, but my hon. friend can easily find the documents. My hon. friend sees fit to disregard the position of consideration if not of prudence which was held by the then members of the House, including his colleague the leader of the opposition.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I am not a member of the Agriculture Committee. That is the only instance the hon. gentleman has given to me.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend is the leader of the opposition in this House; he was a member of the last parliament, and he must accept his share of responsibility for the action or inaction of his followers in regard to public matters.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. OLIVER. I must say, Mr. Speaker, that the hilarity, the satirical hilarity, with which the suggestion of leadership by the hon. leader of the opposition is met by his followers is in very close accord with the opinion we on this side have generally held with regard to that subject. I was about to say that there are members of the House, and I believe members of the opposition, who look upon the question of immigration, as well as upon other questions concerning the government of this country, from a somewhat different standpoint from that occupied by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster)—who recognize their responsibility as members of the House and the responsibility of the government. Not so with my hon. friend. If it so pleases him, as a matter of curiosity, or as the basis of a speech, with which he may see fit to afflict the House, no consideration of public policy or of the public good will interfere with his carrying out of the whim of the moment. This matter of immigration is one of considerable importance to this country. It is one that is entitled to the consideration of every man who is charged with public responsibility, and it is some thing new to find that my hon. friend was cheered and applauded by his followers to-night in declaring against a policy of immigration.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. OLIVER. The time has come, he said, when the pressure from behind and the attractions of this country, the efforts of immigrants already here, were sufficient to induce all the immigration that Canada requires, if I understood him correctly.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I am sorry to say that my hon. friend did not understand me correctly.

Mr. OLIVER. If I did not understand what the hon. gentleman meant, I certainly

did understand what he said. Now, does the House and does the country altogether realize how important this question of immigration is and has been in Canada? Do they realize that the policy of immigration is a most important part of that general policy which has resulted in the present favourable conditions in this country, and do they realize that the policy of immigration is necessarily one that cannot be measured with a tape line, that cannot be fitted to the multiplication table, that cannot be measured by the standards which my hon. friend sees fit to set up, any more than water can be measured by the yard or peaches by the acre? He assumes to set up a standard that would be required, and properly required in the erection of a public building, and apply that to the carrying forward of a system of immigration. I had occasion to make some remarks in regard to that position a few days ago, and I have to say this, that if this House insists that every move that shall be made by this government to secure immigrants shall be known before it is made, then this House will have taken the responsibility of providing that that effort shall be forestalled by all agencies that are not favourable to immigration to Canada. The position which my hon. friend has placed before this House at such length to-night in regard to immigration would make successful immigration effort an impossibility.

Immigration, in the minds of most of our people, has meant the securing of settlement and development for the Northwest, the making of the prairies productive. It was with this idea in view that, away back in the fifties, the great men of the two old provinces of Canada undertook confederation with the hope of extending Canada to the Pacific ocean. They recognized that the agricultural possibilities in the valley of the St. Lawrence were limited, while the agricultural possibilities in the valleys of the Red river and the Saskatchewan were stupendous. They recognized that if Canada was to be a great country, it was there it was to be great. It is a lifetime since the great minds of Canada took part in securing control of those western prairies with a view to their becoming productive by means of settlement through immigration effort.

It is not only that they wished to settle up Western Canada but they also had in their minds the impossibility of holding the natural increase of population of Eastern Canada against the rival attractions of the Western States, and they hoped, by acquiring the Northwest Territories and giving access to them, to secure the settlement in our own country of our own people as well as an increase of population from other countries. Forty years ago it was recognized that if Canada was ever to become great, it must be by the settlement of the Northwest, and from that day to this that subject has been foremost in the minds of those charged with our country's destinies. Upon the success or failure of each successive government to secure the settlement and development of the Northwest stands or falls the credit of that government in the judgment of Canada. I do not wish to weary the House by any lengthy particulars, but let me express, in the fewest possible words, an idea of what the settlement and progress of the Northwest in the past ten years, under this Siftonian management of the Immigration department, has meant to Canada in hard cash. There are in the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta a total area of some 370,000,000 acres. We will take it for granted, for the purpose of calculation, that half of that area, or a little more than half, is of agricultural value, and we will say that in that great western country we have 200,000,000 acres of agricultural land suitable for settlement and the production of wealth. In 1896 the extreme value that could be put upon that land was $2 an acre. That was the extreme value because as was stated here the other night, a railway company, which had the right of selecting the choicest lands within a tract of millions of acres, was glad to sell a million acres at $1.55 per acre, not ten years ago, but five years ago. Therefore I say that our 200,000,000 acres at that time was worth 400 millions at an outside figure, whereas to-day, if the reports which we hear from day to day are correct, that land is worth $6 an acre, at a moderate estimate, or $1,200,000,000, being an increase value of $800,000,000 in the real estate of Canada in six years under the Siftonian administration of the Interior and Immigration Department. Is it then wonderful that the position of Canada to-day is different from what it was ten years ago? Is it wonderful that our wealth has increased, that our cities are building up and increasing in number, that we can get millions for railways to-day where we could not get thousands ten years ago. In my administration of the department of the Interior I have from day to day to turn people away who are asking for thousands and hundreds of thousands of acres of that land at advanced prices, and it is safe to say that every acre could be sold within a month, in the present condition of the money and land market, at the price I have mentioned.

Now, what had the immigration work of the department to do with that increase in value? It is the people who make the country, and it is the demand for land by the people which makes the price. The reason the land was only worth $2 an acre ten years ago was not because it was not fertile or because the climate was not good or because there was not railway communication or because the country did not have good institutions, or law and order were not well maintained. No, it was be-

cause nobody wanted the land, and that lack of demand was due partly to the fact that the country had been badly administered and partly to the fact that the people who wanted the land did not know how good it was. It has been the work of the Department of Immigration in telling the people of the world how good the land of the Northwest is, to which this great advance is due. Because of that administration, which makes living in that country desirable, which has removed the disabilities that lay upon it during those preceding years, and because of the information that department has spread, by one means and another, throughout the world during those ten years, we have had that demand for settlement which has produced that increase in value at which we are all surprised. That increase did not come as the dew from heaven, but resulted from the aggressive policy of the department of Interior or Immigration, or from Siftonianism, if you like to give it that name.

In 1895 the crop of that country was estimated at 32,000,000 bushels and in 1896 it was estimated at 18,000,000 bushels. The crop of 1895 was a bumper one but that of 1896 was a small one. Well, in this last year of 1905, the crop was 85,000,000 bushels, worth $50,000,000, and the total value of the crop of the west during the past year was not less than $100,000,000—$100,000,000 of created wealth as the result of the operations of one year by those immigrants which this Siftonian policy placed on the land. And remember, Sir, that these results are only the beginning. The immigration that has gone in during the past three years has not made itself felt in the matter of production. It is but the result of the lesser immigration of the preceding years that we have in our crop returns. But with the increase of hundreds of thousands of settlers in the past two or three years, the next two or three years will tell you what has been the result to Canada of this Siftonian administration of the Interior Department.

My hon. friend asks this House, this supposedly intelligent House, to condemn an administration which has produced such results, because he is not able to find out who are the shareholders of a certain company.

Now, this matter is not one of mere academic discussion ; it is a matter of policy upon which the government and the opposition are both to be judged. The government has no excuse to offer for its North Atlantic Trading Company contract or for any other part of its immigration and land policies. It demands to be judged by the results that have been achieved. But the country is interested in knowing not only what is the policy of the government but what is the policy of the opposition who aspire to be a government, who ask to be entrusted with the conduct of public affairs. And on no question is it more important to the people of Canada that they should have a definite and satisfactory answer than on this question of an immigration policy. The immigration policy of this government has been before the people for ten years. The immigration policy of the party in opposition has been placed before the country here to-night, placed before the country by a gentleman who was a member of a government from 1888 to 1896. When that hon. gentleman speaks to-night, we want to know if his policy is what it was when he was a member of the government. We have every reason to believe that it is the same policy—certainly I am safe in saying that he will not deny that it is the same policy. Then let us have some of the results of the policy of that administration. I go back to the year 1883-4, a year in which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) was a member of this House supporting the government of that day. In that year there was an expenditure of $511,208 on immigration. The amount expended on continental European immigration is not stated in the return. The total number of immigrants for that year was 103,824 of whom 6,151 were continental Europeans. And as a result of this expenditure of half a million dollars and this immigration of one hundred and three thousand people there were just 3,753 homesteads taken up in all Manitoba and the Northwest. Ten years later, in the year 1893-4, my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) was a member of the government. And, under the policy which he was at such pains to expound to-night, the expenditure had decreased to $202,235. Of that expenditure a part was in bonuses—bonuses, Mr. Speaker, on continental European immigrants—the amount spent under that head being $14,935. There was a total immigration from Europe of 20,829, of whom, 4,825 were from the continent of Europe, and in that year the total homestead entries were 3,209. In the year 1903-4, under the present government the expenditure on immigration was $744,788, and on continental European immigration, $39,933 ; the total number of immigrants was 130,331, of whom 34,728 were from the continent of Europe. And the homesteads were 26,819. Now, let us compare the expenditure and results as between 1896 and 1905. In 1896, the total expenditure on immigration was $120,199. This was the expenditure of which my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) expressed himself as being so proud when he spoke here the other night and to which he pointed out as indicating the immigration policy of his party. In this year, 1896, the expenditure on immigration from continental Europe was $6,710. The whole number of immigrants was 16,835. The immigrants from the continent of Europe were 4,451. And the number of homestead entries in that year—and this, mark you, was after

eighteen years of the immigration policy of our friends of the opposition as set forth by the records of the government at that time—was 1,857. In the year 1904-5 the expenditure on immigration was $972,356. The amount spent on continental European immigration was $86,967. The whole number of immigrants in that year was 146,266; continental European immigrants 37,255, homesteads taken 30,819. This is the Siftonian policy of immigration as compared with the Fosterian policy of immigration. The government, I repeat, has no apology to offer in this connection. In 1895, 2,394 homestead entries, in 1905, 30,819 homestead entries. In the years from 1879 to 1896, 18 years, during a part of which my hon. friend was a member of the government and during the whole of which I presume he was a supporter of the government, there was a total of 65,000 homestead entries. In the 2½ years 1904, 1905, and one-half of 1906, there were 75,000 homestead entries, 10,000 more in two and a half years under Siftonian administration than there were in 18 years under Fosterian administration. It was not until this government came to power, and not until my predecessor assumed office, that the hopes of the founders and fathers of confederation, had realization in the building up of Canada by the filling of the Northwest. Just one instance more. In the years 1894, 1895, and 1896, there were in all these three years 389 homestead entries in the Edmonton land office. In the month of March 1906 there were 567 homestead entries in the same office. There were nearly twice as many entries in the one month under this administration as there were in the last three years of the administration of which my hon. friend was a member and he asks for an excuse and an apology. It is up to him and his friends——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear!

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. How many of these were due to the North Atlantic Trading Company?

Mr. OLIVER. It has been the complaint of my hon. friends on the other side that too many of the entries at the Edmonton office have been due to that company.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When was that complaint made and by whom?

Mr. OLIVER. Some of the supposedly witty gentlemen who sit behind my hon. friend advanced that argument when they were discussing the returns of the election. I would refer to the member for East Elgin (Mr. Ingram) for one.

Mr. BENNETT. Tell us about the contract now.

Mr. OLIVER. Oh, yes, I will tell about that later. The other feature of this case to which I wish to allude is this: One of the purposes of the acquirement of the Northwest by Canada was that it should retain to Canada the overflow of our surplus population. The census of the United States for 1890 showed that there were in the United States 1,000,000 persons born in Canada; during the twenty-five years following the civil war in that country these people had gone there from Canada. During the greater part of that time the policy and administration of our friends had been paramount in our country. It was said here the other night that it was idle to expect our Northwest to fill up until the United States had been filled up. But let me point to this fact that Canada before the year 1890 had sent to the United States a million of her native born people while her own Northwest, although it had railroad connection, was lying vacant.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear!

Mr. OLIVER. There was no reason why the United States should fill up at the expense of Canada except the policy and administration that we have heard voiced here in the discussion to-night. That was a good enough reason then, it would be just as good a reason to-day if this country were so unfortunate that it could be given.

Mr. INGRAM. You would have given them the whole country in 1891 if you could.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend was very strong on the terms of this contract but, as I said already, when he read out the terms it certainly struck me that they were very favourable. However, perhaps it was not so much the terms that he complained about as the fact that the contract was entered into without the authority of parliament, that it was entered into improperly, and I shall not trouble the House to go over the adjectives which he used in that connection. I have some information to give the House in regard to this matter which may be of interest. It might almost be supposed that bonuses on immigrants from continental Europe had never been heard of before my hon. friend sprung in the House here to-night. I presume the House will be astonished to know that in the year in which my hon. friend entered parliament as a supporter of the government the following letter was written by John Low, secretary of the Department of Agriculture to J. N. Abbott, general passenger agent of the Erie Railway Company, corner of Portland and George streets, New York. It is dated:

Department of Agriculture, Ottawa, January 30, 1882.

I go so far back into ancient history for the purpose of defining accurately the position of my hon. friend in regard to immigration. The letter says:

I have submitted for the consideration of the Minister of Agriculture the points of conversation I had with you in the interview of Friday last. I reported that you expressed willingness generally to assist this department in promoting German and Scandinavian immigration through New York, and via the Erie Railway to the province of Manitoba.

That you would generally afford the department the use of your agency for distributing advertising matter and publications in Europe.

That for the purposes of promoting such immigration you would be the medium of paying to emigration agents in Germany or Scandinavia a commission of $5 per adult for able-bodied immigrants of the agricultural class, or mechanics in common pursuits, such as carpenters, builders, blacksmiths, &c.—such commission being confined to adults of eighteen years of age and upwards—that being the age prescribed by the Dominion Lands Act at which a settler can take up a homestead in Manitoba.

On the understanding that in the next preceding paragraph that only adult male and female immigrants of the class as named are sent the selection will be left to the agents to whom you confide this duty. None but persons of good health and character and able to earn their own living should be sent. Such commission to be payable upon production of the last coupon collected in Manitoba for a voucher. The minister declined, notwithstanding the representations I made to him of your views, to accept the responsibility of paying this commission on the exchanging of the steamship order for the coupon ticket at one of your offices in New York.

It would follow that the agent in Europe would have to take the risk of the immigrant proceeding to Manitoba, so as to give up the coupon, but as this bonus of $5 would be a further inducement, added to the commission of ten per cent on the whole cost of the passage from the port of embarkation in Europe, to the point of St. Paul in Minnesota, it is found that it (the bonus) which you stated to me would be also paid, will make a large and distinct additional inducement to the emigration agent, in that it will as nearly as possible double his commission.

For the consideration of the use of your agency by the department it was understood that all orders issued by the government agents to immigrants for the Canadian Northwest via New York should be confined to the Erie Railway Company, and that the immigrants after leaving its lines should proceed by the Grand Trunk Railway to Chicago, if the all rail route is taken, or via Sarnia or Collingwood if the lake route via Duluth is chosen.

The Minister of Agriculture authorizes me to state that he concurs in the foregoing offer of commission and conditions.

I am to request that you will as early as possible furnish me with an acknowledgment of this letter agreeing to its terms, in order that no time may be lost in having the necessary forms printed, and advertising matter and pamphlets sent to the continent.

Will this hon. House compare this proposition of the secretary of the Department of Agriculture, made to the secretary of the Erie Railway Company, with the contract with the North Atlantic Trading Company? I have also a letter here bearing on the same subject. It is signed by J. H. Pope. He does not sign himself as Minister of Agriculture, but he was Minister of Agriculture, I am credibly informed, at that time. It is dated Ottawa, 16th March, 1882, and is addressed to Sir A. T. Galt, High Commissioner of Canada in London. He says:

Department of Agriculture,
Ottawa, March 16, 1882.

Sir,—I inclose to you herewith a copy of a correspondence which has taken place under my directions between this department and Mr. J. N. Abbott, the general passenger agent of the New York Erie Railway Company, on the subject of German and Scandinavian immigration to Manitoba and the Northwest.

I think it well to explain that that correspondence is a continuation of negotiations which I have had since 1880 with this railway company, and arises from the fact of my knowledge of its very extensive connections and ramifications with emigration agencies in the German empire, and the Scandinavian Kingdoms.

You will see from the correspondence that I have agreed to pay a bonus of $5 for each adult immigrant. after arrival in Manitoba, upon proof afforded of such arrival by the collection of the last coupon of the ticket via the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

You will also see it is agreed by the Erie Railway Company that a further commission of ten per cent will be paid to the emigration agent on the total amount of the ticket as far as St. Paul, that is ocean and railway, and this will probably amount to about $5 more.

Thus making a bonus commission of about $10 to the agent, an inducement it is believed which will cause him to make particular exertions to send emigrants to Manitoba.

As respects a point of discussion as to the advisability of paying the $5 government bonus to an agent for commission or to the emigrant as an aid, or in reduction of passage, I may mention to you that in point of fact the latter cannot be done through any agency connected with the German steamship lines, or the inland railway transport from the point of New York, and the Department of Agriculture has no agency by which it could reach the immigrant, either in Germany or Scandinavia, to offer him the $5 as an inducement.

All question, therefore, as to the advisability of mode of payment is settled by the fact as to what is possible to be done.

That was the rule in 1882 under the Hon. J. H. Pope, Minister of Agriculture, but it is not to be the rule in 1902 under the Hon. Clifford Sifton, Minister of the Interior.

I may add, moreover, that in my opinion the payment of the bonus to the agent will afford the greater stimulant to promote immigration to Canada.

I propose also to make this bonus payable in precisely the same way, upon the same conditions and on the same forms, in the case of immigrants to Manitoba and the Northwest from Germany or Scandinavia, sailing from the port of Liverpool by either the Allan, the Dominion or the Beaver line, or in fact by any Canadian line from other ports, on proof of the

bona fide character of the immigration being clearly established.

You will see from the correspondence that I propose to leave the selection of the immigrants under the general directions stated, to the agents of the steamship companies, for one reason, because the department has no agency, nor is it possible for it to establish any, at least that would be adequate, for the coming season, in either Germany or Scandinavia.

The arrangement is, moreover, tentative, the object being to establish a nucleus of a German and Scandinavian settlement in Manitoba and the Northwest. There is also the check afforded that no bonus will be paid until after the arrival of the immigrants in Manitoba, the chances being against their subsequent removal after reaching that distant point.

The forms of proceeding are indicated in the correspondence herewith, and it is a stipulation as regards the immigrants who come by New York, that they shall be exclusively ticketed by the Erie Railway, a route which is well adapted for immigrant transport between that point and the west. The set off for this special arrangement, as you will see, being the use of the foreign connections of that company for promoting this Canadian immigration.

Forms and tickets must therefore be provided in accordance with this understanding.

As respects the mode of communication with the German and Scandinavian agents, I think it is better that you should put yourself in communication with Mr. Loveland, the general immigration agent of the Erie Company in Europe, as authorized by Mr. Abbott and get him to make the arrangements in detail with the steamship agents in Germany and Scandinavia.

You can also arrange with him the form of the coupon ticket and order for the bonus having in view the nature of the agreement and stipulation in the correspondence herewith.

There will probably come a question as to whether the department should pay Mr. Loveland's travelling expenses while engaged on this service, on its behalf in view of the stipulation of the exclusive benefit to be derived by the Erie Railway Company, as its compensation for such service of its agent. You had better sound Mr. Loveland on that point, keeping this principle in view. If he should demand to have his expenses paid, either in whole or in part, it would be better not to make any difficulties respecting them. But if you agree to pay, it is better to settle in advance on some definite limit.

I think it advisable that the Dominion of Canada should be well advertised in Germany and Scandinavia, and I should be willing to authorize an appropriation of about $2,000 for such service.

I understand that the reports of the German delegates who visited Canada last summer are being printed under the superintendence of Dr. Otta Hahn, of Reuthingen, in Wurtemburg. I think that very large numbers of these should be circulated, the limit to the possible circulation at this late period being really the extent to which it can be carried with judiciousness.

I trust to your prompt action for carrying into effect these several measures which have been delayed from circumstances beyond my control, owing to the protracted nature of the negotiations with the several steamship and railway lines. I have desired as far as possible, to put into effect a complete system simultaneously, and have therefore held back parts of it.

I hope to be able to send you a cable message respecting arrangements with the Canadian steamship lines before this letter will reach you.

Will this hon. House compare the terms of this agreement with the agreement in regard to the North Atlantic Trading Company? Will it compare the arrangement made with the Erie Railway Company for the use of its immigration agents in Europe and for the use of its travelling agents in Europe as a means of promoting emigration to Manitoba with the terms of the North Atlantic Trading Company's contracts and say which it considers the more justified, most in the public interest or more in accordance with sound policy and administration ?

I listened carefully to my hon. friend (Mr. Foster), and his strong point in condemnation of this contract was because it was not ratified by parliament. He said : Why, it is only endorsed by the Governor in Council. But I find that this contract with the Erie Railway Company, this contract with the steamship lines, this contract with a gauzy and hazy and visionary somebody or something was continued for fourteen years, from 1882 to 1896, without the endorsation even of the Governor in Council. And if there was not a million dollars paid out under that contract, it was because its terms were either not faithfully lived up to or because the people administering it were not competent to do so. No, I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon—there was an order in council but it was passed on January 6, 1893. The contract,—and I think we may safely call it a contract—had only run eleven years before the order in council was passed and the occasion of this order in council may be more particularly explained. Again I apologize—I said the contract ran continuously for that time ; the contract did not run continuously for that time but the payments did. It seems that while my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) was a member of the government, the government came to the conclusion that this contract should be cancelled and they wrote to Sir Charles Tupper, then High Commissioner in London, advising him that he was to cancel the contract, and here is the reply of Sir Charles Tupper, dated June 24, 1889:

9 Victoria Chambers,
Westminister, S.W.,
June 24, 1889.

Dear Mr. Carling—I beg to refer to your telegrams of the 20 (?) March and the 23rd April, on the subject of discontinuance on December 31st next of the payment of the $5 bonus to continental steamship agents, for adults whom they may book to Manitoba and the Northwest Territory. In accordance with yonr directions I have arranged that the agents shall be

notified in July next. After discussing the matter with Mr. Dyke I came to the conclusion that it would be unwise to send out the notice before that date, for the reason that it might peril the success of this year's work.

I cannot, however, allow the opportunity to pass without placing on record an expression of my opinion that the measure will in all probability tend to retard the movement which after many years of labour and effort we have been able to set in motion in the direction of the Dominion. I certainly think the bonus system was the best and most economical that could possibly be adopted for obtaining continental immigrants, and for these reasons I regret its suspension.

There was a difference of opinion apparently in regard to this matter of assistance to immigration, between the hon. member (Mr. Foster) and that great statesman Sir Charles Tupper—in order to secure whose accession to power it may be suggested—my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) sacrificed some part of what he had perhaps least to spare—his honour.

I believe there is no difference of opinion as to the value of these people as settlers, or as to the fact that we must look to a considerable extent, to the continent in settling the vacant lands in Manitoba and the Northwest Territory.

It must be borne in mind also, that the payment in question was not an indiscriminate expenditure of money, but simply a payment by result.

I would draw attention to the fact that although it has not been my good fortune to be a follower or supporter of Sir Charles Tupper or to agree with him in many things, the expression which he uses here is almost identical with the expression I have used in this House in practically the same connection.

The success, however, which has attended our efforts in this direction is abundantly proved by the statistics of the emigration that has taken place. I find that in 1885 the total number of bonus emigrants was 448; in 1886, 566; in 1887, 808; and in 1888, 1,430. In this connection it will be remembered that no payments have been made excepting in those cases in which the settlement of the people in Canada has been proved beyond question. From the information I have been able to gather I fear it is a matter of some doubt whether the steamship agents on the continent will be disposed to distribute printed matter about Canada and endeavour to attract attention to the advantages which are offered by the different parts of the country with that eagerness they have hitherto shown if they have not some more inducement to do so than the steamship and railway commissions.

I would also recall to your attention our past experience in connection with the cessation of activity in emigration work. We may pursue a policy of comparative inactivity for two or three years, and in this way show some saving in the expenditure, but the time inevitably comes when a period of activity is again necessary, and in order to get the people then, a very much larger expenditure has to be incurred than would have been necssary had a steady and moderate policy been continued, devoted to keeping before the public in all countries whence emigration has taken place, the advantages of Canada for purpose of settlement. I do not regard our expenditure in connection with emigration either continental or British on this side as having been at all of an extravagant nature. Indeed it has been exceedingly moderate, and very much less than that which individual railway companies in the United States have devoted year by year to such purposes.

All that I have said on the subject of continental emigration applies with equal force to the importance of keeping the Dominion prominently before the British public. Immigration of certain classes is very essential to Canada, not only to populate the vacant lands, but for the purposes of developing its trade and commerce, and it seems to me that this is not sufficiently borne in mind when the question of the comparatively small expenditure that is necessary to attract it is under consideration in the press and other quarters.

There is another matter to which I must call your attention. I find on my arrival that we are very short indeed of printed matter. We receive numerous applications for printed information which we shall not in a month or two be able to supply, unless you authorize the printing of some additional literature. What we want is a new addition of the official handbook, a copy of which I inclose, and of an official folder, copy also inclosed, which have been prepared under my directions, the last editions of which are now exhausted. We must keep the country before the classes of people that are wanted, and we cannot do this more judiciously and effectually than by the continued distribution of the papers to which I have referred. I hope you will authorize me to do something in this direction at an early date. It will, of course, come within next year's vote.

You will be aware also that for many years past we have had displayed at every post office in the United Kingdom a poster somewhat similar to the inclosed specimen. It is now, however, over a year since the last edition was distributed, and the time has arrived when we should prepare another poster and send it round. This will involve an expenditure of from £20 to £25, there being about twenty-three or twenty-four thousand post offices in the United Kingdom. This is a cheap advertisement, and a very effective one, and I find that a good many of our correspondents refer to it in their communications with me. I hesitate, however, to incur the expense without your authority, and I trust you will let us hear from you upon this subject at the earliest possible date.

I am, yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) CHARLES TUPPER.

Here you have a comment upon the administration of immigration affairs under the policy outlined by my hon. friend from North Toronto to-night. He was a member of that government which, on the word of the High Commissioner, did not keep its immigration agencies in England supplied with literature, which was a year behind when the literature was supplied; and in regard to the important matter of immigration literature the High Commis-

sioner could not incur the most trifling expenditure without referring it to the government at Otawa.

I said in the beginning of my remarks that immigration could not be successfully carried on under the system laid down by my hon. friend. The evidence of that fact is this letter of Sir Charles Tupper and the immigration returns for those years. I am afraid I cannot give the returns accurately, because I find that our friends opposite compiled their returns in this way: They had a column for British immigation, a column for continental immigration, a column for United States immigration, and a column for the total immigration.

The returns show the immigration from Britain from 1882 to 1896 to have been as follows: 1882, 41,283; 1883, 45,439; 1884, 31,787; 1885, 18,591; 1886, 23,507; 1887, 31,-104; 1888, 30,852; 1889, 19,384; 1890, 21,793; 1891, 22,042; 1892, 22,636; 1893, 20,071; 1894, 16,004; 1895, 14,956; 1896, 12,384. The policy of the administration of my hon. friend was certainly getting in its work.

The continental immigration in those years was as follows: 1882, 12,083; 1883, 9,677; 1884, 6,151; 1885, 3,072; 1886, 4,995; 1887, 12,376; 1888, 12,962; 1889, 4,320; 1890, 2,938; 1891, 7,607; 1892, 8,360; 1893. 9,562; 1894, 4,825; 1895, 3,834; and in 1896, 4,451.

The returns of immigration from the United States showed the following: 1882, 58,372; 1883, 78,508; 1884, 65,886; 1885, 57,-506; 1886, 40,650; 1887, 41,046; 1888, 44,952; 1889, 67,896; 1890, 50,336; 1891, 52,516.

Those were the very years during which the greater portion of that million of Canadians moved from Canada to the United States; and later on they tell the truth by not giving any returns of immigrants for 1892, 1893, 1894, 1895 or 1896.

Now, the letter of Sir Charles Tupper had the desired effect. An order in council was passed to reinstate the bonuses, which I assume had been cancelled as they had been given in the first place, by departmental letter. The bonus to continental booking agents was allowed on January 20, 1882, it was cancelled on April 24, 1889; and on October 30, 1890, it was revived, and payment was made for the interval between April 24, 1889, and October 30, 1890. That was where the order in council came in. It made provision for the payment of bonuses on immigrants who had come in during the period when there was no authority to pay any bonus. But there was another order in council passed on January 6, 1893, in which another feature is introduced. It provided that the bonus on British immigrants should be $1.75 per head, while the bonus on continental European immigrants should remain at $5 per head.

Now, I have just a word or two to say in regard to this North Atlantic Trading Company contract. Hon. gentleman opposite have been asking during the last two months for mountains of information in regard to this matter, and they must bear with me for a little while to-night; I will not trespass on their time very long. I hope I shall be able to relieve their thirst for information. The contract with the North Atlantic Trading Company does not alter the position which existed practically unaltered since 1882, as set forth by Sir Charles Tupper and in other correspondence, that it is sound public policy to pay to booking agents a bonus of $5 per head on adult immigrants from the continent of Europe. That was the policy of the late government, it has been the policy of this government, and the contract with the North Atlantic Trading Company is a contract to pay this bonus to booking agents collectively instead of individually—that and only that. Our hon. friends opposite have exhausted every parliamentary device and resource to back up their imagination that there has been some other course in this connection; and to-night we have the evidence that they have failed, as they must fail, in finding out something that does not exist. We have paid to booking agents individually, as the returns show, in continental bonuses, the following amounts: 1892, $5,270; 1893, $7,-235; 1894, $14,935; 1895, $1,480; 1896, $6,710; 1897, $3,045; 1898, $14,880; 1899, $11,130; 1900, $24,298.33; 1901, $24,262.60; 1902, $35,-916; 1903, $34,553.33; 1904, $38,933.33; 1905, $86,967.33.

Now, to whom did our hon. friends on the other side pay the bonuses? They paid them to individual booking agents—so their letters show. To whom did this government pay in the years preceding the contract with the North Atlantic Trading Company? They paid to individual booking agents.

To whom do they pay now? Not to any individual booking agents but to the North Atlantic Trading Company, a collective interest of booking agents. And do they get value for their payments? Judged by the standard laid down in the letter of Sir Charles Tupper, they do. And any man of common sense, not warped by political bias, will agree that that is the main question.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Who are the North Atlantic Trading Company? And who were they before their incorporation in June, 1905?

Mr. OLIVER. I have not the faintest idea.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. TISDALE. How do you know they are booking agents if you do not know who they are?

Mr. OLIVER. I know they are engaged in the business of booking emigrants to Canada, and I know that they work under better conditions to-day, as a company, than they did when they worked as

individuals, and are sending more emigrants to Canada. That was the purpose of the change from payments to individual agents to payments to this company.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Are these solicitors' clerks, who have been mentioned in Lord Strathcona's cable, the booking agents? If not, who are the booking agents?

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly they are not.

Mr. PATERSON. Who were your booking agents?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You will find their names in every case if you look into the records of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. OLIVER. The papers of that department are unquestionably at the order of the House, and all the hon. gentleman has to do is to have an order of the House and the papers will be at his service.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I was only answering the question put by the Minister of Customs. I did not understand the Minister of the Interior to state that the booking agents, during all the years over which he has been going, were not known—the years from 1882 to 1896. But I gathered instead from what he said that the booking agents to whom payments were then made were known.

Mr. OLIVER. I presume they were.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But the Minister of Customs asked me to name them—a remarkably sensible question.

Mr. OLIVER. I presume that their names are contained in the Auditor General's Reports, and it is not necessary that I should go into the files of the Department of the Interior to find them.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What I want to know who are the booking agents to whom these moneys in question were paid.

Mr. OLIVER. The committee have been told repeatedly that the booking agents are the North Atlantic Trading Company.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. OLIVER. Any further search as to the identity of these gentlemen will have to be pursued by the hon. gentlemen opposite by such means as they see fit to take. That is not a matter which concerns me in the administration of my department. What I am concerned with is whether we are getting corresponding results. If we get satisfactory results we shall continue the contract. If we do not, we shall cancel it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understood the hon. gentleman a moment ago to tell us that these solicitors' clerks, who form the majority of the shareholders of the North Atlantic Trading Company, are not the booking agents. But now he tells us that this company are the booking agents. How does he reconcile those two conflicting statements?

Mr. OLIVER. I think that my hon. friend is rather mistaken in his point. He surely does not assume that some six men who hold one share each in a company of some 300 shares have the majority of these shares. That is rather too absurd.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Who do hold the shares?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. OLIVER. There are many companies incorporated in this country. There is, for instance, the Canadian Pacific Railway, in which, I am credibly informed, gentlemen sitting on the opposite benches are shareholders, and that is a company which has been frequently and to a large extent bonused by this House. I do not know that these gentlemen are in fault in any way in holding shares in that company, which necessarily has dealings with this government from day to day. But if it be no offence on their part to hold shares in this company, why should it be an offence on the part of any body else to hold shares in this other company?

Mr. TISDALE. You have only to look at the time table of the Canadian Pacific Railway to get the names of all its directors, but where are the names of the directors of this company?

Mr. OLIVER. They have been furnished. My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) spoke of shareholders, and I say that it is not requisite to our doing business with the Canadian Pacific Railway that the names of its shareholders should be known, and I am further credibly informed that there are hon. gentlemen opposite who from day to day are shareholders and are not shareholders in the Canadian Pacific Railway just as the ticker goes up or down. What the names of the shareholders in this North Atlantic Trading Company may be does not concern me. If it concerns my hon. friends, that is their affair and not mine.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But this North Atlantic Trading Company has no shareholders at all before June, 1905, because it was not then incorporated.

Mr. OLIVER. That is not a matter which concerns me in the administration of my department. I have no objection to hon. gentlemen taking any means within their parliamentary rights to find out anything they wish, but they must not expect me to go out of the way of my ordinary administration to gratify what appears to me to be idle curiosity on their part, or a scent for scandal which so far has failed to locate its victims.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Because the hon. minister does not know.

Mr. OLIVER. Well, I certainly do not. But there is a point about which my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was very definite. He is very fond of pointing out that we must take the one horn of the dilemma or the other. This contract, he said, contains the provision that those who are parties to it must not violate the laws of the country in which they operate, and on the other hand he suggests that in order to carry out their agreement with this government and do effective service they must violate the laws of the country in which they carry on their operations. Well, what are their operations? They are booking agents. That is to say they sell transportation and they are not confined to selling transportation to Canada. They can sell transportation, no doubt, to any part of the world, just as do ticket agents here in Ottawa. They will sell tickets to England, or France, Australia or Japan, or any other part of the world. As my hon. friend has pointed out, there has been a flow of emigration to the extent of half a million a year from Europe to America, and these people sell tickets to those who are moving from the one continent to the other. In so doing they are not violating the laws of those countries in which they sell those tickets, for if they were, they could not do the business. They need not violate the laws of any country in order to sell tickets. And, as pointed out in the letter of Sir Charles Tupper and other documents in this connection, we pay these people $5 per ticket in order to induce them to sell tickets to people to come to Canada instead of selling tickets indifferently for transportation to the United States. We give them an object to induce the emigrant who is leaving one of these European countries to come to Canada—we make it worth $5 to them to do it. That is the principle of the bonus system, and that is what is required of them, and all that is required of them, by this contract. It is true, there is an indefinite boundary between what is within their rights as citizens of these countries and what is beyond their rights. We expect them to use due activity, and we believe they do use due activity, but we do not require them to break the laws of these countries, and it is not necessary for them to break the laws of these countries in order to fulfil their agreement with this government.

Now, I have dealt with this question at considerable length. I have said that this government has no apology to offer, has no excuse to make either for the North Atlantic Trading contract, or for its administration under that contract, or for its immigration policy generally. But it is the business of the government to administer this immigration policy in the best interests of the country; and that applies to the North Atlantic Trading Company's contract as well as to everything in connection with the policy. In dealing with the North Atlantic Trading Company, in going over its work in the last few years, we find that conditions have changed, there is reason for a change of method.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear!

Mr. BENNETT. Let it come.

Mr. OLIVER. We find that the contract is a good contract—

Mr. FOWLER. Better hang on to it then.

Mr. OLIVER—but we find, that in our estimation it is not being lived up to in full by the company.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In what respect?

Mr. OLIVER. I will state that presently. And, for this reason we have given notice of the cancellation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear!

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh!

Mr. OLIVER. I am very glad to have secured the approval of my hon. friends opposite.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear!

Mr. OLIVER. I am delighted to find that they do approve of this action of the government. But I would not like that they should be under any wrong impression.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh!

Mr. OLIVER. As to why the government arrived at this conclusion. And may I draw my hon. friend's attention to this point. They have put forth the argument here in the House, in the committee, in conversation and in the press, that this government was in some way concerned, or committed, or bound up, or financially interested, in some way with this North Atlantic Trading Company. They have, so far, failed to establish the most remote connection between this government, or any official of this government, and this North Atlantic Trading Company. And the fact that this government, believing that the company has not lived up to the letter and spirit of its contract, sees fit to cancel that contract, is ample evidence that the government is not committed to the North Atlantic Trading Company in any way.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Oliver) a question? When did the government arrive at this conclusion?

Mr. OLIVER. The cable was sent to Lord Strathcona on April 14.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When did the information come to them that the company was not living up to its agreement ?

Mr. OLIVER. The information has been coming for some little time. But the conclusion was reached, I have said, on the 14th of April.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would the hon. gentleman give us the date when the information first began to come ?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not think I could give the hon. gentleman any definite or fixed date on that point. I do not think, if he will consider the matter, that he would repeat the question.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I would be inclined to repeat it but for the fact that it does not seem to commend itself to the minister.

Mr. OLIVER. If the House will bear with me, I will give the cable and the letter sent to Lord Strathcona in this connection.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the hon. minister does that, would he permit me one more question ? Had any of this information come to the government when they voted down the motion of this House last year to cancel the contract ?

Mr. OLIVER. No, the information had not come to the government at that time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. It began to come after that ?

Mr. OLIVER. I had then come very recently into the position of minister and was not familiar with the working of the department, and so I was not in a position to form a policy at that time.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. As I understand it now, this information came in some time between the date when the government voted down the motion to cancel, and the 14th of April inst. ?

Mr. OLIVER. I think that is a fair conclusion. I would like to say further that the vote of last year had no more to do with the conclusion reached by the government than has the investigation which my hon. friends opposite have held or the so-called 'dynamite' which they have exploded here to-night, for the contract was cancelled before this 'dynamite' was exploded.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would the minister kindly—

Mr. PATERSON. We are not in committee.

Mr. OLIVER. All right.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would the minister have any objection to laying on the table of the House the information on which this is based ?

Mr. OLIVER. I propose to lay it before the House now.

The following letter was sent to Lord Strathcona :

Ottawa, 14th April, 1906.

Dear Lord Strathcona,—The following cable signed by myself was sent to you to-day :

Dominion, London, England. Notify North Atlantic Trading Company that no bonuses will be paid under company's contract on immigrants arriving in Canada after November 30, 1906. Letter follows.

The agreement of November 28, 1904, provides for the payment of a special sum for the encouragement of immigration from Norway, Sweden and Finland, and also provides that payment on immigrants from certain other European countries shall be restricted to a fixed number.

These provisions indicate clearly the purpose had in view in making and continuing the arrangement with the North Atlantic Trading Company. Notwithstanding the plain purpose of the arrangement the returns show that while the claims made as to immigrants from the countries in respect of which a maximum is fixed are kept up to the maximum the returns of qualified arrivals from Norway, Sweden and Finland, show a continuous falling off. The department can only accept this fact as an indication that the company is not carrying out its agreement in good faith, and that, therefore, under the provision appearing in section 12, that the contract may be cancelled 'if it shall appear to the satisfaction of the minister that the company is failing to carry out its obligations.'

I have considered it desirable to give notice of the cancellation of the contract.

The date is fixed at November 30, so that the company may receive the full benefit of any work it may have done in respect of the current season of immigration.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd.) FRANK OLIVER.

I do not know that I can add anything to what has already been said.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. In the telegram to Lord Strathcona which the minister has been good enough to read to the House there are certain returns mentioned upon which a certain conclusion is based. Can the minister tell me within what date those reports are comprised ?

Mr. OLIVER. They are comprised from the fiscal year 1901 to the fiscal year 1905. That is they show in the latter years a decrease in the number of immigrants from the countries in respect of which we paid a special sum and of course that conclusion can only be arrived at by a comparison of the returns of several years.

In conclusion I would say that the importance of the work of immigration and of the immigration department cannot be overestimated, that fair criticism is always welcome, but that unfair criticism not only embarrasses the government, which I suppose is its legitimate object, but it embarrasses the efforts put forth in respect of immigration and thereby injures the country, and that our friends on the other

side in taking the position they have done this year for the first time, have placed themselves under the criticism, under the adverse opinion I believe, of the country in regard to this matter. That as far as the administration of this department is concerned, there is every effort to administer it vigorously and in the best interests of the country and that so long as it remains in the charge in which it is at present that vigour will not be abated because of unfair criticism on the part of our friends on the other side. We will have to accept such criticism as they choose to offer. If it is fair we will be glad to accept the benefit of it ; if it is unfair we will simply do our duty irrespective of that criticism. In the case of this North Atlantic Trading Company we find a certain condition existing, we find a contract alive, we believe it to be a good contract but we believe it is not being carried out in its proper spirit by the other parties to the contract. We are therefore, in the discharge of our responsibility, prepared to cancel that contract and we do so without regard to the criticism, the very unfair criticism, which has been made in regard to it. As regards the suggestions of private names that have been used—I think the names of Mr. Sifton, Mr. Smart, and Mr. Preston have been used—all the machinery of parliament is available to our friends on the other side to deal with these gentlemen in such manner and in such way as parliament provides. That has nothing whatever to do with the administration of the immigration branch of the Department of the Interior. I have only to say in conclusion that when any of my hon. friends desire to call in question the policy or principles or attitude of an hon. member of this House, they might at least have the grace to await his presence in it.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). The announcement which the Minister of the Interior has made reminds me a little of the story told in one of his novels by Charles Dickens. When a witness was asked : 'Were you ever kicked downstairs', he replied : 'Never, was pushed once rudely at the head of the stairs, and came down a little faster than usual, that is all.' This announcement has put a new complexion certainly on this debate. I thought certainly the minister was at his best when finally he made that announcement. It induces me to wonder whether the government is prepared to acquiesce in this motion. If the contract is to be cancelled that was the object of the motion. If the government does not acquiesce in that motion I think that in view of the advanced hour, and the new complexion that the discussion has taken on, I would be justified in moving the adjournment of the debate. It would probably shorten discussion.

Mr. OLIVER.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If my hon. friend desires 48 hours to prepare his defence, there is no objection at all.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 11.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY, April 23, 1906.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

NEW MEMBER.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that the Clerk of the House has received from the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery certificate of the election and return of Wilbert McIntyre, Esq., for the electoral district of Strathcona in the province of Alberta.

MEMBER INTRODUCED.

Wilbert McIntyre, Esq., member for the electoral district of Strathcona, introduced by the Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. Oliver.

REPORTS PRESENTED.

Abstract statement of Insurance companies in Canada for the year ended 31st December, 1905.—Hon. W. S. Fielding.

Reports and communications from the Superintendent of Insurance during the years 1903, 1904 and 1905 relating to defects in or proposed amendments of the Insurance Act.—Hon. W. S. Fielding.

Copy of special report of the Superintendent of Insurance to the Minister of Finance, 9th November, 1905, &c., respecting the regulation of life insurance in Canada. —Hon. W. S. Fielding.

Documents relating to the necessity of investigating the working of insurance companies doing business in the Dominion of Canada, &c.—Hon. W. S. Fielding.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). Does the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) intend to have these documents which he has just presented printed?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I think that my hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) had better allow them to go to the committee in the regular way. Some of them are merely of a formal character, and such as he himself, I am sure, would not propose to have printed. However, I shall be glad to leave that matter to the committee.

Correspondence relating to Port Colborne breakwater and elevators or proposed elevators.—Hon. C. S. Hyman.

Hon. C. S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works). This return is not quite complete. Some matters from the Railways and Canals Department are to be included.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). I desire to ask the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Hyman) when the return relating to Collingwood dry dock may be expected? It is pretty old now.

Hon. C. S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works). The report has been sent over from the Department of Public Works to the Department of the Secretary of State, which means that I shall probably be able to present it to-morrow or the next day.

INDUSTRIAL AND CO-OPERATIVE SOCIETIES.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 144) respecting Industrial and Co-operative Societies. He said: Mr. Speaker, the Bill which I wish to introduce is one intended principally to benefit the poorer classes of the people. It is intended to provide an easy method for the creation of co-operative societies, which societies are principally intended for the benefit of the agricultural and wage-earning classes. The preamble of the Bill enunciates clearly its objects. It says: Whereas it is desirable to provide for the creation and organization of industrial and co-operative societies among the farming and labouring classes of Canada. I need not tell the House how important the subject is. The method of organization here provided for has proved so phenominally successful in European countries and in some other parts of the world, and I think that the time has come to provide for a similar form of organization in this country.

If the House will indulge me a few moments, I shall explain briefly the object of this legislation, in the hope of interesting some of the members and inducing them to give their attention to this matter. I might mention that much of the information which I have obtained has been derived from a very valuable book published in England in 1896, and which can be found in our library, 'The Peoples' Banks', by Mr. Henry Wolfe. In it Mr. Wolfe deals at length with the different kind of banks and co-operative societies established in the different countries of Europe and their mode of operation. Another work, much more recent, and of great value as giving the results obtained by these co-operative societies, is the work of Mr. Edward A. Pratt on the organization of agriculture, published in 1904. Mr. Pratt does not deal so much with the system as with the marvellous results it has produced on the continent of Europe and even in England. There is also in the third volume of the Journal of the Canadian Bankers' Association, to be found in our library, an article at some length reviewing Mr. Wolfe's work. The article is entitled the Peoples' Banks and will be found on page 274, vol. 3.

Co-operation, as it is understood for the purposes of this measure, consists in a union of persons of limited resources in organizations having as their object the securing or the production on favourable conditions, of the necessities of life, the providing of a ready means of investing small earnings and the encouragement of habits of thrift among the people.

I cannot do better than quote to the House, in support of the legislation I am introducing, some authorities of weight, which may induce some hon. members, who may not have given the question any considerable study, to bestow further attention upon it. In order to show that this matter has interested the great as well as the lowly, let me give a few citations.

In his inaugural address to the Leeds Co-operative Congress, lord Derby said:

> It is not in the language of idle flattery, but as the expression of a deliberate and sincere conviction that I begin by telling you that the subject which brings this congress here to-night is, in my judgment, more important as regards the future of England than nine-tenths of those discussed in parliament and around which political controversy centres.

The present Governor General of Canada, Lord Grey, when in England, took a very lively interest in the movement now going on in that country towards the multiplication of these societies. He is himself honorary president of the 'International Co-operative Alliance',—a union having for its object the diffusion of knowledge and the encouragement in different countries of Europe of the formation of these societies. Speaking on this subject, Lord Grey said:

> I believe that the greatest hope of permanent improvement in the condition and status of the working classes lies in the successful application of the co-operative principle to the cultivation of land and other productive industries, I will help on, to the best of my ability, the wise efforts of free men in bringing about its voluntary application to industrial enterprise.

Mr. Gladstone himself has often referred most favourably to the movement in favour of co-operative societies. On one occasion he said:

> That the twentieth century would be the century of co-operation, as the nineteenth had been that of the joint stock form of associations.

On another occasion the same statesman said:

> There has not been a better thing done in this country, in my opinion, than the establishment of co-operation, such as the successful

co-operation of which Lancashire deserves the principal credit.

The Duke of Argyle said :

Co-operative societies will raise the feeling of independence in the working classes ; they will begin to feel they are not mere hired labourers, but partners, and to a certain extent, capitalists. It is a significant movement of the working classes to their own improvement.

And Mr. Bright thus spoke :

I wish co-operative societies all success, and I am anxious that they should be managed in all cases by prudent, honest men ; and I strengthen my arguments in favour of giving the suffrage to working men, by showing what they are doing in co-operative societies and other directions, to justify their demand for a share of political power

Mr. John Stuart Mills, the great economist, said :

Of all the agencies which are at work to elevate those who labour with their hands, none are so prominent as the present co-operative movement.

These authorities are corroborated by equally prominent authorities in other countries of Europe. I would like to quote to the House the testimony of an economist of great merit, Mr. Jules Meline, formerly Prime Minister of France, in his very able work entitled ' Le Retour à la Terre '.

(Translation).—Our farmers are no longer obliged to resort to horse dealers when in need of live stock, and to sign promissory notes at unreasonably high rates of interest ; they are in a position to pay cash by calling at their own bank where the necessary amount may be obtained at a maximum rate of three or four per cent.

Facilities to farmers for obtaining funds are certainly more developed and more perfectly organized in this country than anywhere else. The state having put at the disposal of district banks as loans not bearing interest the forty millions of the Banque de France, farmers cannot complain any longer that their progress is impeded by lack of capital or its inadequate supply. In that respect they are on a par with manufacturers and even have lower rates of interest to pay.

Co-operative associations will in time become the great means whereby farmers will free themselves.

Speaking of the marvellous pliability of these institutions, the same statesman said :

(Translation).—They are wonderfully adaptable and indefinitely variable in form ; such has been their development of late years, that the only difficulty, for whoever is desirous of pointing to special cases, lies in their selection.

To-day there are no less than 18,000 farmers' associations, of which 1,500 are savings and loan establishments.

I might multiply these citations because, as is well known by most of us, this movement originated and had perhaps its greatest development in Germany and has also been developed in an extraordinary degree throughout the whole Kingdom of Italy. At a time when agriculture in that country was extremely depressed, after the formation of the present kingdom, and its people were suffering extremely from the want of money, not only in the rural districts but in the cities as well, the establishment of these institutions was perhaps the most potent factor in the revival of prosperity which followed. During the great crisis of 1893 in Italy, under the direction of the then Minister of Finance of Italy, M. Luigi Luzzatti, who was twice Minister of Finance in Italy, these institutions received a great impetus, and although many banks succumbed during the crisis, the savings of the people were, with an extraordinary manifestation of confidence, confided entirely to these rural and small village banks, and in no instance whatever was there a loss sustained of a single cent. In Germany where these banks were first established about fifty years ago, under the direction of a man who has been identified with the establishment of these institutions, Mr. Shultze, they develop with extraordinary rapidity and produced very wonderful results. In his book on the organization of agriculture, Mr. Pratt, referring to Germany, speaks as follows :

There are in Germany 4,000 Raiffeisen banks—

Raiffeisen was a man who, side by side with Mr. Shultze, worked for the establishment of the banks, but his system was somewhat different from the system established by the first mentioned economist. The responsibility of this association was unlimited, that was the principal point of difference, but there are in Germany both Shultze banks and Raiffeisen banks, both systems prevail there. Mr. Pratt says :

There are in Germany 4,000 Raiffeisen banks, that is purely village banks, working in small groups of population.

Of others ' co-operative credit banks, says Mr. Pratt, in general there are 4,455 in Prussia, and 3,399 in other German states—a total of 8,354, representing a membership of close on 1,500,000.'

In other words, the total of peoples' banks or credit associations of all types is 12,354.

Some states will have co-operative credit banks in over 33 per cent of their parishes, and 50 per cent of the farmers in those parishes will be members.

As for the good, adds Mr. Pratt, that has been done by such institutions, Mr. F. P. König says, in a report on ' Agriculture in Germany ', issued by the foreign office :

' It has always been a puzzle to me why English farmers do not club together and form similar co-operative banks for the benefit of all concerned. Co-operation has proved to be the key to success in Germany, and has saved many thousands of farmers from ruin.'

Mr. Pratt goes on to examine the results obtained through the incorporation of these co-operative societies, and other companies. I will just summarize what he says :

There were in Belgium in 1894, only four

all newley established. On December 31, 1901, there were 286, connected with six central banks created by the different federations, the 286 societies representing a membership of 13,000. In Holland, Mr. Pratt says, the movement is very active, but he does not give the figures. In Hungary the organization of the Central Co-operative Credit Bank gave a further great stimulus to the general movement, so that by the end of 1903, there were about 2,000 local co-operative credit banks in Hungary, and the whole year's business represented a turn over of £3,000,000 sterling.

Mr. Pratt points out to what an extraordinary degree these credit associations, wherever they had been established, had put a stop to usury. The truth is that experience has demonstrated that no amount of legislation will effectively stop that abuse. In order to put a stop to usury you must remove the cause, and there is no more potent agency to remove the cause of usurious dealings than the creation of associations of this kind. I will now quote from Mr. Pratt:

> In one village, for instance, the leaders of the movement held a meeting of the peasants to induce them to start a village co-operative bank. . . . The peasants took a few days to consider the matter. They then gave a reply in the negative. Inquiry showed most of the villagers were indebted to a group of money lenders who had set up a local bank of their own and now threaten them that if they agreed to the starting of a co-operative credit bank in the place, they would at once call in the whole of the outstanding loans. But the propagandists were equal to the occasion. They obtained from the central fund a sum of money sufficient to pay off the debts of the entire village, thus getting the peasants effectually out of the grasp of the money lenders; and they then established the co-operative credit bank, debiting the peasants with the amounts on their behalf.

In these banks, organized principally in European countries, it is obligatory on the members of the local co-operative and credit banks, not only in Hungary but in other European countries, to pay a small weekly subscription, one penny, two pence or three pence, as the case may be, towards the funds from which the wants of those requiring amounts can be supplied. In Austria the development has been equally phenomenal, says Mr. Pratt:

> There are now in Austria over 2,000 institutions of this kind. Close on 800 came into existence in the three years between 1897 and 1900. Agricultural credit banks are now in course of formation in all parts of Finland, the total number at the beginning of December, 1903, being fifty-one. To show the strength of co-operation in all its various forms and the beneficent results already obtained, there are 300 societies and their amount of actual business done is £160,000. Such figures speak well for the vigour of a movement still in its infancy in a land of only 2,700,000 inhabitants. In Siberia there are over 2,035 co-operative societies of all types, whose export trade amounted to 685,500 cwts, in 1902.

There is an immense trade in eggs from Siberia. England is principally supplied with eggs from Siberia, and that immense exportation of eggs is done principally through the instrumentality of co-operative agricultural societies. There the same marvellous progress has taken place as in other countries of Europe. But let us see what has been done in England. Here I quote again from Mr. Pratt's book:

> Happily here again a good commencement has been made by Co-operative Banks Association, whose headquarters are at 29 Old Queen street, Westminster, S.W. The purpose of this association is to establish both town and country co-operative banks. . . . But experience has already shown no really effective scheme of agricultural organization on a widespread basis can be carried out, even in Great British, unless supplemented by some practical system of co-operative agricultural credit banks, arranged on so comprehensive a scale, as to meet the varying wants of all our agricultural classes. There may not be in England, Wales and Scotland so large a proportion as in Ireland and in various continental countries of those very small cultivators to whom the loan of £5 or £6 from a co-operative bank would be a great personal convenience.
>
> A certain demand for such facilities there undoubtedly is on the part of labourers and very small producers, and such demand the co-operative bank association should, with adequate support, be well able to meet. But a wider basis of operation than this is required to answer the requirements of farmers who would want to borrow more substantial sums, and might find it an inestimable benefit if they could obtain them from a co-operative credit bank. . . . In almost every agricultural district in Great Britain farmers or cultivators of the smaller class are practically in the hands of commission men or brokers who advance money to them before their crops are ready, and afterwards get the produce at substantially less than its legitimate value because of the financial obligations which the growers incurred towards them at a time when they were pressed for money.

That observation applies to a great many parts of the province of Quebec.

> An agricultural co-operative association backed up by an agricultural credit bank, could meet this evil by itself undertaking the sale of the produce, advancing to the farmer the greater part of the amount which the crop might be expected to realize, and paying the balance to him—less a moderate charge for expenses—when the transaction had been completed. In this way the grower would no longer be at the mercy of the dealers, better results would be obtained for the sale of individual lots, and there would also be a greater prospect of the market prices being maintained, in which case the larger class of growers would benefit as well as the small ones.

That is very much the case, I think, in this country and what has been found on the continent of Europe and what is be-

ginning to be perceived in England is that many of the complaints against railway companies made by farmers in respect to the rates are not well founded but that the railway companies, when sufficient freight is offered to them by the farmers acting collectively through co-operative societies, will give rates which are satisfactory. As a matter of fact, one of the reasons for the agricultural depression existing in England at the present time, is, as pointed out by Mr. Pratt, that a very large proportion of the farm products required in England are shipped from the continent in immense quantities by co-operative agricultural societies who thanks to that co-operation, succeed in obtaining from the railway companies rates that enable them to compete in England with the farmers who have not the advantage of that combination. Of course, most of those who have given any attention to this subject know of the marvellous development of those who started that movement in England known as the 'Equitable Pioneers of Rochdale' whose example is always cited as a wonderful illustration of the work that can be accomplished and the progress that can be made by societies of this kind. These co-operators, the pioneers of Rochdale, founded their society in 1844. There were twenty-eight associates. They were simple poor labouring men and had scarcely any capital at all—a few pounds only—accumulated during months by weekly installments of a few pennies. Ten years later from twenty-eight the number of members had risen to nine hundred. In 1864 the pioneers of Rochdale numbered 4,747 ; in 1874, 7,039 ; and in 1878 more than 10,000. In 1878 their capital amounted to £198,115, their business turn over was £298,888, and they had clear profits of over £40,000. The members of the House know that at the present moment one of the largest co-operative organizations of this kind is in operation in Manchester and is known as the Manchester Wholesale. The Manchester Wholesale is not a co-operative society composed of individuals but of a multitude of co-operative societies. These co-operative societies, after having organized, formed a union which is known as the Manchester Wholesale. They have an immense business of their own. They have tea gardens of their own in India, they have several ships of their own to convey products from foreign countries and if I mistake not a year or two ago they sent out a delegation to this country for the purpose of acquiring a very large tract of land in the Northwest in order to produce their own wheat and raise their own cattle. That commission of delegates reported favourably after having returned to England from Canada and there is every reason to believe that the project of that very important association in regard to the acquiring of land in Canada will be put into execution. I have other data in regard to co-operative societies in other countries in Europe, but I do not wish to take up unnecessarily the time of the House, although the explanations I give now will not be required to be given again when the Bill reaches its second stage. I would like to call the attention of the House to the condition of these societies in Germany and I shall do so by quoting from the report of Mr. John F. Winter, consul for the United States, who, making a report from Germany on the 3rd October, 1902, says :

> Until thirty years ago, the German empire was one of the weakest nations financially ; but now, instead of being in need of foreign capital, Germany is following the example of England and France, and is loaning and investing money in foreign countries. According to a recent semi-official statement, there are about $2,000,000,000 of German capital invested in the United States and Mexico. It is estimated that another $2,000,000,000 are invested in Central and South America, some $250,000,000 in Turkey, and about $1,000,000,000 in Africa, Australia and the Far East. In addition to this, it is claimed that $3,000,000,000 are invested in stocks and bonds in different countries.

Or a total of $8,250,000,000 in thirty years. When one thinks that it was during these same thirty years that those reservoirs of small savings, the people's banks, have so wonderfully developed in number and importance, it can hardly be denied that there should be a co-relation between both, and that it cannot be a mere coincidence.

Co-operative societies take the form not only of banking, financial or loan societies, but, as I have already intimated, there are societies of production. There are also societies in respect to agriculture for the purchase of agricultural implements, for the securing of manure or artificial fertilizers, for the transportation of agricultural produce and for buying and selling. They can be organized for a multitude of objects and there is no limit ; in fact, in Europe they have been sometimes organized for the most extraordinary objects—preserving crops from insects and other such objects—always with the most beneficial results.

The following are some recent statistics :

Hungary—1903—1,653 banks—with 366,721 members ; share capital, 17,146,021 crowns paid ; savings deposits 21,190,955—Reserve fund, 2,284,738 crowns.
Rural societies, 517 ; products sold, 10,553,912 crowns.

Germany—13,299 societies, with 1,600,858 members.
Their general turn-over in one year, 1902, amounted to 11,023,497,954 marks.
Amount of loans, 2,990,413,111 in one year.—Assets 2,008,705,629.
Share capital, 200,701,011.—Reserve fund, 91,871,381 marks.
Deposits—1,764,649,632 marks.

Austria—9,713 co-operative societies, including 6,445, people's banks.
Loans in 1900, 1,936,401,000 crowns.

Bohemia, Moravia, Silesia.—558 societies in 1902 ; with 346,449 members.
Share capital, 19,225,257 kroners ; savings deposits, 621,594,048.
Loans, 383,400,060 in one year. Balance of outstanding loans, 591,738,238 kroners.

Italy—3,979 societies in 1902, with a general turn-over of 1,127,713,928 francs.

Switzerland—4,400 societies, with 109,410 members.

Belgium—2,000 co-operative societies.
Netherlands—1,449 co-operative societies.
Finland—288 co-operative societies.
Servia—678 co-operative societies.
Roumania—1,121 rural co-operative banks in 1904.

There is no doubt that the establishment of these societies in India where they were organized under special legislation in 1902, has produced most beneficial results. Just one word with regard to the special rules which should govern all legislation concerning these very interesting associations. The first rule to be observed is that in view of the small resources at the disposal of these societies—at any rate when they begin—a very simple and economic mode of organization must be provided in order to avoid expense on account of middle men and intermediaries ; it cannot be done by charter or by letters patent or any such expensive process. In view of the nature and origin of these societies, each of the associates should have but one vote. In order that the society may really be a popular one and that people of limited means may be induced to join, they must not be overshadowed by large investment of capital. The capital invested by each individual should be limited either by law or by the rules of the association and there should be but one vote for each associate. Another rule which seems to have been observed in all countries, is, that the association must be open to all honest people including women and minors. Another rule which is invariable in continental countries, but which has been departed from in England, is, that the operations of the associations must be absolutely restricted to members. In order to obtain a loan you must become a member, and the reason of that is that these associations can only become powerful by having a large membership. The fact that a man is a member of the association is, in case of a loan being made to him, a guarantee, and sometimes a very good one, that the borrower will observe the conditions of the loan. Another condition is that the membership must be controlled absolutely by the governing body of the association, however, that body may be organized. They must be able, just as in the case of social clubs, to exclude those whom they do not deem it well to associate with. It is urged also as a sound rule, that the association should have a strong reserve in order to ensure its stability and its solvency, to protect it against accident and to make sure that the resources should not be too variable, because, as a rule, in these associations the capital is withdrawable. It is deemed of the utmost importance not only for the benefit of the association but for the sake of the practical lesson, that there should be a permanent reserve which is provided by means of a proportion raised each year on the net profits and put aside as a permanent fund to draw upon in case of need. It has also been deemed a necessary rule that there should be no vote by proxy, a system which in the larger institutions has often been the occasion of evil results. In order to ensure a united interest in the association and the welfare of the company it has been deemed necessary that every man should be present to give his vote when the affairs of the association are being discussed. This is made easy by the fact that the operations of the society are done on a limited area. There is also a rule which I think the Finance Minister will approve of, and that is that there should be a limit fixed for the operation of the associations which are intended to do banking. On the continent of Europe, the banking associations, the rural banks, the village banks, are limited in their operations to the parishes or villages where they have their chief place of business. I do not think that rule prevails in England. Strange to say, banking associations have been far less numerous in England than co-operative associations for the purposes of production and sale. In the Bill which I have submitted I have adopted the rule which limits the field of operations of the banking associations. On the continent, the capital of these associations is always withdrawable, and when a member has withdrawn from the association he is no longer responsible in any way for its debts. I may be asked how that operates in the case of banking associations. In England the law requires that where co-operative association has for its object the carrying on of a banking business, the capital shall not be withdrawn.

In the Bill which I have framed, and which is largely founded upon the English Act, I have not introduced the provision requiring associations carrying on the business of banking to have a non-withdrawable capital. Upon the continent the safeguard afforded by a non-withdrawable capital is replaced by the necessity of the association creating and maintaining a reserve, which is considered an equivalent safeguard. If we were rigidly to apply that rule of the English law in this country it would be extremely difficult in the inception of the movement—because it is in its inception—to get members to join such an association. In our country districts or among our labouring classes, if you organize a banking association, and you state to the prospective associate that he will not be relieved of all responsibility and cannot with-

draw his money if at any given moment he judges fit to withdraw from the association, you place a great obstacle in the way of the movement; and that is why on the continent the obligation is imposed on the association to provide a reserve fund as a guarantee. It helps the association, it insures habits of order, it teaches thrift, and it enables the association easily to secure members, because they know that they can withdraw whenever they like, and after all it seems to me that they are entitled to consider that they secure the right to do so by contributing to the creation of this reserve. Hon. members who read this Bill and compare it with the English law, will find that while it provides that if the association creates and maintains a sufficient reserve fund, the capital shall be withdrawable just as it is in any other co-operative association.

I have been somewhat lengthy, but I desire now to acquaint the House with some details concerning this movement, which if it receives encouragement, will I do not doubt work a revolution in my own province, and I believe everywhere else among classes whom the larger banks do not reach, and who have hitherto failed to take cognizance of the immense benefits which co-operation can secure among the agricultural classes and in large cities among the labouring classes.

This is not the first time that the ills which this legislation is intended to cure, have been referred to in this parliament. The matter was brought before the House, I find, in 1884, by Mr. Orton, a member of the House who moved for a committee to consider the means of creating institutions of this kind. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) seconded the resolution and spoke in favour of it, and it was received with favour by the House. Sir John Macdonald, who was prime minister at the time, admitted the necessity of institutions of the kind which I am now referring to, but nothing seems to have come of the motion. It was referred, I think, to the Banking Committee, it being deemed unnecessary to refer it to a special committee. In 1885 Mr. Orton introduced a Bill providing for the creation of farmers' banks. Nothing seems to have come of the introduction of the Bill, I do not know for what reason. But there was a feature of that measure which would not commend itself to me, and probably did not at that time commend itself to the House. It provided that the government should come to the assistance of these associations by issuing for them paper money, which would be guaranteed by mortgages upon the property of the associates. That involved to a certain extent paternal interference by the government, in order to help the movement. I think anybody who studies the question will recognize that to be strong and effective these associations must work without government assistance, must be created by the people and helped by the people themselves. The government can no doubt favour the movement. Under the Bill which I have framed it is called upon to exercise a certain surveillance over the dealings of these associations. It can be resorted to for the purpose of having inquiries, and can even cancel the charters of these associations under certain circumstances; but material help from the government is not required—is even in my humble estimation detrimental to the movement. In 1903 my hon. friend the present Minister of Finance introduced a Bill to incorporate penny banks, and on that occasion, and also I think on a previous occasion, I referred to the necessity there was for the framing of a law embodying the views which I have just briefly laid before the House. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance seemed favourable to that movement, and promised the assistance of the government. The only penny bank created under that Bill, I believe, is the one which exists at Toronto, and as a matter of fact the movement in favour of penny banks has greatly diminished; in England it has practically died out. Not that they are not useful institutions, but they do not, in point of usefulness, as educators, as a powerful means of co-operation and self-help, approach the institutions which have of late years obtained such great success all over Europe.

I may be asked whether the provincial parliament would not be best qualified to deal with a subject of this kind. In regard to co-operative institutions having for their object the business of banking, I suppose there is no doubt that the provincial legislature would not have jurisdiction. Institutions having for the object the co-operation of agriculturists undoubtedly come under our jurisdiction. Producing and manufacturing associations come under our jurisdiction. Most of these are either banking or commercial associations, and consequently I do not doubt that we have jurisdiction for the creation of organizations of this sort, though possibly, in regard to some of them, our provincial legislation may have jurisdiction also. But there would be a great advantage if they could be organized under a uniform, a Dominon law, which would make their conditions similar all over the country. The movement must be in this country, if anything is to come of it, a national movement as it has been in other countries, and in such case it is better that it should be organized under the Dominion statute. Furthermore the provincial legislatures might not all view it from the same standpoint and might not be in a position to obtain for it the same encouragement which it would receive if inaugurated by this parliament.

The Quebec legislature, at its last session,

passed a Bill providing for the creation of associations of this kind. I have that measure, which has just become law, here, but of course it touches, though in a very gingerly way, the question of banking, and in my view that question is perhaps the most important. It is the banking associations which have revolutionized Europe, and of course our provincial legislatures are exceedingly touchy about touching anything in that connection in view of the provisions of our constitutional Act.

I might mention also that the system has been tried in Canada, and far from being found wanting it has proved here, as everywhere else, an unqualified success. There is probably no man who has given as much time and attention in this country perhaps, or even on the continent, to this co-operative movement as has Mr. Alphonse Desjardins. of Lévis, president and manager of the first credit association of this kind, founded on a truly co-operative basis in America.

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

Mr. MONK. He has studied it for many years and has kept in close contact with the leaders of the movement all over Europe. And in order to test its efficacy, he started five years ago in the town of Lévis, a small institution, whose main object is to provide small loans of money to people requiring them, and the results of his very patriotic efforts have been astonishing. Any one can obtain a statement of the operations of that institution, which is know as "La Caisse Populaire de Lévis', and no one, who examines that statement, can fail to be surprised at the results. The society, which started with a few hundred dollars of subscribed capital, of $5 shares, payable by weekly installments of ten cents each, in five years, by conducting the institution strictly according to the rules laid down by those who founded the system, brought that capital up to nearly $40,000, and the turn over last year amounted to nearly $140,000. The success of this society in the town of Lévis, as an educative institution, has been marvellous. It has formed there a generation of young men and women who have learned through it the value of thrift and economy, and carry on in their small and modest way with people who would not have secured loans elsewhere, except from the usurers, the business of banking just as it is done on the larger scale in our large cities, and with most excellent results.

In the Bill I have framed, I have followed, as far as possible, the English Act. The legislation of England in this matter dates back nearly half a century, but that legislation was consolidated in 1893. It is simple, and provides a most simple and easy machinery for the creation of these societies. It gives them sufficient power, but not too much. These institutions there are under the control of an official, who is a government official, and is called the registrar. But where it seems to me the English Act is perhaps a little faulty is that it conforms too much to the legislation regarding the organization of joint stock companies. That is the defect, if there be a defect, in that legislation, and where it has been possible for me, with the experience derived from what has been done on the continent, I have departed from the English legislation, but not too much. I have placed the control of these societies under the Department of the Postmaster General and the Minister of Labour. The House will see by the Bill why I have done that. It has seemed to me proper that the Department of Labour should exercise the supervision required and also endeavour to give an impetus to a movement which is destined to benefit the working classes, although in that matter the Department of Agriculture also is interested perhaps to as great a degree.

I shall not go into the details of the Bill, but the explanations I have given on this first reading have been given in the endeavour to rouse the interest of hon. members in this measure. I am in hopes that here as elsewhere will be found that this movement, though unimportant in its inception will have magnificent results and, like the grain of mustard seed, develop into a great tree.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Before the orders of the day are called, I desire to draw the attention of the government to the fact that certain returns, ordered long since, have not yet been brought down. Amongst others, a return respecting the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, which was ordered on the 14th March. The notice of that return was given a considerable time in advance, and it is about eight or nine weeks since the department was first informed that it would be required. There are also the returns moved for by my hon. friend from West Algoma (Mr. Boyce) namely, relating to the classification and export of fish, the expropriation of White Fish Island, and the Board of Pilotage Commissioners at Sydney, Cape Breton.

Mr. A. B. INGRAM. I moved for a return for copies of all forms and declarations for homestead entries since 1890. The return has been brought down but it does not include form 82 and I would ask that that omission be rectified.

Mr. URIAH WILSON. I moved for two returns on the 14th March last, namely, the correspondence between the High Commissioner and Mr. Preston and the correspondence between Mr. Griffiths and Mr. Preston.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier, speaking on the occasion, told us, that there had been serious trouble between Mr. Preston and Mr. Griffiths, and I think we should have the correspondence as soon as possible.

Mr. H. B. AMES (Montreal, St. Antoine). On the 14th of March last two returns were moved for by myself, one relating to land patents, and the other to homestead entries. These are both very much desired.

Mr. S. BARKER (Hamilton). On the 11th of April, I moved for a return of the reports and communications to the Department of the Interior from C. W. Speers, an officer of that department who recommended the government to open 10,000 acres of land, subsequently granted to Col. Davidson, for the purpose of showing that it was capable of producing wheat. That report is very important with matters which have already been discussed to some extent and which will be discussed further. I cannot see any reason for the delay in producing it.

PUBLIC OWNERSHIP—SESSIONAL INDEMNITY—PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). Before the orders of the day are called, I will take this opportunity of St. George's Anniversary to pay tribute to progressive legislation by giving notice to the government that, on the first suitable occasion on motion for committee of Supply, I will move :

That, in the opinion of this House, the state should proceed to nationalize one or all of the following services in this country, telegraph lines, trunk telephone lines and express companies.

And I would also take this occasion to call the attention of the government to the fact that while, on April 3 a Bill was introduced by the hon. member for Prince Edward (Mr. Alcorn) in regard to Express Companies, that Bill has not yet been printed. It is a very short Bill, and it is now three weeks since it was introduced. Four days ago a Bill was introduced by the hon. member for Lennox (Mr. Wilson) with regard to the repeal of the Act respecting an annuity to privy councillors. This Bill also has not been printed.

And, while I am on my feet, I wish to make a personal explanation concerning an incident of the debate on Friday in regard to my own Bill relating to the indemnities of members and annuities of privy councillors. It is true that I have not moved the second reading of that Bill ; but surely a member has a right to choose his own time for presenting the second reading of a Bill. I find that the opinion of the House at least I believe so—is running somewhat in favour, if not of my own Bill, certainly in favour of the Bill proposed by the hon. member for Lennox. I shall be ready at any time, after I get the answer to a question that stands in my name on the paper to-day, to go ahead. And, if it will facilitate matters, I am ready to make an arrangement with the government for the setting aside of a day for the discussion of the Bills that I now have on the paper.

DREDGING AT PORT ARTHUR AND FORT WILLIAM.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.). Before the orders of the day are called I would ask the government whether or not tenders have been received for dredging at Port Arthur and Fort William about a week ago, and if so whether or not the contracts have been awarded, and, if they have been awarded, to whom ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Tenders have been received by the department. They are now in the hands of the engineers to report upon them. The contracts have not been awarded.

YUKON CONCESSIONS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I ask whether the report in the press to-day is correct, to the effect that certain concessions in the Yukon, including that known as the Bronson and Ray concession, have been cancelled, and if so whether the government will be good enough to lay upon the table of the House the order in council effecting this concellation, and setting forth—as I presume it would—the reasons ?

Mr. OLIVER. I may say that there has been no cancellation of the concession in question. The government has under consideration at the present time the question of hydraulic leases in the Yukon, and will be able, no doubt, to lay a statement before the House at an early day.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I ask the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) to lay upon the table of the House returns referred to by him on Friday, if he has them in convenient shape to do so—I mean the returns alluded to in the debate on Friday evening, and, if there is any order in council which formally cancels or otherwise deals with the contract between the government and the North Atlantic Trading Company, other than, or in addition to, that which was read by the hon. minister in the course of his speech on Friday, I think it would be an advantage to have it laid upon the table as soon as possible. It is possible that everything was communicated to the House by the hon. gentleman in the course of his speech. But I ask, if there is anything further, that it should be communicated to the House without delay, as the debate will proceed to-morrow.

Mr. OLIVER. As my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) knows, the contract provides

that it may be cancelled by notice over the signature of the minister, and that notice has been given in the form of the cablegram and letter, which were read to the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. And the returns mentioned ?

Mr. OLIVER. I shall be glad to place them on the table.

SECONDS READINGS.

Bill (No. 126) respecting the Thorold and Lake Erie Railway Company.—Mr. Dyment.

Bill (No. 127) respecting the Farmers Bank of Canada.—Mr. Calvert.

Bill (No. 131) respecting the Royal Bank of Canada.—Mr. A. K. Maclean.

Bill (No. 135) respecting the Empire Trust Company.—Mr. Worthington.

Bill (No. 136) respecting a patent of the Cyclone Woven Wire Fence Company, Limited.—Mr. A. C. Macdonell.

Bill (No. 141) respecting the Quebec, Saguenay and Gulf of St. Lawrence Railway Company.—Mr. Girard.

QUESTIONS.

PAYMENTS TO JAMES W. WOODS AND THE WOODS COMPANY, LIMITED.

Mr. TAYLOR—by Mr. Lancaster—asked:

1. What has been the total amount paid by the government to James W. Woods and the Woods Company, Limited, Ottawa, for supplies furnished to the different departments of the government, and the amounts paid by each department, respectively, for each year of the financial years of 1897-8, 1898-9, 1899-1900, 1900-1, 1901-2, 1902-3, 1903-4 and 1904-5 ?

2. What amounts have been paid on account of goods supplied by tender ?

3. What amount has been paid to the said James W. Woods, or the Woods Company, Limited, during the same years, for rents of buildings used by the government ?

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

1. AMOUNTS paid by the different departments to James W. Woods and the Woods Co., Ltd., Ottawa, for supplies furnished for the financial years of 1897-8, 1898-9, 1899-1900, 1900-1, 1901-2, 1902-3, 1903-4, and 1904-5.

Department.	1897-8.	1898-9.	1899-1900.	1900-1.	1901-2.	1902-3.	1903-4.	1904-5.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Agriculture	.....	.....	.....	.....	422 55	238 61	499 95	.....
Departments Generally	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	64 31
Geological Survey	.....	157 50	272 95	251 00	382 88	283 99	145 74	419 92
Indian Affairs	7 50	.....	144 73	37 60	124 25	56 20	111 30	496 73
Interior	383 05	758 25	60 63	600 00	49 75	37 00	81 50	132 60
Justice	.....	.....	.....	16 50	.....	.....	.....	.....
Marine and Fisheries	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	3,526 52	6,650 70
Militia and Defence	6,429 60	118 50	48,999 67	1,427 08	18,024 45	67,065 68	98,140 47	82,300 77
North-west Mounted Police	3,945 55	768 46	3,588 30	1,648 03	5,351 44	3,952 33	2,961 66	10,770 68
Public Works	453 00	863 09	17,251 57	1,597 48	17,739 45	3,567 14	14,711 75	34,667 87
Railways and Canals	4 00	1,517 72	175 67	.....	.....	.....	48 25	426 90
Transcontinental Ry. Com	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	16,125 29
	11,222 70	4,183 52	70,493 52	5,577 69	42,094 77	75,000 95	120,227 14	152,055 77

2. Northwest Mounted Police...$6,596 04
Indian Affairs..... 1,141 37
$7,737 41

In Militia Department tenders were not called for by public advertisement but were obtained by letter from other firms in the trade.

3. Amounts paid to Woods Company, Limited, for rents for financial years 1897-8, 1898-9, 1899,1900, 1900-1, 1901-2, 1902-3, 1903-4 and 1904-5.

1897-8..... Nil.
1898-9..... Nil.
1899-1900..... Nil.
1900-1..... Nil.
1901-2..... Nil.
1902-3..... Nil.
1903-4..... $ 6,720 00
1904-5..... 17,690 00

LANDS FOR CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY.

Mr. FOSTER—by Mr. Sproule—asked :

Was any extension of area of selection, transfer or exchange of lands first earned by the Canadian Northern Railway Company, authorized by the government, so as to permit the said company, or its vendee, to select in other areas than those originally defined ? If so, what were they ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The Canadian Northern Railway Company is entitled to 2,180,928 acres as land subsidy for the construction of its lines of railway to Erwood, in the province of Saskatchewan. The company has had no extension of area of the land to which it is entitled. There was no original reservation of lands for selection by the Canadian Northern Railway Company. Its rights to land are held by it as the assignee of the Winnipeg Great Northern Railway Company and of the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company.

LOSS OF COAL BARGE 'REMBRANT.'

Mr. LAURENCE asked :

1. Has there been any investigation held in respect to the loss of the coal barge 'Rembrant' ?

2. If so, when, and will the Minister of Marine furnish the report of such investigation to the House ?

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

1. Yes.

2. A formal investigation was ordered in January, but owing to the sickness of some of the witnesses, it did not take place until the beginning of March. Yes.

DAM AND LOCKS ON SCUGOG RIVER.

Mr. SAM HUGHES—by Mr. Sproule—asked :

1. Has the federal government assumed full control of the dam and locks on Scugog river, at Lindsay ?

2. Has the government given a guarantee to construct and maintain in an efficient condition said dam and locks ?

3 Is the government aware that the said dam and locks were reported to them to be in bad condition last year, said report being made by the Ontario government ?

4. Will the government construct a new dam and locks at Lindsay this year ?

5. Will said dam and locks be of concrete ?

6. Will the lock gates be worked upon most modern plans ?

7. Will there be a cradle or slide operated by water power, for the conveyance of small boats and yachts over the dam, thus saving the great waste of water occurring when the locks would be used ?

8. Who is superintendent or in charge of Lindsay lock ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. Yes.

2. The government have undertaken to operate and keep in good repair and condition the lock and minor works in connection therewith.

3. During the negotiations for transfer, a copy of a general report made to the Ontario Commissioner of Public Works by the assistant commissioner on the 4th of March, 1904, enumerating the works owned by the province and making suggestions as the basis for transfer, was sent in to the Department of Railways and Canals. This report described the condition of certain works, amongst others the Lindsay lock, which was incidentally stated to be old and out of repair. No further report has been received in the matter.

4. No.

5. Answered by No. 4.

6. Answered by No. 4.

7. Answered by No. 4.

8. J. H. McClelan, superintendent ; John Makins, lockmaster.

SUPERINTENDENT TRENT CANAL.

Mr. SAM HUGHES—by Mr. Sproule—asked :

1. Who is superintendent of the waters recently taken over by the Dominion from the province of Ontario, at the head waters of the Trent canal in Victoria and Haliburton ?

2. In what capacity is Mr. Pearson employed?

3. Has Mr. Pearson authority to stop the flow of water in any stream so as to close a mill or mills below such dam ?

4. What are the instructions given to Mr. Pearson ?

5. Under whom does Mr. Pearson directly serve ?

6. What are his duties ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. J. H. McClelan, superintendent of the Trent canal, has control of all the waters recently taken over by the Dominion from the Ontario government.

2. Mr. John Pearson is employed as foreman on the Burnt river waters in the counties of Victoria and Haliburton.

3. There are no power users on these waters, who have any privileges granted to them by lease or otherwise from the government.

4. At the present time his instructions are to place in stop logs in all the dams on the Burnt River waters and keep them in until such times as the lakes, which serve as reservoirs, are full.

5. Mr. Pearson acts under instructions from the superintendent of the Trent Canal, under whom he directly serves.

6. Answered by No. 2.

BONDING BITUMINOUS COAL.

Mr. TAYLOR—by Mr. Lancaster—asked :

1. Does the customs law permit bituminous coal to be bonded in Canada, and when Canadians use such coal on steamers running from one port to another Canadian port, to allow the person bonding said coal to be entitled to save duty by making export entry ?

2. Have any refunds of duty paid on coal been made during the last three years ? If so, to whom, and what amounts ?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs) :

1. Section 105 of the Customs Act provides that warehoused goods may be delivered

as ship's stores to ships bound on a voyage to a port out of Canada, and also to vessels engaged in trade on inland waters along the international boundary between the United States and Canada.

Under this provision, coal has been delivered ex-warehouse as ship's stores at ports above Cornwall to steamers bound from one Canadian port to another on the Great Lakes, if traversing foreign waters during part of the voyage.

2. The coal so delivered as ship's stores is in bond. It is not customary to grant refunds on duty paid coal used as ship's stores. It would be necessary to examine some 50,000 refund claims before stating what refunds (if any) have been made in respect of duty paid on coal during the last three years.

I may perhaps add that perhaps the hon. gentleman who has asked the question would not wish the department to go through these 50,000 refunds. The commissioner, so far as he can speak from memory, thinks there have been no refunds on coal, but there may have been. If the hon. gentleman has any in his mind and will give me a little memorandum of them, I will look over the entry.

MARINE HOSPITAL, LOUISBURG.

Mr. DANIEL asked :

1. When was the marine hospital at the port of Louisburg, Nova Scotia, completed ?
2. What was the cost ?
3. Has any keeper been appointed ? If so, when, and at what salary ?
4. Has his salary been paid quarterly ? if not, how otherwise ?
5. Has any physician been appointed to attend the hospital ? If so, who has been appointed, at what date was he appointed, and at what salary ?
6. What report, if any, has been made to the department respecting the condition of the foundation of this hospital ?
7. Has any report been made to the department as to the condition of the roof of this hospital ?
8. Does such report indicate that the roof or any portion thereof has sagged or is otherwise defective ?
9. What information has the department as to the condition of the foundation and of the roof of the hospital generally ?
10. Is the hospital equipped and ready to receive patients ? If so, since what date has it been so equipped ?
11. What period elapsed after the completion of the hospital before it was equipped and ready to receive patients ?
12. How many seamen have been admitted and treated in the hospital ?
13. How many persons, other than seamen, have been admitted to or treated in this hospital ?
14. Since the completion of the hospital how many seamen landed at Louisburg have been treated in private houses in that town, or sent to St. Joseph's hospital at Glace Bay, or to the hospital at Sydney ?

59½

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I have not been able to get the information. I do not know whether it would be possible to get it by Wednesday, but in the meantime I will get it if I can. If I find it is too voluminous, I will ask my hon. friend to make a motion. But I will give him an answer on Wednesday.

WHARF AT PUGWASH.

Mr. BARKER asked :

1. What was the cost of the repairs during the summer of 1905 on the wharf at Pugwash?
2. How many men were employed on the work?
3. Was the work done by tender and contract ? If not, why not ?
4. Was Mr. E. Demings the inspector ? If not, who was the inspector ?
5. What was the occupation or business of the inspector before his employment ?
6. Is Mr. Demings a miller by occupation ?
7. How much time did he devote to the inspection daily ?
8. What remuneration did the inspector receive for his services, and at what rate per diem ?

Hon. CHARLES S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works) :

1. $1,978.23.
2. In the month of August, five men. In the months of September and October, eleven men.
3. Work done by day labour ; (b) thought more advisable.

4, 5, 6, 7 and 8. Mr. E. Demings was foreman during forty-five days at $2.50 per day, all his time to be given to the department during that period ; his previous occupation is not known to the department but he was recommended to the department as a capable person to supervise the work.

SUPPLIES TO HALIFAX GARRISON.

Mr. FOWLER asked :

1. Who has the contract for the following supplies for the Halifax garrison : bread, meat, groceries and fuel ?
2. What prices are paid for each ?
3. Were tenders called for by public advertisement ? If not, why not ?

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

1. Bread, Moirs, Lt'd.; meat, W. A. Maling & Company ; groceries, John F. Outhit ; soft coal, George E. Boak & Company.

2. The prices are : For meat, 8½c. per lb. for beef and mutton; bread, 3c., 24-100 per lb.; groceries and vegetables; bacon, breakfast, 14c. per lb.; bacon, green, 11c. per lb.; potatoes ¾c. per lb.; beans, 3c. per lb; jams, 6¼c. per lb.; evaporated apples, 9½c. per lb.; butter, 22½c. per lb.; cheese, 13c. per lb.; split peas, 2¾c. per lb.; suggar, white, 4½c. per lb.; salt, 1c. per lb.; coffee, 18c. per lb.; tea, 17c. per lb.; salt, 1c. per lb; coffee, 18c. per lb.;

tea, 17c. per lb.; pepper, 15c. per lb; evaporated vegetables, 15c. per lb.; evaporated onions, 24c. per lb.; flour, $2.25 per hundred lbs.; coal, for 'best quality soft free from soot,' $4.35 per ton—75c. per ton additional for delivery outside city limits.

3. Yes, except for coal. The contract made by the imperial government for soft coal expired December 31, 1905; and tenders were obtained by letter from dealers, including the agent of the Dominion Coal Company.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—ESTABLISHMENT OF COAL DEPOTS.

Mr. BARKER asked:

1. Has the Department of Railways taken steps for the establishment of depots at Lévis or other points on the St. Lawrence, or on the coast of New Brunswick, for the storage and distribution of the coal supply of the Intercolonial Railway?

2. Has land been purchased for such purposes? If so, where, when, and from whom, and at what price?

3. Has there been any negotiations for such purchases? If so, when, where, with whom and with what results?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals):

1. No.
2. No.
3. None.

PURCHASE OR ACQUISITION OF PUBLIC LANDS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN—by Mr. Sproule asked:

1. How many colonization or land companies, associations or syndicates have purchased or acquired, or agreed to purchase or acquire, public lands from the government since 1898?

2. What are the names, head offices and addresses of the said respective companies, associations and syndicates?

3. How much land has each of them purchased or acquired, or arranged to purchase or acquire?

4. What was the price in each instance?

5. What persons other than companies, associations and syndicates have purchased or acquired, or arranged to purchase or acquire, public lands from the government since the first of January, 1898, in areas of more than 160 acres in each instance?

6. What are the names, residence and occupation of each such person, and how much land did each purchase, arrange to purchase, or acquire, in each instance, and at what price?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The information can only be given satisfactorily in the form of a return which will be brought down as soon as possible after an order of the House has been obtained.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN.

CHARGES AGAINST IMMIGRATION AGENTS IN UNITED KINGDOM.

Mr. U. WILSON asked:

1. Has Mr. W. T. R. Preston made charges against some of the immigration agents in Great Britain and Ireland?

2. If so, what was the nature of the charges, and what are the names of the officers?

3. Has Mr. Preston submitted documents showing that certain officers in England have been collecting travelling expenses improperly, and that the practice has been going on for some time?

4. Did Mr. Preston discover and expose accounts for expenses which should never have been presented?

5. What are the names of the parties, and what are the amounts paid to each?

Mr. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I would like to say to my hon. friend (Mr. Wilson) that this is a question that can only be satisfactorily answered in the form of a return, which, if moved for, will be brought down at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. U. WILSON. May I ask if the information is in the department at Ottawa?

Mr. OLIVER. I could not say what limit my hon. friend includes, but I can assure him that whatever information is in the department will be brought down without delay.

MR. ALEXANDER WILSON, PUGWASH, N.S.

Mr. BARR asked:

1. Was Mr. Alexander Wilson, of Pugwash, appointed a special immigration agent to Scotland immediately after the last general election?

2. What remuneration did he receive?

3. How many bona fide settlers did he send out to this country?

4. What was the total cost to the country of Mr. Wilson's excursion to Scotland?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. Mr. Alexander Wilson, of Pugwash, was appointed a special immigration agent to Great Britain 1st November, 1904.

2. $100 per month and expenses.

3. In the large number of immigrants coming from Scotland it is impossible to state how many came as the result of the work of any particular person.

4. $569.17.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY—PURCHASE OF LAND.

Mr. A. A. McLEAN asked:

What does the government intend to do respecting the following statements contained in the report of Mr. W. A. Weeks, Sessional Paper No. 82, viz.: 'That Mr. Sharp, the superintendent of the Prince Edward Island Railway, in his zeal for the department which

he represented, drove a hard bargain with these people, produced agreements already prepared, and induced them to sign the same, whereby they agreed to convey the lands taken at so much per acre. That these people were not advised as to the damage and injury which would be caused their property, and it was not until they had executed a conveyance of their property that they became aware of the real nature of the transaction. According to the testimony of Professor Herbert H. Shaw, one of the surveyors who ran the line of the railway, and who had a personal, independent knowledge of the parties and their lands the compensation given these people was altogether inadequate ?'

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals). The matter is under consideration.

YUKON TELEGRAPH SYSTEM.

Mr. BLAIN asked:

1. What has been the total cost of the Yukon telegraph system ?
2. What were the earnings of Yukon lines in each year since 1901 ?
3. What was the cost of operating in each of these years ?

Hon. CHARLES S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works):

1. $758,094.05.

2 and 3 :

	Revenue.	Expenditure (operating).
In 1900-01,	$108,272.13	$ 84,536.86
1901-02	93,283.68	130,220.31
1902-03,	113,605.93	281,608.28 (this includes arrears due on construction accounts).
1903-04,	126,991.97	199,226.14
1904-05,	115,876.18	227,824.80

REPRESENTATION OF NICOLET AND GASPE.

Mr. FOWLER asked:

Is the Solicitor General still representing the two constituencies of Nicolet and Gaspe ?

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Solicitor General). In answer to my hon. friend (Mr. Fowler) I beg to say, yes.

SALE OF LAND TO MR. PHILIP PARKE.

Mr. AMES asked:

1. What is the character of the land, amounting to 71,120 acres, sold by the government on February 6, 1903, to Philip Parke ?
2. Near what line of railway communication and what station thereon is said area situated?
3. Where does the purchaser reside and what is his post office address, as known to the department ?
4. For what ostensible purpose was said area purchased ?
5. Had the area been surveyed, and were there any reports in the department as to the nature and value of said land ?
6. Was said area sold in solid blocks, odd and even sections alike ?
7. Was the land purchased by Philip Parke for himself or on behalf of others, and has any transfer of the property been made since its purchase ?
8. In whose hands is the property at the present time ?
9. What conditions and obligations were imposed upon the purchaser at the time of sale ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior):

1. The land sold on the 6th February, 1903, to Philip Parke covered an area of 711·20 acres and not 71,120 acres. The field notes of survey show that the land is intersected by Cache creek and that generally speaking the country, bare gravelly hills, broken by numerous ravines, soil being clay, sand, gravel and loam. It is classed as third class for agriculture and first-class for grazing and is quoted as good cattle range.
2. The land is situated about six miles north of Ashcroft on the Canadian Pacific Railway.
3. Cache Creek; post office address Buonaparte, B.C.
4. Ranching purposes.
5. Yes, the land has been surveyed. Yes, report of surveyor referred to in answer to question No. 1 and report of agent of Dominion lands at Kamloops as to value of adjoining lands.
6. In two blocks including parts of odd and even sections.
7. No transfer of the property has been filed in the department; the land was patented to Philip Parke.
8. Department is not in a position to answer this question.
9. The payment from the area purchased at rate of $2.50 per acre.

SALE OF LAND TO MR. EDWARD CLAUDIUS SCOTNEY GEORGE AND OTHERS.

Mr. AMES asked :

1. Under what conditions were 1,291 acres sold on August 10, 1905, to E. C. St. George and other members of the St. George family, in township 19, range 17, west of the 6th meridian ?

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). The land was not sold to E. C. St. George and other members of the St. George family, but to Edward Claudius Scotney George and other members of the George family. The said area included land in township 19, range 18, as well as 17, in the arid section of the railway belt of Manitoba Central. The conditions of sale were the payment for the land purchased at the rate of $1 an acre, being the price at which the land had been valued.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND RAILWAY—BRANCH FROM MONTAGUE TO CARDIGAN.

Mr. A. MARTIN asked :

1. Is the contract for the construction of branch railway line between Montague and Car-

digan, in Prince Edward Island, completed ? If so, is the road ready for being operated ?

2. If work is not completed, what remains to be done ?

3. When will the road be opened for traffic ?

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Minister of Railways and Canals) :

1. The contract for the construction of the branch line of railway from Montague to Cardigan, P.E.I., is completed. Some trimming up, caused by water and frost during the winter is necessary to be done before the road can be operated.

2. The following work remains to be done by the department : Montague water supply, tank and pipe line. Snow fencing. Names to be painted on stations. Erect and paint bridge over Brudenell river.

3. It is expected the work remaining to be done will be completed by July 1 next, on which date it is proposed to open the line for traffic.

THE 'APPEAL TO REASON.'

Mr. BARR asked :

1. Has the newspaper called 'Appeal to Reason' been placed on the prohibition list by the Postmaster General ?

2. If so, what are the reasons for so doing ?

Hon. A. B. AYLESWORTH (Postmaster General). The publication referred to has been refused transmission or delivery by or through the mails of Canada because its contents appeared to be of an indecent, immoral, seditious, disloyal, and scurrilous character.

LIGHTHOUSE AT FRENCH RIVER.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

1. When was the lighthouse, situate on the Ontario Lumber Company's property at French river, erected ?

2. Who was the contractor who built the same ?

3. What was the cost of construction, and the labour and material, respectively ?

4. What title was acquired to the property on which it was erected and from whom was the same acquired ?

5. How much was paid for the property required for the said lighthouse ?

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

1. In 1875. Rebuilt in 1893 on a new site.

2. Messrs. Wilson Bros., of Collingwood.

3. The contract paid was a bulk sum of $350.

4. Written permission was obtained from Mr. S. H. Cook, president of the company to occupy the site and use the right of way to it.

5. Nothing.

FISH LADDER IN COWIE'S DAM, MILTON. QUEEN'S COUNTY, N.B.

Mr. CROCKET asked :

1. What was the cost of the fish ladder built in Cowie's dam, lower pulp mill, Milton, Queen's County, N.S. ?

2. How much per thousand was paid for the material of which the ladder was constructed ?

3. Has the work been completed ?

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

1. $1,035.63, of which amount the department paid half.

2. 250 feet of spruce at $12 per M.; 5,126 feet of hemlock at $10 per M.; 1,590 feet of boards at $8 per M.

3. Yes.

ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATORY—CONTRACT OF AHEARN & SOPER FOR ELECTRICAL WIRING.

Mr. AMES asked :

1. What was the total amount paid to the Ahearn & Soper, Limited, for electrical wiring of the Ottawa Astronomical Observatory ?

2. Were other firms asked to submit prices ?

3. Did other contractors ask leave to tender, and what was the attitude of the department regarding said offers ?

4. Is the contract with Ahearn & Soper, Limited, finished and the work completed ? If not, what will be the probable cost of the remainder ?

Hon. CHAS. S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works) :

1. $4,284.93.

2. No.

3. No.

4. Yes.

DREDGING AT MIDLAND.

Mr. BENNETT asked :

How many tenders were received for dredging for current season at Midland, who were the tenderers, and what were the prices asked ?

Hon. CHAS. S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works). Five tenders were received :

The Owen Sound Dredge and Construction Company, Limited. Class No. 1, rock, $2 per cubic yard ; class No. 2, all other materials, 34 cents per cubic yard.

The Dominion Dredge and Construction Company, Limited. Class No. 1, $2.50 per cubic yard ; class No. 2, 34½ cents per cubic yard.

Weddell and Company. Class No. 1, $2 per cubic yard ; class No. 2, 35 cents per cubic yard.

The Canadian Dredge and Construction Company, Limited. Class No. 1, $4.80 per cubic yard ; class No. 2, 80 cents per cubic yard.

W. E. Phin. Class No. 1, $2.75 per cubic yard ; class No. 2, 50 cents per cubic yard.

WHARFS AT HUNTSVILLE, BAYSVILLE AND BRACEBRIDGE.

Mr. W. WRIGHT asked :

What are the names of government officials, if any, having charge of the government wharfs at Huntsville, Baysville and Bracebridge, Ontario ?

Hon. CHAS. S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works). These wharfs are still under the control of this department through the resident engineer.

EMPLOYEES OF SENATE AND HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey) moved for :

A return showing the number of permanent employees at present in the service of the Senate and House of Commons, respectively, and the names and duties of each ; the salary and length of service in each case ; the number of sessional employees at present in the service of the Senate and House of Commons, respectively, the daily pay of each, and the names and duties of each ; the number of employees of both classes who were employed in the session of 1896.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is no objection to the first part of the motion in reference to the House of Commons ; but the second part regarding the Senate would not be according to the rules of parliament.

Mr. SPROULE. I thought the government could get the information from the Senate ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think there is a certain procedure provided with regard to that. The first part of the motion can pass.

Motion as amended agreed to.

PURCHASE OF PUBLIC LANDS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.) moved for :

A copy of all correspondence, reports, documents and papers relating to any dealings transactions or negotiations between the government and any company, association or syndicate, who have purchased or acquired, or arranged to purchase or acquire, public lands from the government since 1898 ; also a statement giving the names, head offices and addresses of the said respective companies, associations and syndicates, together with the amount of land purchased, acquired, or arranged to be purchased or acquired, and the price paid or agreed upon ; also a statement giving the names, addresses and occupations of any person or persons, other than companies, associations or syndicates, who have purchased or acquired, or arranged to purchase or acquire, public lands from the government since first January, 1898, in areas of more than 160 acres in each instance, and a statement of the area of such lands in each instance. Also a copy of all correspondence with such persons, and all documents and papers relating to the sale or disposal of such lands.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is no objection to the motion if the words ' first of January, 1880 ' be substituted for the words in the motion ' first of January, 1898.'

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There is no objection to that except that we will not get the return down for a couple of years.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Why ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. If the right hon. gentleman desires the information from 1880 to 1898 his proper course would be to have it moved for by some one on his side of the House. Some of the transactions referred to in my motion have been discussed during this session, and I do not want to wait indefinitely for the information.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot agree with my hon. friend. I think if we are preparing a return it should be complete so as to show to the House the exact number of these transactions.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The motion had better stand then.

Motion allowed to stand.

HALIFAX TRACHOMA HOSPITAL.

Mr. U. WILSON (Lennox and Addington) moved for :

A copy of all orders in council, reports, letters telegrams, communications, documents, and papres of every kind, relating to the establishment, acquisition, construction, enlargement and maintenance of a hospital for trachoma patients at or near Halifax, Nova Scotia, including a statement of all sums of money expended in connection therewith, whether for establishment, acquisition, construction, enlargement or maintenance ; also a statement of the person or persons to whom such moneys were paid, the amount paid in each instance, as well as the date of payment, and generally all particulars concerning the said hospital from the time when it was first established.

Hon. CHARLES S. HYMAN (Minister of Public Works). The return will be quite a lengthy one and will likely take some time to prepare. I mention this but I have no objection to the motion.

Mr. U. WILSON. That is the usual reply.

Motion agreed to.

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

A return showing what information is in possession of the Department of the Interior, or any department or member of the government, regarding alleged irregular or improper dealings, acts, charges, payments, or accounts of any officer, agent or other person in Great Britain and Ireland, or in Europe, in connection with immigration to Canada ; what period is covered thereby. Also what communications, if any, upon or in relation to such matters have been had from or with the High Commissioner for Canada, the commissioner of immigration or others, in writing or otherwise. Also a copy of all correspondence, reports and papers, if any, relating to such matters.—Mr. Barker.

A copy of all correspondence, memoranda, reports and telegrams in possession of the government or any member or official thereof, in reference to the construction of a new steamer for the winter navigation of the Straits of Nor-

thumberland, including Mr. Duguid's report or recommendations, and those of others co-operating with him, and the expenses connected therewith, and to whom paid.—Mr. A. Martin.

A copy of the report of A. E. DuBerger on the drug and proprietary medicine trade of Canada.—Mr. Parmelee—by Mr. German.

A copy of all letters, correspondence, papers, reports and accounts relating to the construction of a fish ladder at Cowie's dam, lower pulp mill, Milton, Queen's county, Nova Scotia, and of the accounts showing the cost of construction of the said ladder, the amount paid for labour and material, and to whom paid.—Mr. Crocket.

A copy of the plans and specifications of the new steamer now being constructed in England.—Mr. A. A. McLean.

A copy of the report made by the Deputy Minister of Labour on results of his investigation into the importation of Italian labourers to the city of Montreal in the spring of 1904.—Mr. Verville.

Copies of all reports, letters, communications, surveys, papers and documents respecting any defects in the Peterborough lift lock, or any difficulties in the operation of the said lock, or any defects in the Trent Valley canal in the vicinity of or in connection with the Peterborough lift lock.—Mr. Barker.

A copy of all orders in council, reports, correspondence, documents and papers, relating to the proposed sale, grant or disposal by the government of any lands in the province of Alberta, or in the province of Saskatchewan, to a syndicate or company in which Messrs. M. A. Walsh, E. C. Walsh, E. G. Walsh, of Clinton, Iowa; A. W. Carrol, Charles Maher, of Iowa, and J. Brown, of Neepawa, Manitoba, or any or either of them are interested, or which they or any or either of them, or any other person or persons on their behalf, are promoting.—Mr. M. S. McCarthy.

THE TARIFFS OF GERMANY AND CANADA.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton), moved for

Copies of all correspondence since 1896 between the government of Canada, or any member thereof, and the German or British governments or any person or persons officially or otherwise representing those governments, and copies of all documents and papers in possession of the government, respecting the tariffs of Germany and Canada, in relation to each other?

He said: Mr. Speaker, before proceeding to discuss this resolution, I wish to ask the Minister of Customs if he will be good enough to tell me whether he has received from Lord Strathcona any reply to the letter sent to him a week or ten days ago?

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON. I have to beg the hon. gentleman's pardon for not having inquired. I will try to think of it to-morrow, and inquire of the Department of Trade and Commerce, who sent the message.

Mr. URIAH WILSON.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Speaker, the question on which I wish to make a few remarks this afternoon is that of our trade with Germany. I believe the government have been careless and indifferent towards the farming industry of Canada in not encouraging that trade. Though the German empire is the second largest importer of agricultural products in the world, and we in the Dominion of Canada have been able to export to that country only a very small proportion of our farm products, and year by year the quantity is gradually growing less. In 1897, when this government brought down their first budget, they gave a preference to Great Britain of 12½ per cent. Sir Charles Tupper, the then leader of the opposition, said that it would be necessary for them to include Belgium and Germany, because those countries came under the favoured nation clause. The Finance Minister stated that it was not necessary to include them, as they would not come under that clause. The outcome of the matter was that in 1898, when the present government gave an additional preference of 12½ per cent to Great Britain, making a total of 25 per cent, the German government placed goods going into Germany from Canada under the maximum tariff instead of under the minimum tariff, where they had been previous to that time. In 1900 this government increased the preference to Great Britain to 33⅓ per cent, and in 1903 the German government passed a law imposing a restriction of from 50 to 100 per cent on goods going into Germany from the Dominion of Canada, and the present government of Canada in turn placed a surtax on German goods coming into the Dominion amounting to one-third more than the general tariff. The German tariff, I believe, was not brought into effect until the 1st of March of this year. What I wish to call the attention of the House to in particular is the carelessness and indifference which this government has shown towards the farming industry of the Dominion of Canada within the last month or six weeks. During that time I have been asking a number of questions with regard to our trade with Germany, and have been urging the government to give to the farmers of Canada some information with reference to the German tariff upon Canadian goods; but week after week has gone by, and no information has been forthcoming. To give you some idea of the attitude of the Minister of Agriculture on this question, let me quote the remarks he made at the fruit conference held here on the 21st of March last, in reply to an address which was delivered by a prominent apple shipper of the city of Toronto, who had a number of letters from prominent men in Germany, large importers of Canadian apples. The Minister of Agriculture wound up his reply by using these words:

There is reason to believe that the Germans will in a short time seek to open negotiations,

but in the meantime I think we can get along without them.

I think that is a very careless answer for the Minister of Agriculture to make in regard to a question of such vital importance to the apple shippers of this country. Only two years ago there were only $50,000 worth of apples imported into Germany, while last year there were considerably over $400,000 worth in barrels and over $100,000 worth of dried apples. Germany is the best market for dried apples in the world, and the German importations of both green and dried apples are constantly increasing. On the 1st of March last, as I undertand it, and as the apple men throughout this country understand it, the German government placed a duty of $1.50 a barrel on apples going into that country, which practically prohibits them ; and the apple shippers at the recent fruit conference urged on the Minister of Agriculture the necessity of opening correspondence with the German government, through Lord Strathcona, with the view of obtaining from them similar concessions to those which the United States government have been able to obtain within the past few months. The same restrictions had been placed upon apples imported into Germany from the United States. The United States government immediately opened up communication with the German government, the outcome of which is that United States apples are admitted into Germany at a duty of 50c. per barrel, while Canadian apples are taxed $1.50 per barrel, which will practically shut them out of the market. The exporters of Canadian apples have found that Canadian apples are the most satisfactory in that market, and command the highest price, and in order to purchase large quantities of Canadian apples, they have moved their head offices from New York to the city of Toronto. I have here a copy of the old tariff which is placed upon some of the farm products going into that country.

Wheat	$0 54	per 100 lbs.
Flour of wheat	1 14	"
Oats	0 43	"
Bacon	2 17	"
Hams	2 17	"
Butter	2 17	"
Cheese	2 17	"
Apples, dried	0 43	"

and so on.

I merely call your attention to this to show you that since the 1st March the German government has placed an extra surtax on all these goods going into that country. So that while last year we shipped many hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of agricultural products, it has been almost impossible to get any of them in after the 1st March of this year.

In my opinion it is the duty of the Minister of Agriculture to open new markets for the farmers of Canada. In that connection this government has signally failed in its duty and it is folly for the hon. minister to sit still and say he will not open negotiations with Germany and try to obtain for our farmers the concession to which they are entitled. I have here a number of letters from different firms in Germany urging upon prominent exporters in this country the necessity of impressing on our government the importance of this apple export trade. I shall not attempt to read these, but they distinctly state that the new duty comes into force the 1st March of this year. I have also here the prices received at sales on Tuesday, 20th February, 1906, in Germany. Canadian apples, Greenings, sold at 27 marks, equal to $6.35 of our money; Spys, 31 marks or $7.29; Baldwins, 29.50 marks or $6.94; Greenings, 29.25 marks or $6.88, and so on. And a large number of sales were made of Canadian apples at advanced prices over what we could possibly obtain for them in any of the other European markets.

I have also here a large number of letters from the different parts of this country urging action in this matter, and I know that the hon. Minister of Agriculture and a number of other members on the government side have also received many letters impressing on them the necessity of convincing this government that immediate action should be taken. I have further a number of petitions from fruit growers' associations in different parts of the Dominion. I do not wish to weary the House by reading them, but would ask the privilege of merely reading one or two. At a meeting of the Port Elgin Fruit Growers' Association they expressed their views as follows:

That it would be to the interests of the general public as well as of the fruit growers of the Dominion, that an improvement in the trade relations between Germany and Canada should prevail, particularly in regard to the duty now imposed by the German government on Canadian green and evaporated apples, so that they may be allowed to enter Germany under as fair conditions as those from the United States, as Germany is practically our only market for evaporated fruits, and this association would pray that you take such measures as you deem wise to bring about the desired object.

I have another from the fruit institute of Creemore, one from the fruit growers of Forest, Ont., another from the Ontario association, Toronto, and also the following from the fruit growers of Sparta :

At a meeting of the fruit growers held at Sparta, Elgin County, Ontario, on April 2, the following motion was unanimously carried :

That our government be urged to at once take steps to bring about better trade relations between Germany and Canada so that our fruit may enter Germany under as fair conditions as does that of the United States, as our dried fruit business is practically ruined and our green fruit trade greatly damaged by loss

of the German trade by reason of the present prohibitory duty, we earnestly desire some improvement in our trade relations.

And others from Arkona, Freeman, Kimberly and Georgian bay.

In reply to a question which I put to the Minister of Agriculture on the 27th March, namely:

Was it not stated at the fruit convention last week that our apple industry faced a very serious situation so far as export to Germany was considered because of the duty of $1.50 a barrel,

The hon. gentleman replied.

I heard it so stated, but I do not know whether it is correct or not. I have not looked into the matter; but I should be disposed to accept the statement of the hon. member.

I am merely reading these to show how indifferent and careless the hon. minister's course has been with regard to this matter. On the 5th April I repeated the question and got the same answer and likewise on the 6th April. I may say that I have here the Trade and Commerce Weekly Report of April 9, which gives some of the increased duties placed upon goods going into Germany. But what we are anxious to obtain is the exact tariff and if possible to have the government so arrange matters that we may receive better treatment. In my opinion the time is not far distant when we shall require to have a representative in Germany who will look after the interests of the Dominion and in the United States as well. All the colonies of the empire, Canada alone excepted, have the privilege of the favoured nation clause on entering goods into the German empire.

I am glad to see the Minister of Agricultural in his seat and will just read for his benefit from the Montreal 'Herald' of January 27, some of his remarks in Montreal with reference to the preferential tariff. Regarding the necessity of giving Canada food products an advantage on the English market he said:

If any people were to make such a statement, it would be the Canadian farmers who are producing and selling these products, but I say, as Minister of Agriculture, that the Canadian farmers are not interested in that question and have made no such demand.

I am surprised to see the hon. Minister nod his head in approval. I certainly do not believe it is in the interests of the farmers of this Dominion that our Minister of Agriculture should say it would not be a good thing for them to have a preference in the English market. Why, a few cents a bushel to the advantage of the grain going out from the Dominion would increase the value of every farm in the Dominion and be one of the greatest attractions to Canadian immigration that could possibly be imagined. Not only that: Instead of wheat going across and being put through the mills in the United States, it would be ground in our country, giving employment to workmen in our own mills and developing that industry in Canada to a greater extent than it could possibly be developed in any other way. Let me read a little more of what the minister said:

In this I am sure I represent the feeling of the Canadian farmers. The people who make these statements are not the people who produce or handle these products nor the people who know the real conditions.

I feel confident that the Minister of Agriculture did not know the real conditions when he made these statements. He said further:

We farmers of Canada want no preference in the English market. Now, as to our interest, I am going to say frankly, as a farmer and as Minister of Agriculture, I am rather glad that England has decided not to give us a preference.

Can you imagine anything more emphatic coming from the Minister of Agriculture with reference to his position on these matters? I certainly believe that these remarks were most unwisely made. And as he read the comments of the English papers I think he could not but feel that it was anything but to his credit as Minister of Agriculture for the Dominion to have placed himself on record in this manner. I would ask the Minister of Agriculture to tell this House and to tell the people of Canada whether the farmers of Canada receive one-half-penny more for their butter, cheese, wheat, flour or any other products because of this preference. I think he will say that all our goods are placed on the British market, not on sentiment but on the quality of the goods themselves. I am sure that it was unwise of him, in speaking of the proposed preference in the British market, to make the remarks he did.

I was speaking about Germany, which is the greatest dried-apple market in the world. In one year they imported, no less than 2,426,000 pounds of dried apples from this country. This is a most important matter for Canada. In one corner of my own riding, 2,000 bushels of apples are dried each day during the fall of the year. Many a man in this House, I am sure, can tell of large evaporator works which will be practically closed unless some effective interest is taken in this industry and some definite arrangement reached with reference to our trade with Germany.

Let us look at Germany and see whether it would be to our interest to trade with her or not. I have taken some figures from the Commerce and Navigation returns of the United States. In this connection, I may say that our trade and navigation returns are not sufficiently complete in giving the comparisons with the different nations and their trade. The area of Germany is 208,830 square miles: her population 60,000,000.

The imports into Germany in 1905 were $1,428,640,000 ; and the exports $1,193,483,000, a balance in trade against Germany of $235,157,000. Compare Canada with this. Canada has an area of 3,745,574 square miles, and a population of 6,000,000. Our imports in 1905 were $266,834,417, and our exports $203,316,872, an adverse balance of trade of about $63,500,000. The revenue for the German empire including the German states and the colonies amounted in 1901 to $1,402,367,000 and the expenditures to $1,458,432,000. I am merely giving you these figures to show the extent of the German trade which other countries are receiving, but which we are practically prohibited from entering upon. The following figures will show the German trade with the United States in 1905 :

United States exports to Germany..	$224,562,019
United States imports from Germany	122,272,313
Balance of trade in favour of the United States..	$102,289,706

You will always find that the United States has a balance of trade in her favour wherever she does business. The following figures show the German trade with Canada in 1905 :

Canada imported from Germany.. ..	$6,642,139
Canada exported to Germany..	1,123,586
Balance of trade against Canada.. ..	$5,518,553

The total trade between Germany and the United States in 1905 was $346,834,332 ; and the total trade between Germany and Canada in 1905 was $7,765,725. And if you take from our exports to Germany the apple business, which was between $600,000 and $700,000, you will find that we have left only about $500,000 of export trade with the second greatest consumer of agriculture products in the world. I do not believe that we can afford such diplomacy as this. The United States are exporting less and less each year to the world as a whole, and here is a trade that the Dominion of Canada should try to obtain. Germany requires our food products, and every Canadian knows that we have the food products to sell. I was glad indeed to hear the hon. member for Lisgar, Man., make the statement in regard to the province of Manitoba that it was capable of producing 500,000,000 bushels of grain, and that last year it produced 115,000,000 bushels. When these western provinces are fully developed, as they will be before many years go by, we shall be very glad to have access to the German market. We have been catering to the United States market, in relation to which country we have been forced into the position of hewers of wood and drawers of water, for we only got into that country about $77,000,000 worth of goods in 1905, whereas we imported from the United States $162,000,000 worth, leaving a balance of trade against us and in favour of the United States of over $85,000,000. And when we consider that our exports are chiefly composed of the products of our mines and forests $16,000,000 in gold $19,000,000 in timber and its products, $2,000,000 in silver, $9,000,000 in copper, lead, iron and nickel ores, and $4,000,000 in coal, a total of $50,000,000 out of $77,000,000—we can see what portion of trade is done by our agricultural or manufacturing classes. The United States exported to Germany in 1905, in wheat and wheat flour the equivalent of 17,379,941 bushels of wheat. For which they received over $9,000,000. Canada practically exported nothing—a bare $750 worth of flour. In 1905 the United States exported to Germany 188,090,105 lbs. of lard for which she received $14,848,104. I am sure that our pork packers throughout the Dominion would have been glad to have exported a large portion of that lard. But the market of the German empire was closed against them. The United States in 1905 exported 9,234,069 lbs. of bacon, receiving $825,342 in return. Canada was not able to ship anything in this line.

Tobacco—that is an article the trade in which the people of western Ontario are anxious to see developed. The United States exported to Germany 44,442,000 pounds of tobacco in 1905, for, which they received $4,770,000. Canada exported none. Canned goods, fruit, and other products of the farm, were exported to Germany in large quantities. When you come to realize that the total exports from the United States of agricultural products amounted to about $150,000,000, you can see what a great advantage it would be to the farmers of Canada to be able to find a market in that country for their agricultural products, and to receive the reasonable price they would bring. Of dried apples, the United States exported to Germany 19,370,000 pounds, but we will be practically shut out of that market. The United States have access to the British markets, as all other nations have, as well as ourselves. Our goods are sold there only on their merits, it is not sentiment that sells our goods in that country. Why should the farmers of Canada not have a share of that very large German market, as we would have, if the government would take proper steps to procure it for us. But, instead of that, this governmnt and the German government have been drifting farther and farther apart until to-day the trade between these two countries amounts to practically nothing. There is no doubt that Germany can much better afford to be in this position than Canada can.

Now, let me give you a short list of some of the German imports of agricultural products. I take it from the official German records.

Germany imported—

$66,880,000 worth of wheat.
$1,324,500 worth of flour ;

$34,945,800 worth of barley ;
$17,562,000 worth of corn ;
$11,748,400 worth of rye ;
$3,155,900 worth of beef fresh, including veal.
$780,900 worth of prepared beef ;
$1,185,000 worth of fresh pork ;
$404,600 worth of prepared pork ;
$499,000 worth of bacon ;
$337,500 worth of hams ;
$600,000 worth of apples from Canada ;
$45,000 worth of mutton ;
Total, $139,268,600.

Practically, in round figures, Germany imported over $150,000,000 worth of agricultural products, of which Canada was able to send only $600,000 or $700,000 worth. In the year 1906, Canada produced over $600,000,000 worth of agricultural products. Canada is and will be an agricultural country. Her mines may become exhausted, her fisheries depleted, her woodlands denuded like those of the United States, but the farm will always remain the chief asset of the Dominion. It is the farms that builds up our manufactures, our railroads, our telegraph and telephone lines, and to a large extent our cities and towns. It is the farm that has been chiefly instrumental in giving to this government the large amount of revenue that they have distributed so extravagantly throughout the country. Therefore I want to urge on this government the necessity of opening negotiations with Germany at the earliest possible date with a view of trying to obtain for the farmers of Canada concessions at least as fair and reasonable as the farmers of the United States have been able to obtain from that country. Trade once lost by Canada will take years to recover. If this government will try and obtain the present year the same concessions for our apples that the United States have obtained up to the 30th of June, 1907, they would be conferring a great advantage on the apple industry of this country. The United States will be exporters of agricultural products for years to come, and we should also look to Germany for a large portion of our exports of farm produce. Therefore, I beg the government to take immediate steps in reference to this matter. I earnestly hope they will put forth every effort to procure for the farmers of Canada better trade relations with Germany.

Mr. H. S. CLEMENTS (West Kent). As an agriculturist I feel it my duty to congratulate my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) upon the able manner in which he has spoken to this motion. After listening to his remarks regarding the imports of Germany, one cannot help but feel that the agriculturists of this country have been sadly neglected by this government in not having procured for them better trade relations with Germany in respect to our agricultural products. I do not propose to say much on this question, because it has been so thoroughly treated by the hon. member from Lambton, but I must say that in my opinion the farmers of this country have been sadly neglected by the present government. We have no advantages in the United States markets in respect to our products. It was pointed out by my hon. friend who has just spoken that we practically send no agricultural products to the United States, and I am sure that this is evidence of the fact that there is something radically wrong in the tariff policy of Canada in respect to agricultural products. I once again wish to congratulate my hon. friend from Lambton upon the manner in which he has presented this matter to the House and I sincerely trust that his words will have some influence with the hon. Minister of Agriculture and will induce him to take up the interests of the farmers.

I can assure the hon. minister that the farmers will have to be reckoned with in the very near future. They are down, today, practically to the starvation point. I have lived in one of the best farming sections in this fair Dominion of ours, among the very best class of farmers who have to be and are educated in all classes of farming, and I make the statement knowing whereof I speak and knowing that it will be taken down in 'Hansard' that there is not one farmer in seventy-five in the splendid district in which I live who is making three per cent on his investment. If the manufacturers were placed in that position I will venture to say that there would soon be a great deal made of it in the Dominion. I was very much surprised to learn of the amount of tobacco that the United States are exporting to Germany. I want to remind the hon. Minister of Agriculture that we should have a fair portion of the export trade in tobacco to Germany. If we had a proper tariff on tobacco we would not only supply our own Canadian market but I believe that we could supply a fair amount of tobacco to our German friends from the western portion of the province of Ontario. The former Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Brodeur) was in our section of the country last year and we were very much encouraged by the remarks which the hon. gentleman made in which he said that the tobacco interest in the very near future would be looked after and that we in that section of the country would get a proper share of protection for that industry. I know that the people there will not lay out the amount of money which must be laid out in order to develop that industry unless they have some encouragement for our German trade or for our own home industry. It requires a great deal of money to be spent for the erection of barns, especially for that industry. I have a large cement foundation laid out for a tobacco barn which will cost probably $1,500, and no farmer in that section of the country will erect these buildings unless there is such a change made in

the tariff as well give us a proper share of the profit from the tobacco which we are growing and which we can grow to a far greater extent than, I believe, any member of this House can possibly imagine we are capable of.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Mr. Speaker, the motion deals with a requirement for papers in connection with the German tariff question. There can be no objection to the motion, let me say, however, with this qualification, that very many diplomatic papers are of a confidential character, and of course it goes without saying that if there are any confidential documents in connection with this matter they cannot be brought down. Otherwise, there is no reason why the papers should not be brought down. I wish I could congratulate the hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) as warmly as the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Clements) has done. I do not for a moment permit myself to doubt that both of these gentlemen are animated by the excellent purpose and desire of extending the trade of Canada, and particularly of extending the trade of Canada in the localities in which their own constituents are particularly interested; but while recognizing that fact at once, and giving my hon. friends due credit for it, I am nevertheless bound to say that I regard their speeches as most unfortunate, most unwise, and if it is not offensive to say so, most unpatriotic. The hon. member for Lambton has said that the German government and the Canadian authorities have been drifting farther and farther apart. A little reflection will show him that that is not correct. We have been wide apart in the years that have gone by, unfortunately, but a statement has been made in this House by my hon. friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) to the effect that we had recently been approached by a representative of the German government with the view of further negotiations. My hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong) is therefore aware that in an informal way negotiations have been opened between the German authorities and the Canadian government and there can be only one meaning to my hon. friend's speech, if it is to be taken seriously, and that is that this government is to be condemned for what it has done in the past in relation to Germany, and that we should humbly take off our hats and beg pardon of the German government. With all due respect to the German authorities, with all due desire on our part to meet them in a good spirit and with a desire to respond to the suggestions that have recently come to us, appreciating that it is not the part of good government to place difficulties in the way but rather to smooth the path so that we can have a better understanding, I desire to say that it is necessary in the interest of the people of Canada to vindicate the position which this government and this parliament have taken in the past in reference to our difficulty with Germany. We cannot permit the statement of the hon. gentleman to go abroad as a correct expression of the view of the people of Canada. We hold that the commercial policy of this government generally has been vindicated to the satisfaction of the country, that if there is one part of it above all others in which the parliament and the people of Canada have unmistakably vindicated the action of this government it is in the steps that were taken in reference to our trade with Germany. Why did we come into difficulty with Germany? These hon. gentlemen say that the United States obtained better terms than we did. True, it was our misfortune, and because of that misfortune we found it necessary to take steps to maintain the proper dignity of the Canadian people, of the Canadian parliament and of the Canadian government. Why did Germany penalize us? Why did Germany say that she would impose higher duties on the products of Canada than on the products of the United States? Because we vindicated the right of the people of Canada, a portion of the great British empire, to make that preferential trade arrangement which has done so much for Imperial development and for the highest good of this country. That was our only crime. Down to the years 1897 and 1898 when the preferential tariff was introduced we had the benefit of the favoured nation treatment with Germany; we were admitted on the same terms as other countries. Did Canada do anything whereby she should have forfeited these privileges? Surely not. What was it that we did? We simply said that whatever might be our treatment of foreign nations we formed part of the great British empire; it was our own family affair, our own domestic circle and we had a right to make such an arrangement within our own family and our own domestic circle as might be agreeable to the mother country and to ourselves. And so, we brought down the preferential tariff. There was a temporary difficulty about it as has been stated by the hon. member for East Lambton. We anticipated the possibility of that difficulty but it is a certainty to-day that if we had not taken that step in 1897 these unlucky treaties, as Lord Salisbury described them, which has so long stood in the way of a preferential arrangement between Canada and the mother country, would have remained probably in force down to the present moment. These treaties had stood in the way for a great many years. If you will consult the records of the Colonial conferences you will see that the statesmen of the colonies, the statesmen of Canada, the statesmen of the Conservative party in Canada, adopted resolutions urging the British government to denounce those treaties

which stood in the way of commercial freedom between the mother country and her colonies. Years pased and nothing was accomplished. The desire was universal throughout the colonial empire, but red tape in England stood in the way, and, these unlucky treaties, to repeat Lord Salisbury's words, were an obstacle. It was not until the adoption of the preferential tariff by the Canadian government and parliament in 1897 that the forces were set in motion on the other side of the water, which led to the denunciation of these German and Belgian treaties, by which the commercial freedom of the British empire was won. That which our friends on the other side had been trying to accomplish year after year, honestly and faithfully trying, that which they laboured for in vain, was accomplished through the instrumentality of this government by the adoption of the preferential tariff in 1897. The German government took offence at that and underlook to penalize the trade of Canada because we had taken that step, and for no reason. We were called to account in this House by hon. gentlemen on the other side—not perhaps without some reason—that we were too patient in our negotiations with the German government. But diplomatic proceedings are slow. We had to proceed in the ordinary way; we had to come to a conclusion ourselves; we had to communicate perhaps with our High Commissioner in London who would communicate with the colonial office, and the colonial office would communicate with the foreign office, and the foreign office with the ambassador in Berlin, and the ambassador in Berlin would communicate with the German foreign office, and gradually, running through all these necessary channels of diplomacy, we might reach the German government. It so happened that though we year after year carried on these negotiations in this way and made representations as to the injustice which was being done to us by Germany, our representations were without any success.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Might I ask the Minister of Finance why that is so? If, as he states, this was purely a family affair why is it that the rest of the empire has better terms with Germany than Canada has.

Mr. FIELDING. I said that the preferential tariff arrangement was purely a family affair between the mother country and her colonies and that no foreign nation has the right to penalize us because of that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But the rest of the empire has a better tariff with Germany than we have.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not see how that touches the point. We imposed a surtax for good and sufficient reasons which this parliament concurred in.

Mr. FIELDING.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. But that was the case before the surtax.

Mr. FIELDING. Prior to the adoption of the preferential tariff we had the same tariff privileges in Germany as the rest of the empire; we shared the same tariff as Great Britain did, but when we adopted the preferential tariff——

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Would you repeat that.

Mr. FIELDING. Prior to the adoption of the preferential tariff we had the same treatment as Great Britain had; but when we adopted the preferential tariff then the German government, in making their new arrangement with Great Britain, left Canada out of it, and said in effect: We are going to punish Canada for what we deem to be her mistaken course.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. That is the point I directed the hon. gentleman's attention to. If this were purely a family affair why is it that the rest of the empire should have better tariff relations with Germany than we have?

Mr. FIELDING. Because the other parts of the empire have not adopted universally a preferential tariff and therefore Germany has not been called upon to punish them. It was because we adopted a preferential tariff that we have been singled out by Germany. If the House will pardon me for proceeding after six o'clock as I may be able to be present this evening, I would like to point out that in dealing with what is ordinarily called the 'favoured nation principle' we did no wrong to Germany; we gave to Germany and were willing to continue to give to Germany every privilege we gave to any foreign nation and therefore the principle of the favoured nation treaty was not broken.

Mr. SPROULE. Was it not broken in this respect—that the treaty compelled another country to receive the goods of that country exactly on the same terms as the goods from England, and to give no preference to England even over that country. That was one of the provisions of the treaty.

Mr. FIELDING. Which treaty do you refer to?

Mr. SPROULE. The treaty with Germany; the 'favoured nation clause'.

Mr. FIELDING. There is a distinction between the Belgian and German treaties, and, what is ordinarily called the favoured nation treaties. The favoured nation treaties simply deal with the relation say of Canada, (if it be with Canada) and a number of foreign nations. By the favoured nation treaty you come under the obligation that you will not give any privilege to any one foreign nation without giving the like privilege to the other nations concerned. The Belgian and German treaties went beyond

that ; they required that Belgium and Germany should not only have the same privilege that we may extend to any foreign nation but the same privilege that we may extend to Great Britain. That was a vital difference ; that was what we complained of We said : So far as the favoured nation principle is concerned we are willing to respect it ; we are willing to give to Germany every thing we give to France, to Italy, to Spain, to any other foreign nation. But Germany said : No, that is not enough, you must give to us not only what you give to foreign nations but you must put us on the same terms as you put the mother country on. We said : No, we will not do that, we will give a preference to the mother country and to such of the colonies as make satisfactory arrangements with us. The German government resented that ; they thought we were treating them, as they said, badly. It is always well to think there is another side to a question and I have no doubt the German government imagined they had some good cause of complaint. However that may be, after repeated representations, after representations through the official channels, we at last took the matter up directly and informally—of course we have no power to conduct negotiations looking to a treaty or anything of that sort, but we have power to negotiate as to what our tariff shall be as respects any country—we opened negotiations with the German consul in Montreal, a gentleman who is no longer in Canada but who at that time was the representative of the German government. We pointed out to Mr. Bopp the unfairness of the attitude of Germany ; we pointed out that the advantages of the trade were all in favour of Germany ; we pointed out that we exported after all only a small quantity of goods to Germany.

Let me say here that while the German trade may be important to some particular industry, and I do not under estimate it ; and while it may be important to some particular section and to some particular class of producers, yet you will find that the exports from Canada to Germany are not large and have not been large. My hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong) mentions the apple export trade, and coming from an apple country myself that appeals strongly to me. But taking our export trade to Germany in the bulk, it is not considerable. While we would be glad to get an increase in trade from any quarter of the world, the truth is that the German trade in its relation to Canada, speaking in the large, is not an important trade. And, when my hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong) says that Germany can stand the difference better than we can I honestly think he is mistaken. As the matter stands I think the fact is that Germany has lost a great deal more than we have. However that may be, I want to point out that we remonstrated through diplomatic channels, and afterwards we took the matter up in what might be called a non-diplomatic way and we had personal negotiations with the representative of the German government. We pointed out to him that we were giving his country every privilege we gave to every foreign nation and we said : what more can you want ? We pointed out that we were being criticised in parliament because we allowed this condition to go on. We were asked : Why don't you retaliate, why don't you hit back? However, we felt that in dealing with a great nation, it would be well for us a young country, to show an example of dignity and patience, it would be well for us to go slow, to remonstrate and plead and try to persuade the German government of the mistake they had made. All this was in vain and only after a lapse of years, not until the year of 1903, we took this extreme step. We took it because we found there was no other way of dealing with our German friends and making them appreciate the situation, than by some method of retaliation, and so we adopted the surtax. And, if my hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong) means to condemn the surtax, then I think I am justified in saying that he is the first man who has risen in the parliament of Canada to condemn it. I venture to say that the adoption of that surtax was regarded by every patriotic Canadian as a necessary and proper step for the vindication of the position of Canada on that question. It is unfortunate that there has been this difference between that great country and ourselves. We are firmly persuaded we are in the right, and though we still feel that we are in the right we are ready to deal in a generous spirit with any approach that may be made. The German government, through a proper channel, have in an informal way approached us. We are glad of it. We are willing to meet them and discuss the matter with them. I am not prepared to say that for the sake of a concession on one particular article that will suit my hon. friend in his country, or that will suit myself in my county, we are willing to give up the whole situation ; but I will say that now the matter is better understood, now that the German government have shown that they appreciate the position of Canada in a higher degree than they did before, we shall be prepared to deal with the matter in the right spirit ; and I think it will not be too much if I ask hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House not to embarrass us, not to tie our hands, not to give the impression that in approaching the German government we are a divided people, but to give the idea that the government of Canada, in what they have done in the past and in what they are willing to do, in their tariff arrangements with Germany, represent the wishes of the people of Canada as a whole.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. T. S. SPDOULE (East Grey). The country, I have no doubt will appreciate the object and aim of the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) in bringing this question to the attention of the House and endeavouring to have something done for that large and important class of the people who are always dependent to a great extent upon foreign markets for the sale of their products. Since the government have absolutely failed in their duty, is it suprising that a member of the opposition should endeavour to draw attention to their shortcomings and spur them on, if possible, to some effort to obtain better markets for our farmers. The observations of the hon. the Minister of Finance in reply to my hon. friend seemed to me the most out of place that I ever heard from an hon. member in this House. And coming from the source they did, makes their absurdity still the more glaring. What were the criticisms in which the Finance Minister indulged regarding the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Armstrong)? My hon. friend's course, he said, was unpatriotic, unwise and ill-advised. Just fancy, Mr. Speaker, the term 'unpatriotic' being applied to another member by this Finance Minister who, a few years ago, ran his own provincial election on the platform of secession from confederation. Was that, I ask, patriotism ? Was that love of his country? Was that a desire to keep his country united ? Was it wise ? Was it timely ? Yet we have a Finance Minister, who took this extremely unpatriotic course, charging that crime against the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) and describing his remarks as unwise, unpatriotic and illtimed. To my mind the speech of my hon. friend was the very reverse. It simply threw the broad light of criticism on the unbusiness blundering of the present government from the time it took office down to this day. One of the planks in the platform of the reform party in 1896 was more and better markets for the farmers and producers of Canada. Entrust us, they said, with the administration of this country, and we shall be prepared to give you the markets of the eighty million people to the south which your Conservative administration never seriously attempted to obtain for you. We shall be prepared likewise to give you other extensive markets for your products. But their great plank was better trade relations with the eighty million people to our south. And, Sir, what was the result of their efforts when they did get in ? Their first course was characterized by bungling and unbusinesslike conduct followed by their preferential tariff. They told the people that they were aiming at free trade and would lower the tariff; but when the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) found that the conditions were such that he could not meet the expectations he had realized, he said : Our tariff may not seem to the people as low as what they expected, but the condition of things is such that we cannot lower it as much as we would like. Still it must not be forgotten that we are going to do a great deal more than what we have already done in this direction. We have that general tariff but we are going to give a preference to the mother country. We are going to reduce the tax 12½ per cent on goods coming from England, which may be regarded as a reduction in our tariff to that extent. Then we shall reduce it another 12½ per cent, and finally we shall make the reduction 33⅓ per cent. And that, the hon. gentleman claimed, would be a redemption of the government's promise to lower the tariff. At the time this preference was first proposed, his attention was drawn to the fact that he was making a blunder. Here is what Sir Charles Tupper said on that point :

> Does my hon. friend say, hear, hear ? I tell him that the course the government pursued a month ago was nothing short of a declaration of independence on the part of Canada. It was a declaration in the face of the world that Canada refused to be bound by the treaties which England had made with regard to Canada as well as to herself.

That is to say, the contention of Sir Charles Tupper was that in making this reduction on British goods, the government were violating the treaty which England had with Germany and Belgium and which declared that England would allow these countries to trade with her colonies on the most favoured nation principle. Under that favoured nation clause, the lowest rates charged on British goods by any one of Britain's colonies must apply to goods going into that colony from Germany or Belgium. This declaration of Sir Charles Tupper was flatly contradicted by the Finance Minister. He said that clause would not apply and could not in any way affect the situation. that he had made this offer open to the whole world and it was for these other countries to accept it if they chose. Sir Charles Tupper replied that that did not get over the difficulty, that a treaty existed between England and these countries in which there was the favoured nation clause, and that the Canadian government were violating that treaty and practically declaring that Canada refused to be bound by treaties made by the mother country. The Canadian government, he said, were going outside those treaties and were practically making a declaration of fiscal war against Germany and Belgium. Is it not therefore true, as I have said, that these hon. gentlemen opposite began their administration by blundering ? What folowed ? Sir Charles Tupper drew the attention of the Finance Minister to this question again. The Fin-

ance Minister replied that there was not an eminent lawyer or statesman in the country who held the views enunciated by Sir Charles. What did Sir Charles Tupper reply :

My hon. friend has said that there are high legal authorities who maintain that these Belgium and German treaties have no relation to this case and do not apply to Canada.

But the Minister of Finance declared they could not apply to Canada. Sir Charles Tupper said :

I defy the hon. gentleman to name one high authority in the world who has ventured to express such an opinion. Hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have not hesitated to give the authorities upon which they base their opinions. They gave the authority of Lord Knutsford who is charged with the duty of administering the whole colonial empire of Great Britain, and who laid it down in the clearest and most emphatic terms, that in the British colonies no preference could be given to British goods, that, under the terms of the treaties made by England with Belgium and Germany the colonies were included and that German and Belgian goods were entitled to receive entry into these colonies on precisely the same terms as the goods coming from the mother country.

Now, was not that plain enough ? Against the declaration of the Minister of Finance that it did not apply was the declaration of one of the most eminent authorities in the imperial parliament that it did apply ; and, therefore, as Sir Charles Tupper rightly said, you are making a blunder, you are declaring commercial war against Germany, you are singling out Germany which offers us a valuable market and you will offend that country, for your tariff cannot go into effect without a virtual declaration of commercial independence on your part and a denunciation of these treaties by Great Britain.

Now, I have said that they did this by stupidity and blundering. They practically proclaimed commercial war against Germany. We had a growing market in Germany, a valuable market for our barley, wheat, rye and other products. When Germany found that we were levying unfair duties against her, not allowing her to have the advantage of the most-favoured nation clause treaty, she retaliated and shut us out of her market to a large extent. Then, hon. gentlemen opposite found that they had made a mistake. And what did they do to rectify their blunder ? The only thing they could do was to ask Great Britain to denounce these treaties, and rather than offend her most important colony, Great Britain did so. What was the result ? The result was that our trade with Germany was killed. The disaster of which these gentlemen had been warned came upon us. And what was the next step ? The Minister of Finance announced to the world that he was going to put on a surtax against Germany he would single out Germany for special treatment. He declared :

We have to-day practically three tariffs. We have the British preference, we have our general tariff, and we have the German surtax.

We levy against Germany the highest tax that we levy against any country in the world, and all because she dared to strike back when we injured her by the policy we adopted. And not the least wonderful thing is that to-day we are told that the party who call attention to the blundering of the government is unpatriotic, unwise and unkind to mention the matter at this time. I say that this charge of want of patriotism comes with particularly bad grace from the man who ran his election on the cry of secession only a few years ago. It is an old and oft-quoted saying that patriotism is the last refuge of a scoundrel. That saying has not lost anything of its force to-day.

Under the direction of the Minister of Finance, we have singled out Germany and levied against her a special duty of thirty-three and one-third per cent higher than against any other country. What was this but a declaration of commercial war against that country ? Is it any wonder that Germany has treated us as she has done ? And the Minister of Finance grumbles because attention is called to the results of his policy. I say that instead of criticism those who call attention to these blunders are entitled to credit and thanks. Germany has tried her hand at further retaliation. She has struck back and struck heavily—she has levied against Canada special duties of fifty cents a hundred on wheat and $1.50 a barrel on apples. Germany was one of the very best markets for our apples, and apples are a crop raised in every part of our country, and the export of them means millions of dollars of return for the labour of our farmers. I have stated at the outset that the government, when they came into power, declared that the two main planks in their platform were lower duties and better and more extensive markets. Have they found these better markets for our products ? They were to have got a better market in the United States by means of reciprocity treaty with that country. But we know that they did not fulfil that promise. Did they open any other markets ? No, instead of that they lost part of what markets we had—they have lost to us this great market of 60,000,000 of the people of Germany. And the government have not secured for us any special advantages in the British market. They gave a preference on British goods coming into Canada, but what good did that do the Canadian farmer ? Britain did not give us any better terms in her market than she gives to countries that offer her no preference. We on this side claim that we have a right to ask Great Britain for more favourable treatment. Yet the Min-

ister of Agriculture last year stated that he was glad that Great Britain had decided not to give a better market for the products of Canadian farms. The Minister of Finance tells us that what we gave we gave voluntarily and we were not beggardly enough to ask anything in return. Evidently they do not want it in Germany, because they have acted so as to take away the market we already had, and have given us no better market in the United States. At one time they thought they had made a great bargain with Trinidad, and plumed themselves highly upon it, but what does it amount to to-day? Practically little or nothing.

Now, the Minister of Finance is still pursuing his fatuous and unwise policy. He does not desire to retrace his steps. His colleagues seem to entertain the same opinion, and when attention is drawn to their unbusinesslike conduct they declare it to be unwise and unpatriotic for any member of this House to criticise them. Why did they get in to difficulty with Germany? They say it was our own family affairs. It was our own family affairs when we were dealing with England. If so we had a right to remember that the parent had made a contract which we as children were bound to respect. We did not respect it; we were planning commercial independence, as Sir Charles Tupper said, and to-day we are led to see the folly of it in the first place and the result of it in the second place. We are reaping the reward of that folly to-day, and the best evidence that the hon. gentleman has been pursuing a course of folly is the fact that the situation has been getting worse instead of better. There is no brighter outlook for the farmers of Canada. They did not try to protect the farmers of Canada and they got us no additional market abroad. And to-day because we desire to draw their attention to it and ask them to change their unwise course they turn around and become abusive. Now, the farmers of Canada had better know that it is all due to the unwise and unbusinesslike conduct of this government. We are suffering from it to-day. We tried retaliation, and every stroke we made put us in a worse position. The Minister of Finance had better take note of that. I wish the people to take note of that and remember the fact that we have lost the markets of this sixty millions of people by the folly of the present government, and we have no other market to take its place. They have given us no further advantage in the British market that we did not enjoy before. Therefore, I say that as long as they continue in this unwise course the people of Canada must suffer, and no class of Canadians will suffer more than the farmers.

Mr. THOMAS CHISHOLM (East Huron). I wish to say a few words in the line of the remarks of the hon. gentlemen who have preceded me on this side, because I believe they have suggested a remedy for the evils our farmers complain of. I was sorry to see the Minister of Finance bristle up so defiantly, but perhaps it was the proper attitude for him to assume when he had no other answer to make. He spoke about patriotism. Well, we believe that patriotism is all right, but we have not much confidence in the patriotism which some gentlemen carry in their pockets. Now, I am here to look after the interests of my constituents; I am here to look after their financial interests. This question of a surtax and of Canada's commercial relations to the great German empire is something in which I am interested. The farmers of the western part of older Ontario have found for many years that they cannot compete with Manitoba and the west in the raising of grain. They have, therefore, been compelled to go into fruit, dairy and stock farming. Again, the scarcity of farm labourers during recent years has driven many of our stock farmers into what is now called grass farming. That is, they turn their farms entirely to pasture. They buy cattle in the spring, allow them to run on the grass all summer and then sell them in the fall. But during the last two or three years the cheaper ranch fed cattle of the prairies have been brought east in thousands to be sold in the fall and have thus caused a glut in the market and a lowering of prices just at the very time that the so-called grass farmers of Ontario are compelled to sell their stock. Thus the Ontario grass farmers have been nearly ruined by buying cattle in the spring, when they are dear, and selling them in the fall when they are cheap. This has practically driven them out of the business, so that they are compelled to depend on fruit, dairying and the raising of hogs. Fruit, however, must eventually be their mainstay, as it is the only line in which the west can never compete with them. Germany after Great Britain is the largest and best market in the world, not only for our fruit, but also for our dairy products and bacon, therefore, it is easy to see why the farmers of older Ontario are so deeply interested in the removal of the German surtax and the improvement of our commerical relations with that great intelligent manufacturing and food consuming country.

Let us consider the apple crop as an example. Statistics show that the county of Huron on an average every year produces nearly two and one-half millions of bushels of apples, and it is estimated that this could be increased to seven millions from the same orchards, if the trees were properly pruned, sprayed, scraped, cultivated and otherwise cared for. Those apples should be worth a dollar a bushel on the trees, if we had an effective, complete and continuous system of cold storage from the hand

of the producer to the table of the consumer, seasonable and proper facilities for transportation and the full benefit of the British and German markets. Something must be done to meet these changing conditions. New markets for our fruit, dairy products and bacon must be secured, and more, we must be provided with cheap sugar for canning purposes. It is estimated that if it were not for the Canadian duty we could have one hundred pounds of good German sugar laid down wholesale in Toronto for two dollars and eighty cents. Now, if we had this cheap sugar, we could can all the apples that were not of the high standard required for export, and if we had free access to the German market we could export all the apples that were of too high a grade for canning. Why, then, not try to make some kind of a trade arrangement with Germany on the basis of the free admission of German sugar into Canada in return for the free admission of Canadian fruit into Germany ? We can afford it, for we have a surplus. Canadians at present contribute to this surplus by paying duty on sugar to the amount of three million dollars a year, while Germany charges one dollar and fifty cents on every barrel of Canadian apples which now enter her markets. It is, therefore, plain that if we could get the duty taken off German sugar in Canada, and at the same time the duty off Canadian apples in Germany, our farmers would gain in two ways; first, by buying cheaper sugar. and secondly by selling dearer apples. This would be a mutually advantageous arrangement, and would be similar in its workings to the different trade treaties which Germany is now negotiating with other countries. The government of the United States has already made arrangements with Germany that the duty on apples shall not take effect in their case until next June, and no doubt in the meantime will make further arrangements. Can our government not do some thing in this matter to put our Canadian farmers on equal footing with those in the United States?

More, the arrangement which I have proposed is not only practical and possible, but it is fully in accord with the system of maximum and minimum tariffs, which we find in such well known protectionist countries as Germany, the United States and our own Dominion of Canada. Again, we have hundreds of thousands of German settlers and voters in this Dominion, and they will be greatly pleased by the removal of this surtax, for if a German in this country wishes to purchase a Bouker knife, or any of his favourite goods that have been manufactured in Germany, it is very difficult for him to understand why he must pay thirty per cent more for these goods than if they had been manufactured in France. He is very likely to resent such a discrimination against his fatherland. I hope, therefore, the government will consider this matter seriously, and that we will soon hear that the German surtax has been removed.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton). Mr. Speaker, it does seem to me very remarkable that the government knows so little about the German tariff which is said to have been in force since the first of March. It has been referred to a great many times during the present session. Information has been asked for time and time again. I will not weary the House with the references to it but I have these references under my hand. The Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) told us some weeks ago that he did not know anything about it but he thought the government might summon sufficient energy to write a letter about it. Afterwards, I think, on one occasion he promised to telegraph but he informed us this afternoon that it was a matter of such trifling importance to the government that he had forgotten all about it. The government were not always so careless about sending telegrams on less important subjects. I recollect on one occasion when there was some debate over the building of a railway in the Yukon the government hastened, without the slightest delay, to send a telegram to the High Commissioner for Canada inquiring—well, we do not know what the telegram was; the telegram was private, but the answer was to be public and it was communicated to the Liberal press promptly upon its receipt. There was a promise made to bring the telegram down but it never was brought down. The government are prompt enough to send telegrams to the High Commissioner or to any one else in regard to matters of that kind, but with thirteen or fourteen minsters of the Crown there is not one of them, who, during the last six weeks, has been able to devote sufficient attention to public business to send a telegram for the purpose of enabling the government to inform parliament as to the actual German tariff levied on goods exported from Canada to that country. This afternoon we had the extraordinary statement from the Minster of Customs that although this matter has been referred to at least half a dozen times by question, by attention called to it on the orders of the day and otherwise, there has been such extreme carelessness and negligence that nothing has been done up to the present time. Now, he frankly confesses that he had forgotten all about sending a telegram to the High Commissioner in regard to this subject involving very large interests in this country. Well, I did hope that some explanation would have been given of that other than the bald statement of the Minister of Customs that there have been absolute forgetfulness and negligence. Are not our trade relations with Germany of equal importance with the subject which demanded

a prompt telegram from the Prime Minister of this country to Lord Strathcona on the occasion to which I have just referred? When it is a question of a possible party advantage there is not a moment's delay or loss of time but when it comes to a question in which the interests of thousands of farmers are involved the government cannot find it in their hearts or in their energies to arouse themselves from that lethargy which seems to be creeping over some of the departments and send a telegram for the purpose of communicating to this parliament information which should have been available on the very first day of this session.

I agree with my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) that the taunt of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Armstrong) who moved this motion was entirely uncalled for. My hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong) saw fit to discuss a subject which ought to occupy the attention of the government if it has not occupied it up to the present time. I will not go into the history of the extraordinary series of blunders which led to the condition which now prevails. Every one knows the history of it. The government came down with a tariff policy in 1897 which was proclaimed by the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) to be a step in the direction of free trade. That was the principle upon which it was put forward. He said that the ship's head was now pointed towards the open sea, that it was the deliberate intention of this government to place upon the statute-books of this country a measure which, to the extent provided for, would give the people of Canada the advantage of lower duties from all the countries which were enumerated. It did give lower duties from a great many countries and from more countries than the government anticipated or intended at the time. They went on and they made strong representations which procured the denunciation of the German treaty. Upon what grounds was that treaty denounced? It was denounced by the government of Lord Salisbury upon the representation of this government, upon the strong, urgent demand of this government, for the reason that the continuance of the German and Belgian treaties was not in the interest of the empire as a whole. Very good. If these treaties were denounced in the interest of the empire as a whole how does it happen that without one single word of remonstrance from this government, the rest of the British empire, under a treaty made afterwards, secures from the German empire better tariff conditions than Canada does? That is a point that I have never been able to understand. It may be that this government having brought conditions into a very unhappy state by the action they took, the argument might be made that there was no other course for them to take than that into which they had driven themselves; but what I have never been able to understand, what I have challenged an answer to over and over again across the floor of this House is this: If the government of this country procured these treaties to be denounced upon the representation that their continuance was not in the interests of the whole empire, if they procured the assent of the Imperial government to the denunciation of these treaties upon that ground—and that was the ground expressed by Lord Salisbury—how does it happen that they have been sitting silent while the rest of the empire, under a treaty made by the mother country, is receiving better tariff treatment from Germany than Canada is? Has there ever been any remonstrance from the government to the British government in regard to this? The hon. Minister of Finance this afternoon said that this is a family affair; then why is not the whole family receiving the same treatment from Germany? Either his term is wrong or else the condition in which we find ourselves at the present time is undeserved. Family affairs, says the Minister of Finance. Well, if this treaty was denounced because this is a family affair within the British empire, how is it that one member of the family is shut out from that treatment which is accorded to all the other members of the family? How does it happen that the government of Canada sit silent without remonstrance while that undeserved treatment has been meted out? That is a subject which should have invited the attention of the government long ago; that is a question to which I have never heard any sufficient answer given, or indeed any answer at all. The consideration which the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) has given to this subject and the manner in which he has directed the attention of the public to the inaction of the government, deserve the thanks of the House and of the country.

Hon. WILLIAM PATERSON (Minister of Customs). It is not necessary to go back, as did the hon. the leader of the opposition, to a period when a discussion as to the wisdom of enacting the British preference would be of any practical value.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not go back any further than the Minister of Finance.

Mr. PATERSON. I am not finding fault, but I do say the British preference was fully discussed in the country in 1900 and the Liberal party were sent back to power by an overwhelming majority. We went to the country again after that, and not only did we announce our intention to maintain the British preference, but we announced that Germany having objected to our making this family arrangement by which Can-

ada made her tariff more favourable to the mother country, and representations having been made to Germany ; and having waited patiently for five years for Germany to see that her position towards Canada was not fair, and after using all means that could be employed between friendly nations to have justice rendered us ; we proposed to enact on our statute-book a surtax clause similar to that which Germany herself had on her statute-book. The German statute-book contains a law that if any country should discriminate against the German empire, Germany may put a surtax on the goods of that country equal to 100 per cent—we stopped at thirty-three and one-third per cent.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Did the German government put that tariff into force in 1903 ; did they apply the surtax against us in 1903 ?

Mr. PATERSON. They did not add the surtax they had the power to add on their maximum tariff, but under their law they had the power to add on their maximum tariff, but under their law they had the power to do it, not to the extent of thirty-three and one-third per cent but to the extent of 100 per cent. Just let me point out to my hon. friend that when this very German surtax was proposed by the government, this House agreed to it unanimously, and the line of argument pursued by gentlemen opposite then was : Ah, the Liberal government has at last awakened, and they are doing now what they should have done long ago. But why is this question revived in parliament and at this critical time ? Hon. gentlemen opposite are not ignorant of the fact (for I mentioned it) that we are being approached on the part of the German government with a view of seeing whether there cannot be freer and mutually beneficial trade relations established. These negotiations I believe will go further. Not very long ago an official of the German government saw the Minister of Finance again ; the thing is being discussed, and I think it was stated in the House that when the new tariff was introduced with a minimum and a maximum, then all questions could be considered in reference to this matter. I feel at one with the Minister of Finance that this being the present condition of the question, it is regrettable that responsible members of parliament should rise and virtually say that it is an absolute necessity for the prosperity of Canada that Canada should have the German market. Well, we don't believe that. We are anxious and we shall endeavour to extend our trade everywhere, but the extension of our trade must be on fair terms. I regret that under such conditions the opposition should think it well to bring this matter up and that the leader of the opposition should lend countenance to his followers in so doing, because when that gentleman representing the German government again approaches us he may come with the idea announced in Canada's parliament, that it is of vital interest to the people of Canada that we should get this treaty with Germany.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. What part of the remarks of the leader of the opposition does the Minister of Customs find fault with ?

Mr. PATERSON. The remarks of the leader of the opposition were altogether condemnatory of what he termed the blundering and the bungling of this government in enacting the preferential tariff ; and out of that preferential tariff sprung this whole difficulty with Germany which undertook to punish us for doing what we had a right to do.

Mr. HENDERSON. To blunder ?

Mr. PATERSON. No, it was not a blunder. If it were a blunder then it was a most fortunate blunder, for if ever there was anything that enriched the agriculturists of Canada it was that measure of preference in the British market. If the Liberal government can blunder into a measure so beneficial to this Dominion what will they do when they formulate a carefully considered and well matured policy ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. When was it the farmers of Canada got the preference in the British market to which the hon. gentleman refers ?

Mr. PATERSON. The farmers of Canada got that preference in the British market the day after the preference to Britain was declared in this parliament, they got it the day the London 'Times' and the other great newspapers of England proclaimed that Canada had given a preference to British goods, and when a feeling was aroused—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh !

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, a feeling was aroused in Britain in favour of Canadian goods ; a feeling that did not require to be crystallized into legislation ; a feeling that sent the British purchasers of goods into the market to ask as they had never asked before : Have you Canadian cheese ? have you Canadian butter ? Have you Canadian hams ? We want to buy from Canada for Canada has given us a preference. I have been from the Atlantic to the Pacific ; I have listened to farmers' deputations ; I have met them, I believe, in all the provinces of this Dominion, and I believe that every farmers' deputation that met us from the Atlantic to the Pacific emphatically declared : 'We stand for and demand a continuance of the preference to Great Britain.'

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question ? If Canada does not want a preference in the British market,

why did the government ask for it at the Colonial Conference in 1902 ?

Mr. PATERSON. I have not said that Canada does not want a preference in the British market. I said that Canada had got it from the good will of the people there—

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is that the only preference you asked for ?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. PATERSON. —and it is only betraying an ignorance of English sentiment for any hon. gentleman to attempt to deny that Canada and Canadian products stand better in the British market to-day than ever before. Moreover, the farmers, for whom the hon. gentleman professes to speak want the British preference continued. Let him go to them and suggest : If you will wipe out the preference to Great Britain, then Germany will have no cause of complaint against you, and you may be able to send them the $1,500,000 of goods you sent to them before,' and what will they say ? They will say : 'The $150,000,000 we send to England is worth a great deal more to us than the German market of $1,500,000, and we will stick to the preference.' What are the facts ? The facts are these, that under the old arrangement Germany was sending us double, treble, in some years nearly quadruple, the quantity of goods we were sending to Germany. What is the total of our exports of Canadian produce to Germany, which these gentlemen are talking about ? I am not saying that we would not be willing to increase our trade if we can, but we are not going to increase it by doing away with the British preference in order to please the Germans. We cannot do that ; the country is opposed to it. Our exports to Germany are very nearly as much now as they were before we were shut out off its market. For instance, in 1902, the year before the surtax was imposed, we imported from Germany $10,919,994 whereas Germany took from us of Canadian products of all kinds only $1,298,654. Last year the German surtax had such an effect upon what we bought from Germany that our imports from that country fell to $6,642,139. In 1903 we bought from them $12,127,867, and they took from us $1,618,517. In 1904 they took from us $1,358,910 and last year $1,123,586. We are sending them practically the same amount of goods we sent before the surtax was imposed, but Germany is sending us half the goods it sent us before, and therefore Germany is coming to us and saying : 'Can't we arrange this matter in some way?' And when she comes, she will point to the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite to show that Canada is in a difficult position because of the surtax. Sir, in regard to the British preference, we have nothing to take back ; we boast of it ; we say it was the greatest step ever taken to advance the agriculture and every other industry of Canada; we propose to mainfain it, and at the same time to extend the trade of Canada with all other nations as far as we can on fair and equitable terms. But no nation must attempt to discipline Canada if she sees fit to enact a tariff that will give a preference to other parts of the empire. Canadians will not tamely submit to that ; at least, the people's representatives on this side of the House will not. Allusion has been made to the fact that hon. gentlemen opposite asked for the new German tariff, which went into effect on March 1, and that we had promised it. It goes to the Trade and Commerce Department. I had asked for it. I gave the answer of the Department of Trade and Commerce. The Brussels Convention, to which Canada is a party, forwards the tariffs of all the countries connected with that Convention. It had not come to hand. I understood the deputy to say that they had wired Lord Strathcona for it. I did forget to ask him if it had come. I supposed it had not come, or he would have sent it to me. That is all I can say as to that. But of what avail or importance is it ? If it is in force, it is in force whatever it may be. It was going into force with reference to the United States , but the German government reconsidered the matter and extended the time temporarily for one year from March 1, 1906, to March 1, 1907. Then the United States, by proclamation of the President, extended the preference which they had given to Germany on certain articles ; and what are those articles ? They are some five in number; argols or crude tartar ; brandies or other spirits, reduced about 22½ per cent ; still wines and vermouth and some other liquors, reduced about 22½ per cent : and paintings in oil or water colours, pen and ink drawings and statuary, reduced from 20 per cent to 15 per cent, a reduction of about 25 per cent. These are the benefits which the United States gives to the Germans for which they get in return their conventional tariff. And what do hon. gentleman opposite propose to get from Germany to save our agriculturists from ruin, and what benefits do they propose to give to Germany ? When the representative of the German government comes to us to discuss this matter, he will want to know what we are prepared to give ? Should we say : If you give us your minimum and that minimum suits us, we shall give you our minimum. He will reply : Oh, you ought to be content with very much less. According to some of your representatives in parliament, it is a matter of life and death for you that you should get the duty on apples lowered. You ought therefore to be content if we lower the duty on apples provided you wipe out the surtax. That is the position which the speeches of these hon. gentlemen opposite would warrant the representative of the German government in taking. I can only repeat that the bringing up of this question by these hon. gentlemen

the line of argument they have taken is the most unfortunate they could have adopted at present ; and I speak as plainly as I do now in order that any representative in the German government may recognize that while we are anxious to do what is right and fair, and while we are anxious to have the most friendly relations with the German empire as well as any other country, yet we are not prepared to be dictated to how we shall manage our own fiscal affairs or quietly submit to be punished because we have done what we believe to be in our own interests and the interests of the empire.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON, (Halton). I must confess that we have had this afternoon one or two rather extraordinary exhibitions of temper. My hon. friend the Finance Minister rose in his place and denounced the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Armstring) as unpatriotic and in fact unfit to be a representative of the people, and we have just had an equal exhibition of temper along the same line from the hon. the Minister of Customs. I wonder what it is that has touched these hon. gentlemen so keenly? Is it the fact that they are conscious they have made a huge blunder in their arrangement of our fiscal tariff and that this consciousness is cutting them to the quick ? They are evidently beginning to realize their position but do not like to humilate themselves by acknowledging that they have blundered. I was astonished when I heard the Minister of Customs, a few moments ago, saying that we have a preference in the British market. Why, the Minister of Agriculture says that the agriculturists of this country do not want any preference. The Minister of Customs however says we have one. Where is the evidence of it ?

Mr. PATERSON. In the increased sales.

Mr. HENDERSON. If that is the only argument the hon. gentleman has to advance, I would advise him never to advance it again because he would be laughed out of court. If we sell more, Mr. Speaker, it is simply because we produce more. The United States likewise produce more and consequently sell more. If you increase your products, you have to sell more and do sell more. Is the fact of our selling more the only evidence the hon. minister has of a preference in the old country ? Can he point to a single instance in which we get a fraction of a cent to-day more for our cheese than we would get if we had not given British goods a preference ? Will he tell me that we get a cent a bushel more for our wheat than we would get if there had been no preference given by us ? I can tell him that in the last year of the Conservative regime, Canadian wheat sold at Toronto for 20 cents a bushel more than in the Liverpool market. Can he say it has ever sold at that price during the present regime ? Can he say we have had under the present administration a greater preference in the British market than we enjoyed under the old regime when we got that price for our great product ? Not at all. The hon. gentleman is advancing a most fallacious argument. In fact it is no argument at all, but simply a fallacious assertion and he is simply deceiving the people when he attempts to make them believe that we have a preference to-day in the British market over any other country.

Mr. PATERSON. Why do our farmers then insist that we should keep the preference in force ?

Mr. HENDERSON. I will tell him why. I have the honour of representing a county and have represented it during the last eighteen sessions—as honest a county as there is in the whole Dominion—and let me contrast the result of the verdict given by that county with that given by the hon. gentleman's riding. Since this preference was given, my majority has been increased and the majority in favour of this government reduced.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman has misunderstood me. I was referring to the fact that without exception, we have been urged, during the course of our tariff commission, to maintain this preference. That is what I was referring to.

Mr. HENDERSON. I have read a good many of those reports, and let me tell the hon. gentleman there are a lot of sensible farmers around the town of Berlin, and I would ask him did they give him the impression that they wanted this preference maintained ? I do not think that any such sentiment is general. But we all admit this. We all admit that there is a feeling in this country that we should show a sentimental preference to the old country.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. HENDERSON. Who denies it ? Should we not respect our mother country more than we do Russia or Germany or France or other European countries ? I think it is only reasonable that we should. The old country is the fatherland of the majority of our people and we look upon it with a great deal of respect. But why should we do something for it that will hurt our own Canadian people ? I am a Canadian first and British afterwards. I do not believe in taking the bread out of the mouths of the children of Canadian workingmen for the sake of helping even British workingmen, yet that is what we are doing. By our preference we are giving employment to the workingmen of Great Britain and depriving our own Canadian workingmen of the opportunity of doing that work. Will the hon. gentleman attempt to deny that ? He dare not because if he did the people would not have any confidence in any statement he would make. Do we import more goods? Yes, but we make less than

we would were it not for the increased importation. No doubt there is a class of people in this country who approve of the preference. There is the middleman, for instance, the wholesale importer, who makes more profit on imported goods than he does on Canadian goods, and who consequently will favour a preference for the mother country. But what has this preference done for Canada ? The Minister of Finance tells us that it has done a great deal. I have yet to learn that it has. I say, speaking for myself—I am not speaking for those around me, for I have not consulted them—that in my opinion the preference as given in 1897 and increased in 1898 and 1899, has not resulted in any substantial benefit to this country.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Are you in favour of repealing it ?

Mr. HENDERSON. When we come into power, we will answer that question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. HENDERSON. Well, I have no objection to giving my answer now, and I do not say one thing to-day and do the opposite to-morrow. I am not going to advocate a duty on cabbage to-day and lower it to-morrow. But let me say that had I now the opportunity I would strike the present preference off the statute-book. What we ought to have is a mutual preference. If we obtain a preference that will be equally advantageous for Great Britain and ourselves let us adopt it. But this jug-handled policy of the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Finance is not at all to my liking. I am not in favour of a preference that is wholly one-sided.

Mr. MILLER. My I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) a question?

Mr. HENDERSON. Certainly.

Mr. MILLER. Would the hon. gentleman vote a mutual preference upon our statute-books?

Mr. HENDERSON. I can assure the hon. gentleman that I will vote for anything that will bring benefit to Canada. I am not like the hon. gentleman (Mr. Miller) who would vote away all our rights and get nothing in return. My motto is 'Canada first and always. And if we can get a benefit through mutual preference I would certainly hold up both hands for it.

Now, the Minister of Customs is always prepared to discuss a question of this kind. He expressed surprise that some hon. gentleman on this side had gone so far back in the discussion. But a few moments after he had begun speaking we found he had got as far back as any hon. gentleman on this side. If there has been a benefit through the preference, I would like to ask the Minister of Customs where that benefit has come in. He has not shown us where we got one single cent more for our butter, cheese, bacon, hams, wheat, flour, eggs or anything else that we sent to Great Britain than we would have received. All that he is able to say is that we find a larger market there. Of course we find a larger market there, but that is because we are producing more every year. Canada is growing ; her cultivated area is becoming greater, and, no doubt, year after year, we shall continue to send more and more whether the hon gentleman reduces the preference or increases it. There is nothing in the hon. gentleman's argument that we sell more of the products of the farms of Canada in Great Britain.

Mr. DERBYSHIRE. At better prices.

Mr. HENDERSON. But can the hon. gentleman from Brockville (Mr. Derbyshire) say that we get one-tenth of one cent more for cheese than we would have got if there had been no preference? Does he mean to say that a customer—say some woman going into a shop in an English village say: I am willing to give you a cent more a pound for Canadian cheese because Canada gives us a preference in her markets ? I will undertake to say that there are twenty millions of people in Great Britain who never heard of the preference. A great many of our own people, I believe, are not fully familiar with the facts, but in Great Britain there are large numbers of people who do not even know that such a thing as the preference exists. Yet the hon. member for Brockville would tell us that the British people willingly pay more for cheese because we give Great Britain a preference in our markets.

Well, then, where is the advantage to us ? The Minister of Customs will tell us that we make our purchases of British goods at lower prices. How much lower? What was the policy on which they framed the tariff when they gave us the preference? They simply put up the duty on one thing and took it down on another. They put the duty on the white cotton that the hon. Minister of Customs' shirt is made of down to 16⅔ per cent, giving him a preference, but the man who works in a foundry or the farmer who, because of his occupation prefers a coloured shirt, has to pay 35 per cent—a decrease to the Minister of Customs but an increase to the workingman. And this is what the hon. gentleman calls a British preference. Why, I would not even call it a Yankee preference—it is simply a bit of humbug. The instance I have quoted is merely an instance, but it was repeated time after time in the scale of duties. And hon. gentlemen opposite told us last year that the preference was a failure. The Minister of Finance found that he had ruined the woollen industry of this country and that the woollen goods formerly made in Canada were not made here now, that our workmen were out of employment and were

going away to find homes in other parts of the world. And for sheer shame he came at last to the rescue—for a short time and to a slight extent. He gave back to that industry some of the protection he had taken away some years before. Instead of a duty of 23 per cent on woollen goods he increased it to 30 per cent—that is he re-reduced the preference. And what did he do with the iron industry? When he found that he had paralyzed that industry by his British preference he told the farmers and workmen of the country virtually: You will have to help the iron industry by going down in your pockets to pay a bonus to the producers of iron that the industry may be maintained. Time after time, this preference which they laud to the skies they themselves have condemned and brought to ridicule. And yet one of these hon. gentlemen asks me if I will vote against a preference. I should not be at all surprised if, when the revision of the tariff takes place, this preference will be wiped out. And by the way, there is something strange about that revision. We were to have had it in 1904, then in 1905, then most assuredly it was to come on in 1906. And now we are told that it may be brought down in November, 1906, but the probability is that it will be 1907 before we see it. There seems to be some thing about it that the hon. gentlemen opposite are afraid to disclose. If the new tariff is a good thing why do they not bring it down and let the people have the benefit of it. They have admitted that their preferential tariff is a failure and an injury. They have done this by restoring last year protection to the woollen industry. If they are going to do more for our industries, by all means let them not wait any longer, but let them come down with their new tariff and let our industries have the benefit of it. The Minister of Finance told us in his opening remarks that he had done no harm to our trade with Germany. And I think it was the Minister of Customs who said that we gave the same treatment to Germany that we gave to every other country. I wish to say just a word with reference to that because I think that is the kernel of the whole trouble. I do not wish to repeat what has already been said of the blundering of the hon. gentlemen opposite in causing the denunciation of these treaties and interfering in the trade between Canada and Germany, which trade has gone on very well for many years. Hon. gentlemen opposite tell us that the Germans took very little from us. But they must remember that the trade was growing, and had it not been interfered with we do not know what proportions it might have reached to-day. We know that there are certain articles that would find a market in Germany much more readily than in Great Britain. For instance, there is a class of wheat we grow, a softer class of wheat than we can find a market for in Great Britain, for which there is a large market in Germany. But we have practically been shut out of the German market by the action of the government. The hon. gentleman says that we are giving Germany everything that we are giving the others. But there is more than that in it—we took some thing away from Germany and have never restored it. We have given to her what we gave to others, but we have not given back to her what we took from her. Is it any wonder that the German people have felt chagrined and have retaliated against us to our great injury? It seems to me it is no wonder at all, and I hope and trust that the government will use their best endeavours to win back for us the markets of Germany which we had. Of course, we are not begging. Of course, we can get along without these markets. We are not saying it is an absolute necessity, as the Minister of Customs presumed to assert we were doing. I think possibly Canada might get along. But we would like to get into the German market because we find it is a market that would consume a great deal of Canadian products and I hope and trust that the government will do something to enable us to get into that market for such products as Canada has a superabundance of. Now, I must confess that it was not my intention to occupy much time of the House. But this is rather an interesting subject, and the Minister of Customs has exhibited so much warmth in discussing this that I thought there must be something troubling him, and I hope I have been able to say something that will soothe him and make him feel a little better particularly in making him realize the fact that we never had a preference in the British market, and have not got one to-day.

Mr. M. S. SCHELL (South Oxford). It was not my intention to join in this discussion when the matter came before the House this afternoon, but after the challenge that has been thrown out by the last speaker the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson), I feel that justice to this country requires me to answer him. I am surprised that a gentleman of his intelligence and knowledge of the conditions of this country should challenge this side of the House to show wherein our products are receiving a better price in the English markets to-day than they were before the surtax was imposed. For instance, consider the article of cheese. Are we getting any more for our cheese to-day that we were formerly? Let us look at some figures. In 1896 our exports of cheese to the British market amounted to 164,689,133 lbs. which was sold at an average price of 8·46 cents per lb. In 1904 our exports of cheese increased to 233,980,716 lb., which sold at an average price of 10·29 cents per lb., an increase of 1·84 cents per lb. Our total sales in 1896 for cheese amounted to $13,956,571; in 1904 they

amounted to $24,099,004. The increased price of 1·84 cents per lb. on the product of 1904, represented alone a value to this country of $3,434,216.

Mr. HENDERSON. Of course the hon. gentleman does not wish to misrepresent me. I never said the price was not higher to-day than it was before, I merely said that the Minister of Trade and Commerce was not able to show that cheese was one fraction of a cent higher to-day than it would have been had we not the preference.

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. Very well. The hon. gentleman had something else in his mind than I supposed, and something else than this House supposed when he made that challenge. If we look at the exports of our butter, we find that in 1896 they amounted to 1,552,000 lb., which brought an average price of a trifle over 17 cents per lb. Ten years later, under the present system, we find that our exports of butter amount to 5,930,000 lb. Now the increased price of a cent a lb. which obtained between those periods, on the products we exported in 1905, would represent a value of nearly $300,000. If we take last year's exports of butter to England, we find they amount to $8,000,000, an increase of nearly 500 per cent over the exports of butter in 1896, and an increase in price of nearly 20 per cent, since the average price this year is 20½ cents per lb., as compared with a little over 17 cents per lb. in 1896. Hon. gentlemen opposite say that the United States is producing more cheese and selling more cheeese, as well as Canada, in the English market. What are the facts ? 15 years ago Canada was exporting to England about 99,000,000 lb. of cheese. At the same time the United States was exporting about 240,000,000 lb. in round numbers. To-day the situation is entirely reversed. We find that the United States is exporting to the English markets less than 100,000,000 pounds, while the exports of Canadian cheese have climbed up to nearly 240,000,000 pounds. Now if we compare the price we are obtaining for our products with the price obtained by other countries, we find that our butter is bringing a price in the English market almost on a par with the best Danish butter, which is considered the best butter in the world. A few years ago they were beating us in that market by 6 cents a pound. During the last year we find that Canadian butter is bringing the very same price as Danish butter, within about a cent a pound, and in some cases it is selling at the very same price. We are capturing the English market with our cheese, and it is largely because of the sentiment that has been spoken of here to-night —not altogether but partially. England has come to appreciate the goods that we send her, and partly because of that appreciation she has come to use our products. We find to-day that Canadian cheese supplies almost entirely the English market. We are supplying them with nearly 80 per cent of the total amount of cheese they import from other countries.

I claim in connection with this discussion that our friends opposite are not taking a position that they would like to advocate in the country. Only a few years ago they were proclaiming their loyalty to the flag, they were talking about loyalty to the British Crown, and advocating a preference to England, but when this government did give a preference to England they said, you have waited too long, why did you not arrange for this preference years before ? To-day we have that preference and I believe there is not an hon. member in this House but who will concede that our products are appreciated more highly because of the preference which was given to the English producers.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question ? Do I understand that we get a penny more for our cheese, butter, or goods of any kind because of that preference ? Is it not quality that sells the goods in the old country ?

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. Because of that preference the English consumers have been led to ask for Canadian goods. Realizing the superior quality of Canadian goods they have been educated to pay a better price for them and they have come to demand Canadian cheese, butter, apples and all the other products which we send to Great Britain because they appreciate their superior qualities. This condition has been largely brought about because of the preference that was granted to England in our own Canadian market. I have not the slightest doubt of that fact. I have been in very close touch with English buyers of our products and at the time that this preference was granted to England in our markets it was repeatedly referred to as a friendly, a generous act upon the part of the Canadian government. I know from experience in connection with the English trade that English buyers began to ask for our products because of the preference we gave to them in our markets. Now, touching this question of apples I happen to have some knowledge in connection with the apple trade. You would imagine from the discussion that has been going on this afternoon and evening that we were sending a very large quantity of apples to Hamburg or to other German markets. Millions of dollars have been referred to. What are the facts ? Our exports of apples to the German market have amounted to about $30,000 a year while our exports to the English market during the same time have exceeded $2,000,000.

Mr. PATERSON. $2,500,000.

Mr. M. S. SCHELL. Exceeded $2,500,000, and some years even more than that,

but take last season as an instance, we know that the German markets have been fairly good for Canadian apples—not better than the English market, perhaps not as good, certainly not as good a year ago as last season. This last fall the German markets were fairly good but still not as good as the English markets. I know from personal experience. We have this market still open, it is a market that will take more apples and take them at better paying prices and if the German government are not prepared to allow our apples to go in on the same basis as apples from the United States I do not think it is becoming in us from the standpoint of our dignity as a nation and as a people to concede to Germany favours when they are not willing to treat with us on the same basis as they treat with other foreign nations. We have given them the same privilege to trade with us that we have given to other foreign nations and we claim that we should be dealt with on the same basis. If they put an exclusive duty on our apples we do not feel that it is becoming in us to sacrifice our national dignity and pander to the German market when we are not compelled to do so. I believe that we will not suffer materially even if we do not have the German market to which to ship our apples. In connection with this discussion I am sure that the Canadian people will stand by the government that has inaugurated this arrangement or that has given England a preference in our markets. I am sure this discussion will show that the government is prepared to stand by that arrangement and we believe it would be for the best interests not only of the farmers who have been specially referred to but of the people of this Dominion as a whole.

Mr. D. DERBYSHIRE (Brockville). Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the House to a few figures in connection with our trade with Great Britain and I would specially call them to the attention of the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson). At the time when the preference was given in 1897 our exports of butter, cheese and bacon were $19,000,000 and since the time that the attention of the British market has been riveted on Canada on account of this preference the increase in our exports has been over $3,000,000 a year until 1905 when we reached the large sum of $5,000,000 more money than we ever received before for our butter, cheese and bacon while in the meantime prices were going up on account of the quality and on account of the preference we had in the British market. We have literally driven the American people out of the British market in connection with butter and cheese. They are exporting less each year while we are exporting more, while we are receiving more money and while we are selling our cheese at higher prices than they are receiving for theirs. I believe that Canada is going to be the greatest country in the world in the production of these articles and that the prices will continue to advance. The government and the country are becoming famous on account of the preference we have given which is rivetting the attention of the British people on the goods that we produce, bringing about a higher appreciation of their quality and leading to the enhancement of prices.

Our exports of these articles in 1905 were $50,000,000, and we consumed at home $50,000,000.

Mr. G. W. FOWLER (King's and Albert). Mr. Speaker, it would seem to me that the Year Book contains a pretty complete answer to the remarks of the hon. member for Brockville (Mr. Derbyshire) and the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Schell). I find on looking at the Year Book, page 340, that a statement is given of the amount of our exports to the various countries with which we trade and I see that in 1894 our total exports to Great Britain were $60,878,000. A percentage of 58·41 of our trade. In 1904 it is true that the gross amount of our exports had risen but the percentage of trade, instead of having risen had considerably fallen off because the percentage was only 55·50 per cent. This was the country to which we gave a preference between 1894 and 1904. Instead of claiming that the preference has produced an increase of trade it is just as fair an argument to say that it has produced a diminution of trade. Take the United States. Our trade with the United States was $32,872,000 in 1894. In 1904, it had increased to $66,856,000. The percentage in 1894 was 31·57 per cent while in 1904 it had risen to 33·70 per cent, an increase of trade with the United States, a country to which we have given no preference whatever, whereas with a country to which we have given a preference trade has fallen off by over three per cent.

It seems to me, that is a complete answer. Judging by what the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Schell) said, one would think we had a preference in the British market. He said the people of Britain were so filled with gratitude to Canada on account of the preference we gave them, that they trade more with us than they otherwise would. Well, the fact is that our precentage of trade with them has fallen off comparatively. It is absurd to say that Englishmen will pay more for their cheese because we have given English manufacturers a preference. Sentiment has very little to do with trade. Is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Schell) so loyal that he will pay more for British goods than for American goods of the same quality ? We heard the Minister of Finance attempt to lecture the member for Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) on his loyalty. That was a strange role for the Finance Minister ; a gentleman who only

a few years ago ran an election in Nova Scotia on the cry of secession from the Dominion; a man who did all he could to break up this confederation and to prevent Canada from being the brightest gem in the British crown. It is he who, because he is now reaping the fruits of office and is ultra loyal on that account, had the presumption to lecture my hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong) on his loyalty to Britain and British institutions. It was like to Satan reproving sin. I am sorry the Minister of Finance is not here to-night for I would like to tell him something about that secession campaign of his in Nova Scotia.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). I would not have spoken in this debate had it not been for the line taken by the leader of the opposition in this discussion. I had hoped that the hon. gentleman would have declared that his party was not against the British preference; that his followers were not prepared to sacrifice that great policy for the sake of getting a little momentary advantage in the German market. The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) is one of the oldest members of the opposition; he sits on the right hand of the leader of his party and is entitled to speak with authority, and the tenor of all his remarks was that the British preference was a thing to be abhored and that we ought to immediately do away with it in order to get into the German market.

Mr. SPROULE. I must have been unfortunate if I conveyed that impression. My whole criticism was on the blundering of the government which got us into this unfortunate position.

Mr. FISHER. Got us into this unfortunate position by giving a preference to Great Britain; there was nothing else to get us into what my hon. friend calls an unfortunate position.

Mr. SPROULE. You got into that position by violating the solemn treaties made between the mother country and other nations, and afterwards declaring that your conduct was not a violation of these treaties.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend can call it what he likes; it was the preference to Great Britain given by Canada which we believed we had the right to give notwithstanding any treaties which the British empire may have had with foreign countries; it was that which brought about the action of Germany. And indeed so strong was the feeling in favour of our contention in that regard that although the law officers of the crown thought that perhaps it was not legal, nobody doubted but that it was just and right; nobody doubted that this policy of the Canadian government was not good policy, and it was followed immediately by the British government denouncing these treaties. It was by reason of the action of the Canadian government that a totally new relationship arose between the self-governing colonies of the empire and the mother country in regard to foreign treaties, and to Canada is due the credit for bringing that very desirable end about. The hon. gentleman from Halton (Mr. Henderson) agrees with his friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) that the denunciation of the German and Belgian treaties was a deplorable thing, but they forget that Sir Charles Tupper and their old time leaders, long before the Liberals came to power, urged the Imperial government to abolish these very treaties. Well, Sir, no matter what these gentlemen may think it is nevertheless true that the denunciation of these treaties was a step in advance for the colonies of the British empire, and that Canada has the honour of bringing that result about. And, up to this evening I have never heard a responsible man in public life in Canada undertake to say that this denunciation of these treaties was a mistake or a blunder. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) wondered why so much heat was displayed by the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs. I do not think there was any heat shown, but I do believe there was room for resentment in that any man on the floor of the Canadian parliament should undertake to plead for Germany when we have simply been hitting back as the result of the violent and unjustifiable attack by Germany on Canadian agriculture and Canadian trade. It is deplorable to see such tactics pursued in this House. I feel certain that hon. gentlemen opposite must take the consequence of what they have done to-night.

Some hon. MEMBERS Hear, hear.

Mr, FISHER. Hon. gentlemen opposite say hear, hear; do they agree with me, or do they agree with the member for Lambton and the member for Halton?

Mr. FOWLER. I would'nt like to agree with you.

Mr. FISHER. They do not agree with me; then they will be taken to task by the people of Canada who do agree with me. My hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) was present at the recent fruit grower's conference when I pointed out that Canada was quite ready to trade with Germany, but was not willing to go cap in hand and beg Germany for favours. My hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong) heard the fruit growers of Canada applaud that statement of mine. I would have expected that the statement should have been applauded by my hon. friend, but judging from what he said to-night it was not.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I did not happen to be there at the time and could not have applauded.

Mr. FISHER. Then I can tell the hon. gentleman that the fruit growers at that conference representing as they did practically the whole of Canada, in large majority if not unanimously applauded that sentiment and accepted the explanation which I gave of the policy of the government. I regret that the leader of the opposition did not on behalf of his party repudiate the idea announced by some of his followers, that we must do away with the British preference so that we may get entrance to the German market. I had hoped and expected that the leader of the party would have declared that that was not the policy of the party; but as he sat silent and allowed it, and as he spoke without so declaring, I think we are entitled to say that that is the policy of the opposition, and we are ready to join issue with them on that as on many other questions before the people of Canada.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Not to join issue, because the government themselves threatened to repeal the preference in 1902, and again in 1903.

Mr. FISHER. I do not think the hon. gentleman quite catches what I mean.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. You catch what I mean.

Mr. FISHER. I want to say a word or two about the preference. Hon. gentlemen opposite have talked a good deal about what I said on a certain occasion in regard to a preference for Canada in the English market. I said that the farmers of Canada made no demand on Great Britain for a preference for their foodstuffs in her market. I say it again. I say the farmers of Canada have had abundant opportunity to ask for that, and they have failed to ask for it, and I do not believe they will ask for it on the terms on which they would require to ask. The hon. member for East Lambton (Mr. Armstrong) said that the farmers of Canada would like to have a preference in the English market. They have a preference in the English market; they have had it for years, ever since England has enjoyed a preference in our market. Hon. gentlemen opposite have declared, and they have repeated to-night, that the policy of giving a preference in our markets to Great Britain without demanding a quid pro quo, was a blunder and practically a crime against Canadian interests. What does that mean? It means that there would have been no British preference in Canada for the last nine years. It means, according to the judgment of the English people, delivered a few months ago, that for many years to come there would not have been a preference for Canada in the English market. What does that mean? It means that we would have stood in the same position in regard to the sale of our food products in the British market that we did prior to 1897—that we would have had no preference, no sentimental preference if you like to call it such, in that market. It means as a matter of fact that we would not to-day be reaping the enormous advantage which the farmers of Canada do reap as the result of giving a preference to English manufacturers and exporters in our markets. That is what the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite would have resulted in. I believe the people of Canada are well satisfied with the British preference which this government inaugurated and which I believe they will carry on for many years to come.

My hon. friend reproaches me because I said that as far as I personally as a farmer in Canada was concerned, I was rather glad that the English people had decided not to impose taxes on food products going into the English market. I think I can justify that position. I believe that if England were to impose a tax on the food imported for her working classes, she would impair the purchasing power of those classes, and in doing that she would strike a blow against the farmers of Canada, because she would seriously impair the market of the Canadian farmer in Great Britain. I believe moreover that if England were to do that she would seriously impair the unity and solidarity of the British empire. I can understand very well that short-sighted people might say that if the Canadian farmer could get a cent or two more a bushel for his wheat at the expense of the English working classes, it might be well for him; but I do not believe the Canadian farmer, prospering as he is on our fertile soil, and making money continuously out of what he sells to the great labouring and consuming masses of Great Britain, wants those people to be taxed and injured in their work in that way for his benefit. My hon. friend says the Canadian farmer would like to get two or three cents a bushel more for his wheat. What does that mean? It means that the working classes of Great Britain who buy that wheat, or the flour made from it, would have to pay more for their bread. That would mean that the commercial and industrial stability of the mother land would be seriously threatened. That would mean that the food of the English labouring classes would be made dearer. It would mean probably a commercial crisis in Great Britain, which would be the most serious catastrophe that could come to the Canadian farmer, the basis of whose prosperity is the market of the mother land. Does my hon. friend think it would tend to the unity and solidarity of the British empire if the labouring classes of England could be told, 'your bread is made dearer for the benefit of the Canadian farmer'? Would that give them feelings of brotherly love towards the Canadian farmer? I do not believe for one moment that the Canadian

farmer is going to take the British people by the throat and say to them, 'if you do not give us that advantage in your market, we will disrupt the empire.' I have said that before on the floor of parliament, and in saying it I believe I speak the almost unanimous sentiment of the Canadian parliament and the Canadian people.

Mr. SPROULE. Perfect rot.

Mr. FISHER. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to be ready to say almost anything so long as they can sneer at and hurt the British preference. I regret it. I thought we were coming to be unanimously in favour of the British preference in the Canadian market. Hon. gentlemen opposite at last come out and frankly oppose it. I believe they have felt that way for a long time past—why ? Not because they had any hard feelings against Great Britain or wanted to injure her, but simply because this government introduced the preference, and therefore, because it is supposed to be a part of the Liberal policy, they are ready to attack it from a purely partisan and party spirit, and nothing else.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that a preference to Canadian products, such as grain and other foodstuffs, in the English market, would in his opinion disrupt the British empire ?

Mr. FISHER. The hon. gentleman has heard what I said, and he has probably read what I said before.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Is that what the hon. gentleman said just now ?

Mr. FISHER. I said that it would tend to disrupt the harmony and strain the relations between the different parts of the British empire.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why did this government ask for it, then, at the Colonial Conference in 1902 ?

Mr. FISHER. The hon. gentleman forgets that when this government proposed that, there was a tax on wheat coming into the British market, and we asked that that tax should be removed on Canadian wheat. We asked for a benefit to the English consumer, and not a hurt. That is very different from putting a tax on. The hon. gentleman is a little at fault in the history of the question, and has forgotten that fact.

Mr. SPROULE. That tax on breadstuffs for war purposes did not seem to disrupt the British empire very much.

Mr. FISHER. That tax did not disrupt the British empire, because it was imposed for a different purpose. And it was found even then by the Chancellor of the Exchequer so unfortunate that about a year afterwards he refused it.

An hon. MEMBER. The war was over.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, but was it reimposed? Was it reimposed for the purpose of giving a preference to another part of the empire ? The two things are absolutely and totally different. In the one case, Great Britain, on her own initiative, without any discussion from the outside, without any incitement or demand, chose, for her own fiscal purposes, to put on a tax. Then she repealed that tax when ready. When imposing that tax, she had the opportunity of giving a preference but failed to take it. I myself, on the floor of this House, some years ago pointed out that England had probably made a mistake in not then giving the preference. When a tax is imposed to meet a deficiency in revenue and then a preference is given that implies that the main object in imposing the tax is to raise additional revenue and the preference reduces taxation insofar as it applies. But when we come to impose a tax for the express purpose of giving a preference by reducing it to a certain extent, that is imposing it for a different purpose than the raising of revenue and increases taxation.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The intention makes the difference.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, it makes a great deal of difference and the results and consequences are absolutely different. Why ? My hon. friend does not seem to be able to appreciate or understand.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I certainly do not.

Mr. FISHER. No, nor do I expect him to understand. These things I fear are absolutely beyond the comprehension of hon. gentlemen opposite.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. They most certainly are.

Mr. FISHER. They certainly do not seem able to appreciate or understand them. My hon. friend may cover up his ignorance by his inane laughing, but that will not cover it up to the people of this country who have found him out and know how hollow and empty are his pretensions. We have had the same kind of thing before from these hon. gentlemen. We were told by them before 1896 that it was absurd to suppose that by reducing the taxation we could increase the revenue. We were told by them that if we took the duties off certain goods, we would ruin the manufacturers of Canada. Well, in 1897 we did reduce the duties and we did reduce the taxes.

Mr. GANONG. You ruined some of them too.

Mr. FISHER. Did we ? Where are they?

Mr. BENNETT. The Montreal 'Herald'.

Mr. FISHER. That was ruined before. These hon. gentlemen told us that if we re-

duced the customs duties we would destroy the revenue. But my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, in spite of these protestations, reduced the duties in 1897 very materially. He cut down the duties on a very large number of articles and he put a lot of things on the free list. With what result ? The result was an immediate increase of revenue. My hon. friends opposite argued that if we reduced these protective duties, we would destroy the industries of Canada. Well, the industries of Canada were at that time in a pretty prostrate condition. I remember very well, as no doubt others do, that when the Minister of Finance announced his budget in 1897, the leader of the opposition, then Sir Charles Tupper, pictured the wailing and the gnashing of teeth of the unoccupied labouring men of Canada, standing around the street corners, not knowing where to get the bread with which to feed their children. But the results utterly falsified his predictions. All Canada knows that although we reduced the duties, Canadian manufacturer have been prospering ever since in a way they never dreamed of under the old protective tariff. But hon. gentlemen opposite do not appreciate or understand true economic principles. They were not able to carry those principles out when they were in power and they cannot understand how it is, when we carry them out, the results are satisfactory. I do not expect them to understand the principles which underlie our tariff policy to-day.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FISHER. They cannot understand how it has succeeded. That is beyond the comprehension of my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) ; and as long as he remains in that condition, he will stay where he is and we will remain in office. My hon. friend told us that we failed to remonstrate about this German discrimination. Again his memory is at fault. He was in his place when the Minister of Finance in 1903 delivered his budget speech and announced the surtax against Germany, and my hon. friend must remember that speech because it, was a notable one. In it the Minister of Finance went over the whole matter. He pointed out how after the treaty was denounced, Germany immediately began negotiations with England for another commercial treaty and how when that treaty was consummated and signed, it contained a clause insisted upon by Germany, which singled out Canada, as the one part of the British empire, which could not have the advantage of it. My hon. colleague went on to show that we had protested against that clause. He read a memo. which he himself had prepared. He read a letter of Lord Strathcona and various other papers which showed that no sooner had Germany thus discriminated against Canada than the government here protested and entered into negotiations to secure the elimination of that particular clause.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I did not discuss that speech at all.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend asked why did we not remonstrate.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon. I did not make that statement. I said that this government had not made the proper remonstrance, as far as I had ever heard, against the renewal of a treaty between Great Britain and Germany on terms which give the rest of the empire better treatment than was given to Canada.

Mr. FISHER. I have just been telling the hon. gentleman that we did protest.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Where ?

Mr. FISHER. I have it right here under my hand. The Minister of Finance, in describing that treaty said :

> But they specifically excluded Canada from the benefits of that treaty.

Mr. SPROULE. It said Great Britain and the colonies.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, they extended it to Great Britain and the colonies generally but they particularly excluded Canada. Just so soon as that became known, we entered our protest against it. Communications passed between our government and the High Commissioner in London. The old treaty did not expire until the end of April, 1898, and on July 11, 1898, shortly after it had actually expired, Lord Strathcona addressed a letter to the Under Secretary of State for the colonies. That was laid on the table and all the correspondence on the subject, but for the purpose of my argument I shall read one or two letters which will put the House in possession of the actual facts. I have all the letters and details of these negotiations, which were being carried on with Lord Strathcona and which were afterwards transferred to Canada and carried on through Mr. Bott, the German Consul.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I understand that those were remonstrances, through the British government, to Germany.

Mr. FISHER. They were remonstances against Canada being excluded from the advantages of that treaty. What more does my hon. friend want ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The point I made was this, that if, as the Minister of Finance said, this was a familly affair, how was it that the rest of the British empire made a treaty from which Canada was excluded.

Mr. FISHER. Because Germany wished to punish us for having been instrumental in the denunciation of the British German treaty.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Why did the rest of the family consent to one of its members being punished ?

Mr. FISHER. The rest of the family managed their affairs and we did ours. We protested to Germany through Great Britain as we always have to do. My hon. friend knows that we cannot directly protest to a foreign power.

Mr. SPROULE. In the budget speech of 1897, when the Minister of Finance introduced the British preference, and when he was told that this was an open violation of a British treaty, did not he go direct then? The contention was that we did not act through England, but acted direct for ourselves.

Mr. FISHER. We acted for ourselves, no matter whom it might strike. That is what we do and propose to do. We propose to act for Canada and in the interest of Canada, and, if it happens to strike anybody else, so much the worse for him. Hon. gentlemen opposite are inclined to say that when anything that they do injures British connection, so much the worse for British connection. But we do not do that, we watch out that nothing under our policy shall happen to the injury of that connection.

Mr. SPROULE. In other words, thank God you are not like other men.

Mr. FISHER. Thank God we are not like hon. gentlemen opposite. On that point, I am glad to say, I am thoroughly in accord with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule). Thank God the government is not as impotent as the opposition. Now, I suppose I have convinced my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) that we did remonstrate, so I need not go on with that.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. The hon. gentleman has not convinced me at all.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) is very hard to convince when he does not want to see things, and when he does want to see them he can imagine them even when they are not there.

I would like to say this: While we are not prepared to go hat in hand to Germany or any other country to beg for favours, we are quite ready to trade with them, quite ready to open negotiations with them, if they will treat us as fairly as they treat other people. In all our tariff legislation since coming into office, we have assumed the position that such legislation is a domestic affair, one that we deal with in the interests of the people of Canada, as is our right and duty, and that we are not doing any injustice to anybody outside of our own bounds by what we may do by tariff legislation to advance our own interests. As to the preference, we think it to our interest—to our interest especially—to give a preference to the mother country and to such other colonies of the empire as choose to come in with us on that line. It happened—and we were glad of the fact; we were perhaps somewhat influenced in doing what we did, because we expected the fact to result—that it benefited the empire at large and so promoted imperial unity and imperial harmony. I believe, speaking for myself, and for every hon. member on this side, that we shall be glad at any time if the government and people of Canada can do anything to promote imperial unity and imperial harmony and to strengthen the empire. We have done a great deal of that kind of thing since we came into office. The predecessors of hon. gentlemen opposite used to say that they monopolized the loyalty to the empire of the people of Canada. I confess that when that used to be said in the old days I resented it.

Mr. SPROULE. At the time of the commercial union agitation, it would seem so.

Mr. FISHER. At any time. At no time in Canada was there any large section of the people disloyal to the empire, or, if such a time ever existed, it was in the old days long gone by, and among the friends of hon. gentlemen opposite, when the leaders of that party signed a manifesto in favour of annexation.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) allow me to ask him a question ?

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) will allow me to finish. I say it is an unfortunate thing for Canada when a considerable portion of the people are accused of disloyalty.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Why do you do it then ?

Mr. FISHER. We are not doing it; we have never done it. The predecessors of hon. gentlemen opposite for years traduced the Liberal party of this country by accusing us of disloyalty, and, as I have said, I resent that. But while these gentlemen were shouting their lip-loyalty through the length and breadth of the land what did they ever do for the benefit of the empire, or what did the government who represented them do to strengthen the connections between the colonies and the mother land? Nothing. They imposed the highest protective duties against British goods. And when it was pointed out that this was not going to help British connection, their leading organ answered: So much the worse for British connection. They have opposed the British preference. They have come out, at last, in the open and we hear them saying now that they do not want the preference, the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) said that

if he had his way he would destroy it. That means that these hon. gentlemen would destroy one of the greatest engines for the consolidation of the empire and the strengthening of the ties of empire ever invented. They want to do away with the sentiment that the preference created in Great Britain and in other colonies, and that incitement to imperial connection of which that step was the greatest that, up to that time had ever been taken. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been against doing these things, while they were ready to talk and shout about their loyalty. I say again that it is bad for the country and for the empire for any part of this country to accuse any other part of disloyalty. I do not accuse hon. gentlemen opposite of disloyalty. I see in their remarks only an incapacity to understand the question. I understand that such speeches as those of my hon. friend from Lambton (Mr. Armstrong), my hon. friend from West Kent (Mr. Clements), my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) and my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson) show that they simply do not understand the use that will be made of what they say. They do not understand and appreciate what is involved in their utterances. While I am far from accusing them of lack of patriotism or disloyalty, I am sorry for their incapacity, and I am disposed to say: The Lord forgive them.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher) would not extend to me the courtesy that I commonly extend to hon. gentlemen on the other side of granting me permission to ask him a question. Perhaps I may be allowed to ask it now. I would like to ask of the hon. gentleman if his party had succeeded in bringing about commercial union with the United States would that have resulted in greater loyalty on the part of Canada to the mother country?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, it would have resulted in prosperity and prosperity always tends to contentment and unity.

Mr. SPROULE. Perhaps——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

An hon. MEMBER. Put him out.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the hon. gentleman who makes that observation come over here and try it. If he will, I will give him such a lesson as he has not had for a long time.

Mr. SPEAKER. Order.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. There had better be order on both sides.

Mr. SPEAKER. The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) will notice that I was calling for order on the government side.

Mr. SPROULE. I only asked at the hands of hon. gentlemen opposite a little of the courtesy that I always extend to them.

Mr. W. H. BENNETT (East Simcoe). I was so overcome with the grief that seized the majority in the chamber last Friday night, Mr. Speaker, that I really do not remember whether you were in the Chair or not when the government side sat in sackcloth and ashes weeping over the remarkable announcement made by a minister of the Crown with regard to the contract of the North Atlantic Trading Company. But the government and their followers have evidently recovered a little to-night, and my benevolent and good-natured friend the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) is trying to galvanize a little life into them. It was a sad scene last Friday night, and I suppose the government have hardly recovered from it and for that reason the Minister of Customs has endeavoured to be a little hilarious. When the Minister of Customs gets hilarious he goes beyond all bounds. To-night he told us about the triumphant wave this government had during the last three elections. I think the hon. gentleman forgot all about the result in the province of Ontario, because the Minister of Customs, if he will permit me to say so, is a political outcast in Ontario, and goes from riding to riding wherever he can be taken in. He is not at all sure of the strength of this government in the province of Ontario. They say that when people get advanced in years—that is what the hon. member for North Ontario always says of him when he is interviewed—they always have a liking to go home. But there is no liking to go home with the Minister of Customs. Why, Sir, he represented the riding of South Brant for years and years. But the hon. gentleman won't dare to go home to South Brant for trial. And why? Because he knows what would overtake him, and so he hies away to a hive of 900 or 1,000 majority, and there he secures his election. There was not a minister from Ontario the last time who had the hardihood or the nerve to go into a fighting constituency, not one of them. The late Mr. Sutherland went into a hive, the late Postmaster General went into a hive, and my hon. friend the Minister of Customs took good care to go into a hive. He knew what had happened to him in his old home once before when he was thrown out there. It was unfortunate that the member for South Oxford (Mr. Schell) happened in this debate to talk about the feeling prevailing in the province of Ontario towards this government. Why, Sir, that political outcast as he has often been called by the Liberal party themselves, Sir Richard Cartwright, used to have a majority of 1,100 or 1,200 in South Oxford, and my hon. friend could not get up to the 500 mark. That is the idea the province of On-

tario has of these gentlemen. The hon. gentleman knows very well that in the province of Ontario they would have been beaten thoroughly last time had it not been for the influences of the local government in the back ridings. The hon. Minister of Customs and the premier himself know, wherever they went in the province of Ontario, what followed in their wake. Why, a trail of devastation to Liberal members. The premier and the Minister of Customs both came into East Simcoe, and what was the result? My majority went up to 400. I hope that these hon. gentlemen will come again, as every time they come they will increase my majority. The same thing happened everywhere in the province of Ontario. The next time when the election takes place there they will have the criminal law behind them. That was their only chance in Ontaria the last time. When the criminal law is against them and they have not the local government to back them up—the Minister of Customs turns his head. Why, Sir, he remembers how the criminal law in Ontario backed them up in all their proceedings, he knows it well. That is the only reason that these hon. gentlemen had any foot-hold in the province of Ontario. Now, the Minister of Customs, when he comes here and discusses any question, had better stick to the facts and not get into a boastful mood. He boasted about what they did in the last election. Why, if all their men had not been able to do more than the Minister of Customs, they would not have had a corporal's guard. What had the British preference to do in the province of Nova Scotia where the hon. gentleman swept the board? What had it to do in British Columbia where the hon. gentleman swept the board?

Mr. MILLER. I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman is not discussing the question before the House.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, now, I am surprised that this hon. gentleman should have jumped into the debate. He explained how he came here the other day, by an expenditure of $1,200, when I will be bound to say he made a declaration that his expenses were under $300, and I challenge him to produce the account of his agent at that time.

Mr. MILLER. I say the hon. gentleman is not discussing the question before the House.

Mr. BENNETT. Now the hon. gentleman has got touched on the raw. He knows that he published no statement showing $1,200 expenditure in his riding. I challenge him to produce it. He told us the other day that he had spent $1,200. Why, Sir, where did the money go? Perhaps the hon. gentleman knows. Now the Minister of Customs is excusable to-night. There had been a chill over the government benches on account of that unfortunate affair of Friday night when that great backdown took place on the government side. But the Minister of Customs should have come down to facts. Why, had any listener been present in the gallery and heard the figures given by that hon. gentleman, he would have believed that our trade with Great Britain was increasing from year to year, when the hon. gentleman knew that exactly the reverse was the case. He says sentiment was so strong that the British people were falling over themselves to buy from us. Let us see. In 1902 we sold $1,733,242 worth of eggs to Great Britain. Last year we only sold $1,053,396 worth of eggs to Great Britain, some $400,000 less. Yet my honest and benevolent friend the Minister of Customs would lead everybody to believe that our sales of produce in Great Britain were increasing yearly, when on eggs alone there was a decrease of $400,000. Take butter. In 1903, we sold $6,954,618 worth of butter. Last year we sold only $4,724,155. Why did not the Minister of Customs tell the country that owing to sentiment our trade had decreased in the matter of butter alone by $2,250,000. Why did not he go a little further, and tell the House that in the matter of cheese our exports to Great Britain had decreased by over half a million dollars worth. I need not follow the figures further. The hon. gentleman knows that his talk about sentiment increasing trade there is not borne out by the facts and by the figures. Our trade has really decreased instead of increased in these articles. Well, now, where do these gentlemen stand, these gentlemen of varied moods, these gentlemen who, on Friday night, could have hired themselves out anywhere as mourners at a funeral? Anybody would have availed themselves of their services, they wore such a dejected mien. Where are they to-night? They can change about as political acrobats, and always have. Now in 1902 this government sent representatives—I think the Minister of Customs was one of them—over to Great Britain, and they had a parley with the home authorities. The Minister of Agriculture said to-night that they did not want any preference. He said as reported in the Montreal 'Herald':

> It is an absolute fact of which I challenge contradiction that the farmers of Canada are not worrying about a preference for their food products, and if the farmers who are chiefly interested in the matter are not worrying I do not see why other parties should worry at all.

Now, I have not heard the Minister of Agriculture deny that statement attributed to him, and he stuck to his guns to-night. Now what did these gentlemen say when they went over to Great Britain in 1902? They prepared a memorandum that was submitted to parliamen enunciating the views they held and the grounds they took when they were in Great Britain:

The Canadian ministers desired to have it understood that they took this course with the strong hope and expectation that the principle of preferential trade would be more widely accepted by the colonies, and that the mother country would at an early day apply the same principle by exempting the products of the colonies from customs duties. If after using every effort to bring about such a readjustment of the fiscal policy of the empire, the Canadian government should find that the principle of preferential trade is not acceptable to the colonies generally, or the mother country, then Canada should be free to take such action as might be deemed necessary in the presence of such a condition.

Now, Sir, what does that mean if it meant anything ? Why, that the hon. gentlemen were prepared to recede from the position they had taken on the question of the preference. Again what did they say ?

The Canadian ministers stated that if they could be assured that the imperial government would accept the principle of preferential trade generally, and particularly grant to the food products of Canada in the United Kingdom exemption from duties now levied, or hereafter imposed, they, the Canadian ministers, would be prepared to go further into the subject and endeavour to give to the British manufacturer some increased advantage over his foreign competitors in the markets of Canada.

Why, the whole keynote when they came back to Canada to defend their position, was that they were only going to give a preference or continue the preference on the ground that we had a preference from the British people, that we had a reciprocal preference, or something of the kind. Well, I do not think the public take the hon. gentlemen seriously on their trade policy or on the trade question. They have heard them in the last ten years and they know where they are to be found. The hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Lemieux) was in Toronto the other night and he addressed the manufacturers meeting. He was an out and out protectionist. The hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) to-day says that the policy of the government in regard to the tariff is not right. The government say it is not right. They have gone from one end of this country to the other telling the people what ? That they propose to make changes in the tariff and that these changes are to be important is to be expected when they cannot take them up during the present session of the House. They are going to postpone them. It is a notorious fact that these hon. gentlemen are endeavouring to placate every manufacturing interest in this country. But, the public are not taking them seriously on the trade question. They know that they will set their sails to every breeze that blows. They know that in 1891 the greatest leader that the Liberal party ever had. Mr. Blake, left them. Why ? Because he said that the policy that they were advocating would drive the country into annexation with the United States. The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) talks away about their loyalty. These hon. gentlemen were prepared to go to any length no matter what the result might be and the result was that Mr. Blake abandoned them and that was the plight they were left in. What has been their policy since they came into power on the trade question ? The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and the Liberal party, after denouncing the policy of paying bounties on iron did what ? They at once granted these same high bounties so that they might stimulate the iron trade in Nova Scotia and they know that unless they continue these bounties they will lose the support of hon. gentlemen from that province. The public does not take hon. gentlemen seriously on anything. They take them on this line as the Premier once said in the House : We are here ; you are there ; what are you going to do about it ? That is the position they take to-day. They go from one end of the country to the other bribing constituencies in one way or another and hoping in this manner to continue in power. Principle is unknown to them, it is a stranger to them ; they are prepared to take up anything that will keep them in power and they are prepared to drive out any man from the cabinet who upholds principle. They endeavour to keep their followers in line from day to day and if the better element go to them and demand that there shall be certain things rectified, as in the case of the North Atlantic Trading Company, they give in at last but only at last. Does any man believe that two weeks ago they were going to give in on that question ? Not a bit of it. But when the better element of the party told them that they would have to cancel the arrangement with the North Atlantic Trading Company they gave in. Does any man believe that they were going to throw up the Bronson and Ray concession two weeks ago ? There was not a minister who did not applaud the hon. member for Ottawa (Mr. Belcourt) the other night and who did not assent to his declaration that the Bronson and Ray concession was a proper arrangement. You can only drive hon. gentlemen opposite when it comes to the point that the better element of the party are prepared to take them by the throat. It is then and then only that they will come down and not until then. Before this session is over they will come down on other questions just as well as they have come down on the Bronson and Ray concession and just as well as they have come down on the North Atlantic Trading Company arrangement. The Premier knows, and no man knows better than he, that in the province of Ontario his party is as dead as a door nail. The Premier knows that some day his life will come to be written with that of the rest of the politicians and statesmen, so called, of this Dominion, and when it does

come to be written he will know—I was almost going to make what might be called an Irish bull by saying that when he is dead and gone he will read it—but somebody will read it and if he could see the advance sheet of it he would find to his annoyance and disgust that the great province of Ontario mistrusted the government of which he is at the head and mistrusted it all through the piece because it had ministers that it did not trust and that the people of Ontario did not trust him. The Premier to-day would sooner have a majority within the province of Ontario than in any province in the whole confederacy. Every man knows that and the right hon. Prime Minister knows it in the bitterness of his heart. He knows that he has never had a majority within that province and he knows, now that he has lost his right arm in the province of Ontario, that he cannot hope to get a corporals guard out of Ontario in the next elections.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have heard that before.

Mr. BENNETT. Well, the right hon. gentleman has heard that before. He was told before the last election that he would not have a majority in Ontario and he did not have one.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I also heard that I was not going to have a majority anywhere.

Mr. BENNETT. I am not going to be so prophetic as to say that but I can tell the right hon. gentleman that his followers from Ontario will be few and far between after the next election. He knows very well that they are endeavouring to-day to get from under the wreck. He knows that hon. gentlemen who sit behind him are advancing their claims to senatorships and other positions. He knows that as well as I do. He knows that the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Dyment) is being put forward for a senatorship because he has not the shadow of a chance of ever being returned in that constituency. He knows that the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) will never be a candidate again. He can go all along the line and he knows that these hon. gentlemen who were elected because of the influence of the Ontario government will never again have an abiding place in this House. Lack of confidence in the leaders of the Liberal party is not shared by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House alone because the prophetic member for North Ontario (Mr. Grant) tells them that they are unfit for their positions, that age and the infirmities that it brings with it unfit them for the functions which they are supposed to discharge and that they are so suspiciously dishonest that he cannot longer tolerate them. If that dilemma stares them in the face can it be wondered at that the average honest, intelligent elector in the province of Ontario believes that these hon. gentlemen have gone to the end of their tether and that it is time for a change because any sort of a change could not be worse than the present state of affairs.

Mr. ALEXANDER JOHNSTON (Cape Breton). Mr. Speaker, the discussion this afternoon and evening in the House is somewhat refreshing, somewhat interesting and I am quite sure that it will be reviewed with some interest not alone in this House but generally throughout the country. There were many things, that, during the last eight or ten years, were, throughout this country, somewhat in doubt. People were in doubt as to the position occupied by hon. gentlemen opposite on a question of very great importance in this country. Perhaps no question, during the last ten years, has received greater attention throughout the length and breadth of Canada than the preference given to the mother country by the Fielding tariff of 1897. During the years from 1897 down to the present time we have had from time to time mutterings of discontent from the other side of the House. We were treated at times to certain expressions of opinion from that side of the House and indeed not alone in this House but generally throughout the country it was difficult to determine just exactly where our friends stood upon this question. But, this afternoon and this evening we have had, probably for the first time, an official pronouncement from the other side of the House as to where the Conservative party stands upon this question.

The hon. gentleman from Halton (Mr. Henderson), a very prominent member of his party, has declared in most positive terms as to where he stands. There is no doubt he made that declaration with the express consent and authority of his leader who sat immediately in front of him, and assented to the statement he made. There can be no doubt whatever that the policy has been outlined by the Conservative party this afternoon, that the party is pledged from now, henceforth, to do away with the British preference. But there was something else made clear—I see my hon. friend from East Simcoe is leaving the House. I have certain things to say to him and I hope he will remain. Now that my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) has returned to his seat I will proceed. The position is now made clear as to where the leader of the opposition and his friends stand on this question ; they are opposed to the British preference and opposed to the German surtax. There is perhaps no feature of our tariff legislation, from confederation down to the present time, which has met with more general approval from the people than the German surtax. From the day it was enacted, until to-night, no reputable public man in this country has taken the responsibility of pronouncing against it. But to-

day our friends on the other side have not only pronounced against the German surtax, but against the British preference as well. From now, henceforth, there can be no doubt as to where the two political parties stand upon these questions ; and it is well the people of Canada should know. So far as I am able to understand it ; so long as the present conditions obtain between Germany and Canada, the German surtax will be maintained by this government, while on the other hand the Conservative party announce they favour its removal.

Now, I propose to make a few observations in reply to my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett). He started out by questioning the statement made by the Minister of Customs that the people of Canada were with the Liberal government to-day as they have been since 1896. That oft told story of the hon. member (Mr. Bennett) we have heard from him to-night. He says: Look, the great province of Ontario has declared against you; Ontario declared against you in 1900, and in 1904 and it is ready to declare against you again. Has my hon. friend (Mr. Bennett) not heard the voice of other provinces. Ever since I have been in this House the hon. gentleman has been proclaiming that Ontario is the whole of Canada, but if perchance he should bump his head against his desk and wake up some day he may discover that while Ontario is a great province—and no one has more respect for it than I—nevertheless Ontario is not the whole of Canada. If my hon. friend will get some small boy during the recess to teach him the geography of his country, he may learn that there are other provinces in this fair Dominion which have the right to be heard in determining the political destiny of Canada. Perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) has not heard of the provnce of Quebec which at last election returned fifty-four supporters of the administration and eleven supporters of the party to which he belongs ? Has he heard of the province of Manitoba which last election sent seven supporters of the government as against three supporters of the party to which the member for East Simcoe belongs ? Has the hon. gentleman heard of New Brunswick which returned seven supporters of the government as against six supporters of the opposition ? Has he heard from the great Northwest Territories which last election sent seven stalwarts to support the government as against three representatives of the Conservative party ? Not having heard from these provinces, the hon. gentleman could not have been expected to have heard from the far distant province of British Coluabia. But let me convey to him a message from British Columbia and the message I have is, that last election British Columbia returned seven supporters of the government—and what support did his party receive from that province.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Nil.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Nil represents the British Columbia support of the Conservative party. There is also the province of Nova Scotia, and let me ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) if he has heard from that province yet ?

Mr. BENNETT. Will the hon. gentleman allow me—it is unkind of him to harrow the feelings of my benevolent friend the Minister of Customs who gets badly beaten when the other ministers carry their provinces ; don't do that, he had a bad night Friday night.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I understand that my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) is one of those who recently entered into a conspiracy against the man who has been his nominal leader during the past few years, and I can understand that he would regard it as delightful that I should call the attention of the country to the fact that his leader was not only not able to bring himself back from Nova Scotia, but was not able to bring back one single supporter among the eighteen members from that province. Harrow the feelings of the Minister of Customs; not at all. The province of Ontario did well by the Liberal party in 1904. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) will find from the returns that Ontario did at least as well for the Liberal party in 1904 as in 1900.

Mr. PATERSON. We gained twelve.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Of course I know that, but I did not want to hurt the feelings of the hon. member (Mr. Bennett) too much. Harrow the feelings of the Minister of Customs. There are men in this House whose feelings can be harrowed when election returns are being considered, but these men do not sit on this side of the House. On every occasion that the hon. gentleman from East Simcoe addressses the House he has something to say about political outcasts. Who are the political outcasts ? Does the member for East Simcoe find any on this side of the House ? How many members occupying seats on the treasury benches have had to flee not only from their own constituencies but actually from their own province ? Not one. But it is different on that side of the House. The cat is out of the bag to-night, and I can understand that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Bennett) has really entered into the conspiracy which has recently been formed against the leader of the opposition. Harrow up the feelings of the Minister of Customs ! I think there are some people in this country whose feelings are harrowed. The hon. member from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) had something to say about the criminal courts. Well, my

hon. friend has had experience in the criminal courts of this country.

Mr. BENNETT. I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman has stated that I have been in the criminal courts. I ask him either to make good his statement or withdraw it.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I quite willingly withdraw the statement I made.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member has withdrawn the statement.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I simply made the observation that my hon. friend had experience in the criminal courts of this country. I thought he had. He has been a practising barrister in the province of Ontario for many years.

Mr. BENNETT. The hon. gentleman has not withdrawn the statement, and I ask for your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understood the hon. member to withdraw the statement that the hon. member for East Simcoe had been in the criminal courts.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I simply said—

Mr. SPEAKER. The statement has been denied by the hon. member for East Simcoe and must be withdrawn.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I withdraw that statement absolutely, for the reason that I did not make it. The statement I made was that my hon. friend had experience in the criminal courts of this country. If my hon. friend denies that statement, I most cheerfully take it back. I learn from himself for the first time to-night that he has had absolutely no experience in the criminal courts, notwithstanding the fact that for many years he has been a practicing barrister in the province of Ontario. All things considered, and from the knowledge of the hon. gentleman that we have been able to gain during the years he has been in this House, I am not surprised to hear that he has had no experience in the criminal courts of the province of Ontario. But he has had experiences in the civil courts of this country, and these experiences have perhaps not been very flattering to him. They would not be pleasant to other people occupying similar positions. There is no doubt that in regard to the methods of getting elected to this House the hon. gentleman is an expert. I suppose it would not be quite parliamentary to say that my hon. friend is a self-confessed briber. If it is not parliamenaary I will not say it.

Mr. BENNETT. What does the hon. gentleman say?

Mr. JOHNSTON. I say that perhaps it would not be parliamentary if I said that the hon. gentleman is a self-confessed briber.

Mr. BENNETT. I can tell the hon. gentleman that if he makes that as a statement that I ever said at any time he states what is untrue.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The hon. gentleman must settle that question with respected citizens of the province of Ontario; he is not going to settle it with me or with this House; he is going to settle it with the men who know him best, the men who know his daily walks, the men who have followed him up hill and down dale in the last twenty years, and who know his character better than we know it. It is with these men, and not with myself or any one else on this side of the House that he has to settle whether or not the statement is a correct one. It is in the great province of Ontario, of which he is ever ready to speak in the proudest terms—and I commend him for it—that they say my hon. friend really is. Well, having said so much, I do not think it is necessary to say more just now on that matter. We will have occasion to go into it later on when we have some further details.

Mr. BENNETT. I have had satisfaction for my money up in that country and I will have more of it, too.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The hon. gentleman says that he has had satisfaction for his money up in that country. It would be very interesting to know how much he paid. What was the name of the man? He was a gentleman named Wilson. The hon. gentleman said: 'Oh, I bought your vote before.' And this is the man who undertakes to read lectures to people in this House and out of it as to the proper methods of conducting elections.

Mr. BENNETT. You come up next time with the Minister of Customs, please.

Mr. JOHNSTON. The Minister of Customs is well able to take care of himself. He has had a long and honourable career in this country, and when he comes to retire from public life I am quite sure there will be nothing recorded against him like that which is recorded against the hon. member for East Simcoe, and which will live as long as history lives in the province of Ontario. I was going to say that this is the man who on every conceivable occasion rises in his place in this House, with the approval of his friend the hon. leader of the opposition—indeed, he is put up on occasions—to read lectures to the people of this country on the purity of elections, when he has been convicted of slander—by whom? By members occupying seats in this House? By a jury of his fellow countrymen. I want the people everywhere throughout the length and breadth of this country to know that the man who stands up in this House on behalf of the leader of the opposition to read lectures on propriety is a man whom he knows is a convicted

slanderer before the courts of the province of Ontario, and not only that, but, a. self-confessed briber. Let these facts be known. It is time the people of Canada knew the character of the man put up from time to time by the leader of the opposition to talk to them as to the proper methods of conducting elections and conducting the government of this country. We propose from time to time to tell the people the true state of affairs with regard to this man, and we have something up our sleeve yet, which in due time will be presented. My hon. friend went on to discuss the question which is really before the House, and he shared the view of those who had gone before, that the preference given to Great Britain in 1897 by the Fielding tariff and the German surtax are iniquitous things and should no longer be maintained. He strengthened the conviction that will be known to-morrow morning all over this country that the Conservative party in the House of Commons have at last declared themselves on these two important questions. The hon. gentleman says that the returns show that our exports to Great Britain have not increased, but on the contrary have decreased. If he will look up the returns carefully and compare those of to-day with those of 1896, 1895, 1894 and all through the early nineties, he will find that the statements made by the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Agriculture to the effect that our exports to Great Britain have increased are amply borne out by the figures which are under his hand, and which he could have given to this House, but which for purposes of his own he refrained from giving. He says that the people of this country do not take this government seriously. Well, that is in keeping with all the other statements he made. The people of this country took this government seriously in 1896 and 1900 and again in 1904, and whenever the opportunity again presents itself I can promise the hon. gentleman that the people of this country will take advantage of it to again pronounce themselves seriously in favour of this administration.

There is another matter to which I wish to refer briefly. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), the leader of the opposition, (Mr. R. L. Borden) and my hon. friend from King's and Albert (Mr. Fowler) charged the Minister of Finance with disloyalty and talked about a campaign he ran as a secessionist in Nova Scotia. Sir, I was not in active politics when that election, which has been so often referred to in this House, took place, but I know the history of it very well as does every member from Nova Scotia. My hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, knows it perfectly well, and he knows the causes which led up to the discontent that prevailed in Nova Scotia before that election. He knows that the reason of that discontent was the treatment which was being meted out to that province by the Conservative government then in power, and he is well aware that it was in consequence of the position taken by the Minister of Finance and those who loyally stood by him that the province was able to obtain that justice which year by year had been hitherto refused it. He knows that the people of Nova Scotia had, as they certainly were justified in doing, expressed their dissatisfaction with the Conservative government of that day, led by Sir John Macdonald, and that it was only when these gentlemen saw that the people would no longer tolerate the treatment they were receiving that they came down, a few months after that election, and met the views of Mr. Fielding and those who had supported him by granting the demands of that province which they had hitherto refused. It was because of the hostile attitude assumed by the Conservative government towards the province of Nova Scotia, and for no other reason, that the Finance Minister and his government, backed up by the entire people of the province, took the position they did. Every man in that province knows well the history of that election. My hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, knows away down in his heart the causes that led to the discontent of the people; and if I mistake not, the hon. gentleman himself warmly approved the course taken by the people on that occasion. Sir, the record of the Minister of Finance in the province of Nova Scotia and generally throughout Canada, is one which can well stand on its own merits. In Nova Scotia particularly he has a record of which every one from that province can well be proud. There he has never met a reverse. From year to year his strength has increased. In 1882, 1886, 1890, and 1894 what were the results? The results were on each occasion the manifestation of an increased confidence in him by his people, and when he entered the Dominion government and handed over the local administration to Mr. Murray who appealed at the earliest opportunity to the people it was discovered that the very best the Conservative party could do was to return three members out of thirty-eight. Four years later there was another appeal to the people, and it then transpired that all the Conservatives could do was to return two out of thirty-eight. And when, a little later on, another appeal took place, the Conservative party had reached the vanishing point and from that day forward the name 'Conservative' is a lost one in that province. My hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, can therefore well afford to treat with a good deal of calmness and indifference the statements which hon. gentlemen opposite choose to make concerning him.

Mr. GEO. TAYLOR (Leeds). I do not rise for the purpose of taking any part in the discussion, but simply to point out that some weeks ago the right hon. the first minister said he hoped to make this a short session. I was therefore much surprised to-night to see him sitting in the House and allowing the Minister of Customs beside him to turn around and say to one of his supporters : Get up and make a speech. In reply to that call the hon. gentleman who has just sat down (Mr. Johnston) took up more than half an hour of our time without saying one word pertinent to the question before the House. All he did was throw mud at members of the opposition. If the first minister intends making this a short session, he will have to chastise hon. gentlemen sitting beside him and not allow his own ministers to induce their supporters to get up and make use of language not fit to be published in 'Hansard.' The language used by the hon. gentleman who has just spoken (Mr. Johnston), during the greater portion of his remarks was such that I am surprised he was allowed to continue his discourse. If the proceedings are to be continued in the future as they have been to-night, hon. gentlemen opposite may depend on sitting here until long after the dog days. While the opposition are willing to assist the first minister in making this a short session, they shall certainly not do so if he encourages such conduct as we have witnessed to-night.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (S. Simcoe). I wish to say a word or two to the hon. member for Cape Breton (Mr. Johnston) who has plunged into a matter about which he evidently does not know anything. In fact that can be the only excuse which can possibly be put forward for the language he addressed to my hon. friend from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett). He began by telling us that my hon. friend is a self-confessed briber, and in doing this he alluded to a case recently tried in Simcoe. He either heard the report of that case here the other night, or got it from those who sit around him and wilfully misstated its effect; or else plunged into a subject which he knew nothing about. Let me tell that hon. gentleman and hon. members opposite that if they wish to engage in a careful discussion of the case of Wilson vs. Bennett, they will find not only that it does not at all tell to the disadvantage of the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) but on the contrary redounds to his credit from first to last.

At the meeting where the language complained of was used, a disreputable gang were assembled for the purpose of badgering and annoying Mr. Bennett and other citizens who were working for the best interests of the town of Midland. They came there and badgered Mr. Bennett until he made a statement which, while reflecting no discredit upon his manliness was, to a certain extent, indiscreet.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. LENNOX. Hon. gentlemen opposite need not shout before they are out of the bush. I know what I am talking about and, in that respect, I have the advantage over many of them. They will see, if they are prepared to give the case honest consideration, that Mr. Bennett took a manly and straight forword part and that is more than can be said of hon. gentlemen on the other side. My hon. friend, after saying that Mr. Bennett was a self-confessed briber, had to take it back. And the hon. gentleman either did not know what he was talking about or acted a most disreputable part in making the statement in the first place. There was this organization of which I have spoken the purpose of which was to break up the meeting. Mr. Benentt addressed this man, 'skinny' Wilson, one of the friends of my hon. friend from Cape Breton (Mr. A. Johnston) a man who had wobbled from side to side according to the side upon which the loaves and fishes happened to be. A man who virtually had said : I do not know which side I am on. I am on the side that gets the coon. My hon. friend understands that class of character very well. This man was one of the leaders of those who were trying to interrupt Mr. Bennett. He was a livery stable keeper and gave his vote and support according to the patronage he received,—that fact he could not deny, for he had made records in his books of having broken the election law by hiring teams out on election day, but without recording names or amounts. And it is said he had brought a suit in the division court to collect illegal fees through certain gentlemen not altogether unrepresented in this House. But he had to abandon that in the end. The fact was that he was trying to force the hand of Mr. Miscampbell, and obtain money that he knew he was not legally entitled to. He brought suit for slander because of what Mr. Bennett said of him. Mr. Bennett knew his record, knew that he had endeavoured to make money out of the Conservatives, and had made money out of the Reformers, in connection with his livery business. After this man had interrupted him several times, Mr. Bennett warned him by name to keep quiet. But this he would not do, because the others egged him on. And Mr. Bennett, as I said knowing his record said, not 'I bought you', but 'we bought you before and we can do it again.'

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. LENNOX. Hon. gentlemen laugh. They think nothing of these things. They will probably laugh on the other side of their mouths before I get through—and that would be an improvement in the appearance

of some of them. As I have said, knowing how this man had changed from side to side, according as he could get money for his teams, Mr. Bennett said, probably somewhat hastily, 'We bought you before, and we can do it again.' But, was it not true? I defy hon. gentlemen on the other side to say that the statements I have made are not absolutely in accordance with the record, and, if so, the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) spoke nothing but the truth. But Mr. Bennett found that a jury assessed $100 against him for that, and costs followed the verdict. But my hon. friend over there does not understand things of that kind, because he does not understand a gentleman going into court and telling the truth of what occurred and standing by his words, as Mr. Bennett did. This case came before twelve jurymen—not such jurymen as my hon. friend over there is accustomed to, but twelve honest men of the county of Simcoe. Mr. Bennett explained that he had not intended to charge a criminal offence against the plaintiff, that all he had meant to say—and the people who heard him knew that that was all he intended—was that this man had been wobbling about in politics according as he could make more money on one side or the other. Mr. Bennett said: I admit I made the statement, and I come before this jury, and, whatever you think this man is entitled to under all the circumstances, I am willing to give him. And what did the jury give him. They gave him $100 where he had claimed $10,000.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. LENNOX. Certainly.

Mr. SINCLAIR. How did it happen that all the twelve men were Conservatives?

Mr. LENNOX. Simcoe is one of the best counties in the Dominion of Canada, and of course, it is pretty nearly all Conservative. We had a most intelligent jury empanelled on that occasion——

Mr. McCOOL. Will the hon. gentleman—

Mr. LENNOX. Let my hon. friend wait a minute, and he will have his chance. Having, as I say, a specially intelligent, jury, it necessarily follows that they were practically all Conservatives. Now, my hon. friend has a chance to ask his question?

Mr. McCOOL. Was it because there were twelve Conservative jurymen that the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) did not settle, thinking that they would exonerate him?

Mr. BENNETT. If my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) will allow me, I would like to reply to my hon. friend from East Northumberland (Mr. McCool), whom I desire to treat courteously. Before the case was started an offer was made to me that each party should pay their own costs, if I would apologize. They got no apology from me. I did not follow the lead of the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

Mr. LENNOX. Let me say to my hon. friend over there—lest he recklessly rise to his feet again—that the more he threshes out this case, the less satisfaction he will get out of it.

An hon. MEMBER. Adjourn.

Mr. LENNOX. I will know when to stop quite as well as my hon. friend of the milk-cans. And I will know when to begin, which is what my hon. friend from Cape Breton did not know. I will not make a charge of crime against the man without knowing my grounds. And, as a preliminary for any discussion of such a matter I will have some knowledge of the principles of law which knowledge the hon. gentleman from Cape Breton did not appear to have though, I am informed, he is a lawyer. He said my hon. friend here had been convicted by twelve jurymen of bribery. Why the charge was that my hon. friend Mr. Bennett had said that the plaintiff had been bribed. Had that charge been established, my hon. friend could not have been convicted at all. Had the hon. member for Cape Breton known anything whatever of the principle of law, he would have known that, had bribery been established, there could have been no verdict in this case. The hon. gentleman, I gather, from his remarks is solicitious about the honour of the profession to which he belongs.

Would it not be well for him to turn his eyes nearer home? Is he coming to the rescue to condemn the practice of hon. gentlemen who are practising in the courts where they appoint the judges themselves—members of the cabinet? Will he condemn them? or will he condemn the conduct of the member for Ottawa? But he is silent when anything of that kind comes up. He repeats the tactics of last session. Never in the daylight, I never knew the hon. gentleman to get up in the daylight, but about this hour of the night, or sometimes earlier, but generally about this hour he begins to make a little murmur, and we know what is coming. He begins to lean forward and says something that is unpleasant, something not very much to his credit sometimes, I will admit, such as 'get out of the house', 'put him out'. Then after a while when the hour gets a little later—what works upon him in the meantime I do not know, I cannot tell, I have nothing to guide me—but when the hour gets later he gets upon his feet. We have noticed this many times in sessions gone by. He has been moderately quiet this session, but now he seems to be breaking out again. I recommend him to follow the advice of the Minister of Customs, for whom I have

great respect, I recommend that he do not yield to temptation again.

Mr. ARMSTRONG., Before closing the debate I would like to make a few remarks. I was sorry indeed to listen to the unwarranted attack the Finance Minister made on me this afternoon. I was merely placing before the House a number of facts and asking the government to take immediate action with reference to the question which I brought up. The hon. the Minister of Finance told us we should keep quiet. Nine long years have passed, and no action has been taken. It is high time some action should be taken. With reference to my loyalty, after what we have heard with reference to the loyalty of the Finance Minister to-night, I feel that I have no need to apologize to that hon. gentleman. I believe, Sir, in a home market for our products, as I have always done. I sincerely hope that this government will take the matter up seriously and frame a tariff that will be satisfactory to the farmers of Canada, and relieve them from the unpleasant position in which they are placed. I wished chiefly to impress upon this government the fact that the United States have been able to obtain concesssions from the German government, by going about it in the proper way, within the last six months. But this government have been careless and indifferent as to the wishes and interests of the farmers of Canada. I am sorry that the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. H. S. Schell) took the stand which he did to-night. I know that he has been urged by many people to come out and try and induce the government to do something to relieve the position in which our farmers find themselves. The Minister of Agriculture again placed himself on record as opposed to a preference being granted to the farmers of Canada. I am sure that when the farmers of Canada realize his position they will not agree with him in that matter. I have brought up this question to-night, having been urged thereto by letters as well as by petitions from different parts of the country, and I will now leave upon the government the responsibility of dealing with it.

Motion agreed to.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. TAYLOR. What business will the government take up to-morrow ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Resuming the debate on the motion of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster).

Mr. TAYLOR. And after that.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. After that, I think we will adjourn.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.35 p.m.

Mr. LENNOX.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

TUESDAY, April 24, 1906.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

TREATY WITH JAPAN.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). I beg to lay on the table of the House the treaty with Japan and all the papers connected therewith.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR GENERAL.

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

Mr. SPEAKER read the message as follows :

GREY.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons :—

I have received with much pleasure the address which you have adopted in reply to the speech from the Throne, and thank you for it very heartily.

Government House, Ottawa,
21st April, 1906.

INSURANCE COMMISSION.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Carleton, Ont.) Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to inquire of the government what are the present proceedings of the Insurance Commission ; when was their last meeting and when do they resume ? And, in that connection we were promised copies of the evidence from time to time, but I have not seen any copies yet.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sorry but the Minister of Justice (Mr. Fitzpatrick) is engaged in some other business at the present time. I will ask him to give my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden) an answer to-morrow.

INQUIRY FOR RETURNS.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I desire to inquire about the returns, generally, to which I called attention yesterday and as to which no reply was given by the government yesterday. Is anything to be said about them to-day ?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Not to-day, I am sorry to say.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Some of them are a little urgent, especially the one with regard to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company which I moved for on the 14th of March last. As I have mentioned two or three times, I gave the department notice of it a considerable time in advance, so that really they have had eight or nine weeks' notice of the desire of the House for it, and it is about six weeks since the motion for it was passed. I do not know

what procedure the departments adopt in these matters, but if these returns are taken up in anything like their order, one would think that this particular return would have been overtaken before now.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I am very sorry if the return is not ready to be presented. The department is not overmanned and this is the rush season—

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I know, and a good many returns have been ordered.

Mr. OLIVER. And our friends opposite have ordered a good many returns, as the leader of the opposition has suggested. We have tried to get out as many returns as possible, preparing those which could be made ready in a short time. This has delayed the larger returns. But as the hon. gentleman (Mr. R. L. Borden) has said that he wishes this one particularly, I will see to its being prepared at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. At the request of the Prime Minister, I gave him privately a list of the returns that were urgent, and this one was among them.

SUPPLY—THE NORTH ATLANTIC TRADING COMPANY.

House resumed the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of Mr. Fielding : 'That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair for the House to go into Committee of Supply, and the proposed motion of Mr. Foster in amendment thereto.'

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). On referring to 'Hansard' I find that my right hon. friend (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on his motion for adjournment the other day, suggested that we required forty-eight hours to prepare our defence. I can hardly believe that my right hon. friend uttered those words. Certainly I did not hear them. I did not understand that we were on our defence. I thought that I belonged to the attacking party. And it seemed to me that at the time of the adjournment that there was very little left to attack. The fortress which had been deemed impregnable last year had surrendered. The white flag was floating over Port Arthur ; General Stoessel—I mean the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver)—was coming out of the fortification, and we, who represent the victorious Japanese, had only to rest upon our arms. A very potent agency has acted against the government in this attack. The pressure of public opinion has forced them to recede from the position which they took a year ago and to cancel a contract which, has not one defensible feature, and which under any circumstances, must remain tainted with a very strong suspicion of fraud. Every motive for cancellation was urged last year—without effect which motives seem to have had this year a paramount influence upon the government. Every fact was alleged—although the facts were not as minutely known last year as they are this year. Yet what did we see ? The Minister of the Interior and the government defending this government like tigers and refusing to entertain the proposition made by my hon. friend the member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) that the time had arrived for the cancellation of that very peculiar arrangement. This year they come down, and with extraordinary haste, cancel that contract. And they find no better excuse for having entered into the contract than this, that nearly a quarter of a century ago a similar system of immigration existed under a previous government.

Well, in the first place, that statement is not correct. The system of immigration at that time, may or may not have been proportionate to the wants of the country and the notions which we possess to-day. But there is one thing certain about it, and that is that we paid less than we do to-day. Besides we dealt with known agents for immigration, and we only paid a bonus on tickets which permitted of absolute identification. But the government at that time found another excuse for refusing to cancel the contract. They shelved, in a manner which I think must be deemed very unchivalrous, the whole responsibility for the contract upon a person who was well able to shield them if he had taken any part at all in the negotiations which led up to the completion of the contract. I refer to Lord Strathcona. They made that gentleman, last year, the scapegoat for the attacks directed upon that contract by members on this side of the House. Allow me to quote on that point the words uttered by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior last year. Speaking in support of the motion made by the hon. member for West Toronto, the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) said, on page 9443 of 'Hansard' :

> These agents came to Mr. Preston, I suppose, and said something like this :
>
> Mr. OLIVER. I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon—if he will change the name to Lord Strathcona.

Further on the right hon. the Prime Minister, discussing himself the motion, speaks as follows :

> I now come to the practical side of this contract. It was first introduced by Lord Strathcona, and was then continued by Mr. Preston on the terms agreed to by Lord Strathcona.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are few members of this House, and I readily understand it, who have taken the trouble to peruse the immense mass of papers that were thrown down before the Committee of Agriculture and the Committee of Public Accounts this year, and that refer to this transaction. They are numerous, and they are not classified in a way that invites ins-

rection. But I have taken the trouble to examine those documents, and there is not one member of this House who looks through those documents who can arrive at any other conclusion than that Lord Strathcona had nothing whatever to do with the making of this contract from the beginning until the end. The letters that are among those papers—and we have a right to presume that they are the only papers disclose on the contrary that from beginning to end Mr. Preston and Mr. Preston alone, with the deputy minister at that time, Mr. Smart, carried on negotiations with the mysterious parties who subsequently became the beneficiaries of this contract, visited the continent, conferred with these parties unknown to Lord Strathcona; and the only thing the High Commissioner in London did while these negotiations were going on, was to warn Mr. Preston that the contract they were entering into was a contract which violated the law of the nations among which those parties were going to operate. He warned them of that fact. Mr. Preston consulted lawyers in England, and received from our lawyers in London the opinion that this contract was a violation of the comity of nations, that we were undertaking by that contract to violate, in a secret and clandestine manner, the laws relating to emigration of all those countries, or most of them, that are covered by the terms of this contract. My hon. friend, the Minister of Finance, had no other defence at that time, he did not commit the ungenerous act which I would almost qualify as a mean act, of sheltering the government under the broad shoulders of Lord Strathcona and transferring to that eminently respectable citizen the responsibility for all the misdoings of those who began and carried on this undertaking. But he had another ingenious excuse. Speaking on July 13, he said:

> The document to which I have referred is on file——

He referred to the protest which we received from Belgium.

> —and it is a protest against the distribution of literature by shipping companies and also against the Canadian government.
>
> Now, my hon. friend says that this is not a contract with a reliable and reputable steamship company. Certainly not. Your reliable and reputable steamship company would not undertake such a work, that is not its business.

He admitted therefore that whoever might be the parties with whom we were contracting at that time, they were not reputable, nor were they people in whom we could place absolute confidence, and consequently, in dealing with them, we were obliged to take extraordinary and unusual precautions. But, what shall I say of my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior? In truth, Mr. Speaker, there is not one, but there are three, Olivers. There is the good Oliver, who this year, in view of the pressure of public opinion, and having no doubt become acquainted with some of the facts, some of the history of this mysterious association, exerted his influence in a proper direction, and came down to this House to announce the cancellation of the contract. There is the bad Oliver, who last year, under similar circumstances, and with a motion having a similar purport, came down to the House and defended in every manner the justice and proper foundation of this contract. And there is what I would call the excellent, the frank Oliver, who, three years ago, in this House, denounced our system of immigration in terms to which I will refer presently, and declared that it was time the system should be changed from top to bottom, and particularly that the continental immigration towards which the country was sacrificing such a large amount of money should be put a stop to without delay.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what is the cause of this sudden change? What is the cause of the anxiety of the government to bury the matter at once as if it were a case of plague or contagious disease, instead of waiting with calm and dignity the result of the investigation which is now proceeding before two committees? There are, Mr. Speaker, for that hurried action, two causes. There is the outburst of public indignation at the very idea that this country, enjoying constitutional institutions, where the people, after centuries, of struggles, have achieved absolute, entire and illimitable control over the expenditure of public money—there is the sentiment that we should not, at this advanced period of our national existence, tolerate for a single instant the expenditure of large amounts of public money when those charged with that expenditure refuse to reveal to us the names of the parties to whom we are paying these immense sums of money. That feeling has found echo throughout the whole of the country has found echo in the Liberal press itself in no uncertain terms, and is no doubt the principal if not the only, reason which has led the government to recede so entirely from the position it took not a year ago upon this self same subject. There is another cause and it is this, the conviction, the widespread conviction existing, not only outside this House, but among many members of this House on both sides, that beneath this elaborate system in regard to which the policy has been one throughout of reticence, of suppression, of concealment, underneath that there was hidden what I cannot qualify otherwise than as a swindle, perpetrated by some clever schemers at the expense of the public chest.

Now, Sir, why did we insist, as we did insist, in view of the blocking of the evidence which took place before the committees of this House, in view of the evasive

nature of all answers to questions put in this House, in view of all the circumstances that were disclosed by the papers placed before the Committee of Agriculture and Immigration—why did we insist upon a telegram being sent to Lord Strathcona? And why was there from the very beginning such intense opposition to what seemed to be such a just, such an equitable and fair demand? The reason was that everybody knew that whatever we received in the way of information from Lord Strathcona we could rely upon. We were assured that if he could not disclose to us all that we contended that we had a right to know, the names, the nature of the syndicate or company or association with which we were dealing and its composition, he would at least give us some information which would enable us to advance the purposes of our inquiry. And what did we get? What was disclosed, Mr. Speaker, by the cablegram received from Lord Strathcona ? This, that since the very inception over four years ago, of our dealings with this company, we have been dealing with a phantom association, with an association that had no corporate existence, with an association that had no responsibility, with a body that was not incorporated and against which we could exercise no recourse. Further, that less than a year ago the parties, whoever they are, who are interested in this contract and in this arrangement, repaired to what place? Not to England, not to Holland ; they thought it necessary to sneak out to the Channel Islands in order to register there an incorporation which I have no hesitation in saying they never thought would be ferretted out. It is well known, Mr. Speaker, that not very long ago laws were passed in England governing the creation of associations such as these and destined to prevent just such frauds as have been perpetrated upon our country in regard to this association, but from the operation of those laws the Channel Islands were exempted, and that is the reason which brought these smugglers, these nefarious contractors, who to-day refuse to see the light of day, to the Channel Islands in order that they might there secure corporate existence and yet be out of the way of tracing and of discovery. And what do we find, Sir? Under the registration which has been summarily cabled to us by Lord Strathcona, a company was created and registered in the Island of Guernsey with a capital of $15,000. There are 3,000 shares and this registration, made in order to conform strictly and merely with the requirements of the law as it exists in that island, reveals to our gaze seven persons who hold one share each only in that association, known as the North Atlantic Trading Company. Who are the others? Who are those that with reason we are endeavouring to discover and publish to-day who hold the 2,993 remaining shares? We know that there is a hotel proprietor, an inn keeper, a tavern keeper who holds one share, there is an engineer, there is a builder, there are two solicitors' clerks, law students, there is a chartered secretary and a legal clerk—very fit and proper persons indeed to whom we should entrust the delicate care of the immigration which we are to receive from the continent of Europe. Persons of experience indeed and deeply interested in the movement which we have endeavoured to create in order to foster an immigration from continental Europe. But who are the others? That is the question which is suggested by the cable received from Lord Strathcona, and very far from clearing up this mysterious affair, the answer we have received, frank, sincere, to the question we put to Lord Strathcona, only deepens the plot, darkens the mystery and makes stronger within us and within the minds of every one interested in this affair that desire to know who are, to use the term employed by Mr. Smart in his examination before the committee, who are the parties behind this scheme.

Let me, as one who has taken the trouble to examine with some care the mass of documents which have been brought before our committees, what in my humble estimation is disclosed by the evidence and by these heaps of papers, all in very great disorder, thrown before the committee and what appears to any man in good faith to be the conclusions to which lead these papers and the examination of Mr. Smart. No man, Mr. Speaker, who takes the trouble to examine what we have so far before us can come to any other conclusion than this one, that in 1899 Mr. Preston arrived in England, and, alone and at once, and without seeming to have any special authority from anybody, scampered over to the continent and made there, alone and by himself, arrangements with parties whose names are known to the cabinet, are known to the government of this country, for a contract which brought to the syndicate, to 'the parties behind the scheme,' ' to our friends,' to use the words employed in these letters and documents, 'to our allies,' in four years a sum of over $250,000 without, as I submit to this House, any acceptable or legal proof of any expenditure whatever, by the parties to whom these large sums were paid. I am prepared to admit that any boy who looks through these papers will find statements of expenditure, but not the statements which would pass muster in a court of law or before actuaries or before anybody who had any desire to satisfy himself as to the absolute sincerity of those statements.

The company itself has prepared accounts for the rent of offices, but Mr. Smart tells us that they have no office on the continent; that there is but a room in Amsterdam which is unoccupied and to which he could not gain admittance, and when asked if they had opened offices in other parts of continental Europe he replied that had they

done so they would very soon have been closed up. If there has been any genuine expenditure for rent why were not the vouchers produced to show that rent had really been paid. There are large sums alleged by the company to have been paid to agents, but Mr. Smart swears they had no agents appointed on the continent, and look where you will there are no vouchers to show that money was really paid for travelling expenses or salaries to agents. Are we not entitled to say that so far as we can find, these claims are absolutely unjustifiable; that indeed was the judgment of the Auditor General when the accounts were first presented to him for verification. And as to advertising, there are no receipts to show that any advertising ever was done or that any money ever was paid for it. There is not an actuary or an accountant who would be able to declare after going through these papers, that during the four years this company has received large sums from the government of Canada it has spent one single cent which it can claim to be recouped for.

There was another fact disclosed which was very ably dealt with by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) who proposed this motion. I refer to the fact that three times since the first arrangements were made by Mr. Preston, in Berlin, made on his own responsibility, accepting the proposals of this company; three times since that the contract has been amended and every time the amendment was more favourable to the company. The extraordinary fact also appears that parliament never was made acquainted with the original contract, or with the negotiations which preceded it or the subsequent amendments. I leave it to any one who can appreciate fairly the importance of matters of this kind to say if that is a proper way to carry on the affairs of this country in regard to immigration, or in regard to anything else. Any one who takes the trouble to look into each succeeding amendment to that contract will find clearly evidenced a desire on the part of the contractors to wrest something more from the government in the shape of concessions, and in the last amendment which was only brought down by the government at the last moment and under pressure—whoever these gentlemen are, and whatever may be their names —they succeeded in obtaining from the government an extension of that contract for ten years from 1904 to 1914, thus making us liable without our knowledge or approval, and unknown I am sure even to certain members of the government, for a total amount which on a moderate calculation cannot be less than $1,000,000. Whoever the members of this company are it is clear at any rate that they possess potency and influence with the government. The investigation has also disclosed that Mr. Smart went four times to Europe in reference to immigration matters, and each time, as his own evidence and the subsequent correspondence show, he dealt with Mr. Preston and with Mr. Preston alone, entirely ignoring Lord Strathcona our High Commissioner. He saw the members of the syndicate, he saw them on the continent, he conferred with them, and each of his trips was followed by a concession more and more advantageous to the company. Let me, en passant, speak of the difficulty we had to obtain information in the Agricultural Committee. From the very beginning, whether in the committee or in this House there has been a continuous disposition to refuse information. Questions asked in the House were incompletely answered; questions asked in the committee were not answered at all or unsatisfactorily answered, and that not by one witness but by all the witnesses. We the representatives of the people were constitutionally entitled to the information we asked, but that information was refused and we had the culmination of it when Mr. Smart himself said to the committee: I will not tell you who this company is, who the men behind it are, who are its officers, who are the parties who for four years in the past and for ten years to come are going to draw vast sums of money from the government of Canada. And, Sir, in that very extraordinary attitude, repugnant as it is to every principle of constitutional government in a free country, Mr. Smart was sustained by a majority in the committee. We had the singular spectacle of certain members of that committee sustaining a witness in his rebellion against the constitutional rights of the people's representatives; we had these gentlemen endeavouring by their questions to show that this was an excellent contract at the very moment when the government were deciding that it must be cancelled because it was indefensible, as was announced to the House on Friday last.

There is one fact which I know will not be lost sight of, but which cannot be too clearly insisted upon, and that is, that during the whole of these four years and up to the time when we finally succeeded in obtaining the production of the last contract, the ex-Minister of the Interior was in this House, he attended to his estimates, we voted large amounts, and yet we never had a clear and frank and sincere statement of our relations with this company; and when finally the contract was brought down, the paper produced before the House, which I hold in my hand, it was found to have torn out, purposely torn out at the end, the names of these mysterious parties who signed the contract with the government; and we have not been able to discover since, in spite of our best endeavours, who the officers of this company are who actually concluded the negotiations.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what have we seen in an

investigation of the system under which the work of this North Atlantic Trading Company was deducted? We have found that this phantom company or its agents, whoever they are, never came into contact with one single immigrant. That is a point the importance of which cannot be exaggerated. They never saw an immigrant, never were in a position to appreciate his fitness to settle in this country and form part of the Canadian national family. They never took occasion to urge one immigrant to come to Canada—never in one single instance were in a position to say, here is a man good, bad or indifferent, that we have brought to your shores, and we are entitled to an indemnity for the work we have done. The emigrants left the countries covered by the contract without having seen this company or heard of it; but if they belonged to the callings specified by the contract if they were farmers or domestic servants, or said they were, we paid for them at a pound a head, men, women and children. That is a point which I think is of some importance, and it will be difficult for hon. gentlemen opposite to show that we acted wisely when under these circumstances we consented to pay. As a matter of fact, the only evidence to show that the company were entitled to draw money from the government, was the manifest of the steamship which brought them out to Canada. When that manifest reached Canada, it passed into the hands of the immigration agent, who checked it and forwarded it to Ottawa, and all passengers of the classes referred to coming from those countries were credited to the company, and the company was paid in consequence. There is in connection with this matter a point to which I desire to refer immediately, because whatever may be the merits of this arrangement, it seems to me beyond all doubt that we have been paying all these years for a large number of immigrants who have passed from Canada into the United States, and that as a matter of fact a very large proportion of the money paid to the North Atlantic Trading Company has gone to promote immigration to the United States. The cream of the immigrants who came from those countries passed into the United States; and although Mr. Smart asserts that a deduction was made for those immigrants, I find no evidence whatever of this or of any regular checking or auditing or examination of this class of immigrants in any of the papers I have seen.

Let the House bear with me for a moment while I quote from the annual report of the Commissioner General of Immigration for the United States for the year ending the 30th of June last. In that report is found incorporated the report of Mr. Clarke, the Canadian Immigration Commissioner, and it contains very valuable information. We find at page 67 of the report that last year there were examined at the Canadian border, 40,488 immigrants coming from Europe to Canada and passing into the United States. But hon. members will perhaps say that they were manifested in the steamship manifest, and consequently were never credited to the company. I do not arrive at that conclusion. There are three classes of immigrants mentioned in Commissioner Clarke's report. There are those manifested through Canada to the United States, of whom last year 12,881 were examined. There was a second class manifested by border boards of special inquiry under department circular No. 97. These are immigrants who have come to Canada, manifested to Canada, and who within the year after their arrival here have determined to undergo an examination and go to the United States. These numbered last year 9,142. There are also those in the third class who, after the year expired, although originally manifested to Canada, have determined to undergo an examination under department circular No. 43, and have gone to the United States. Of this class there were examined last year 20,076. Now, is anybody in a position to say in regard to the two last-mentioned classes—and there was a very large number of them who came from the countries contracted for, —that they were subsequently deducted?

And if it be true that no deduction was made during any year, since the beginning of this arrangement, for the large number of immigrants who first came to Canada and subsequently went to the United States, we have paid a bonus on these which we are entitled to get back?

There is also a fourth-class recently created which comprises a considerable number of people. They are those who arrive in Canada, manifested to Canada, and who within ten days declared their option of going to the United States. Inquiry at the American Commissioner's office showed me that there are, on an average, a thousand of those who every year arrive in Canada and within the delay of ten days decide to go to the United States. Have those immigrants been deducted? There is no evidence whatever that they have. Let us see for a moment how, with regard to countries and nationalities, we can classify the 40,488 immigrants from Europe who were admitted last year into the United States from the Canadian border. There were 5,154 English, 2,096 Finns, 2,124 Germans, 4,777 Greeks, 698 Irish, 8,591 Italians, south, 6,373 Scandinavians, 1,845 Scotch, and of all other nationalities, 7,965. If you deduct from this number of 40,488 the English, Irish, South Italians and Scotch, and leave the others who came from the countries comprised in the contract, you find that there were 24,199 who came from the continent of Europe last year, manifested to Canada, who subsequently passed to the United States, and out of that 24,000, there were 5,778 belonging to the class of gardeners,

farm labourers and servants upon whom we pay a bonus under this contract. That is a matter which certainly calls for a fuller investigation than has been hitherto made.

There has been a strange point brought out, which is of very great importance in an investigation of this kind. It has been brought out by the evidence and by the letters which are filed on record before the committee. That point is this, that the business which we have been carrying on through this company is an illegal business, forbidden by the countries interested We had a protest from Belgium ; and if we are to believe the evidence of Mr. Smart, the offence is punishable by imprisonment. Is it consonant with our dignity, is it right as a matter of justice, whether it be in our interest or not, that we should subsidize unknown persons, who refuse to reveal their names ? And is it right that we should subsidize those persons—who could not be considered as other than our agents—to carry out in friendly countries on the continent of Europe, a work, the doing of which is forbidden in those countries, and would lead to the punishment of those found guilty of doing it ?

Another disclosure of the investigation, so far as it has proceeded, is that we do not deal directly with this company in making the payments. The payments, amounting to this large sum of $250,000 were remitted to England. I do not say that in all cases they were remitted to Mr. Preston himself, but there can be no doubt that some of those remittances were made to him directly. Others were made by bills of exchange to the North Atlantic Trading Company, and others were made to the office of the Commissioner in London. But I have no doubt that further investigation will show that all the payments which went through the London office went through Mr. Preston's hands. In view of the singular conduct of Mr. Preston, in view of his having appointed himself the intermediary and agent in all the negotiations, in view of the letter we find in the record, in which he presses so earnestly for payment, in which he says: you must send over money to the company. I am going to Hamburg and do not like to present myself at the office without the account having been settled—in view of a number of other things and the special circumstances of the transaction, it is legitimate to lay some stress on the fact that Mr. Preston, apart from the many other roles he played in this matter, was the recipient himself of large sums which he handled and subsequently transferred to this mysterious company. That is shown by the investigation as far as it has proceeded. That is what is revealed up to the present. But what we have claimed all along is that we are entitled to know who are the members of this company. Who are the parties with whom we have negotiated, to whom we have paid the money and with whom we have still a very important settlement to make? Are we going to get any further light from the government ? Now that the government has changed its attitude, now that it has cancelled this contract and admitted that it was an improvident and unwise arrangement, are we going to be informed as to the personnel of the company ? The body corporate itself was only created, less than a year ago, and we have the right to assume that previous to that we were dealing with individuals only. Who are they ? Are the government going to tell us ? My right hon. friend remains silent. Why is he silent ? Is there any valid and sound motive for his refusing to give this House and the country the information for which it has been so rightly clamouring. I pause for a reply. Absolute silence prevails. This reminds me of the scene in Macbeth. Does the government want to hush up the 'matter of the murder ?' Is the cupboard going to be opened and are we going to finally see the skeleton ? Silence still prevails, and I believe we are doomed to wait until the withered and dried bones of that skeleton have mouldered into unidentifiable dust, before we find out the truth ?

I have referred already to the absolutely faulty system which prevailed during the existence of this company a system which anybody connected with immigration would undoubtedly condemn. We paid agents for work which they did not do. The agent did not come in contact with the immigrant and judge whether he fulfilled the requirements of citizenship in this country. What I submit to this House is that, if the investigation is pursued as undoubtedly it should be, it will reveal, in the first place, that there were other reasons than the nature of the work which made the government persistantly refuse to come out and frankly tell us the names of those who have been throughout interested in this contract. It will reveal, in the second place, that the company cannot establish that it spent the money it had contracted to spend in this immigration work. I defy the company, or anybody on its behalf, to produce legal, acceptable evidence that it has spent $15,000 a year during the continuance of this contract, or the sums which it bound itself to spend, and to show conclusively before any fair judge that its own part of the contract has been faithfully performed. The investigation will show that a very large number of immigrants from these countries for whom we have paid have not in reality remained in Canada, but have gone to the United States since their arrival here. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) blamed with considerable harshness my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) for having commented with such disfavour, upon the absence of the ex-Minister of the In-

terior (Mr. Sifton) from this House. It is the duty of members of this House to treat one another with indulgence. But surely, there is something singularly extraordinary and abnormal, in view of the circumstances of the case, in the absence of the ex-Minister of the Interior on every occasion when this subject has come up for discussion. And, so far as I am concerned, I do not hesitate to say this—in which I think manly members of this House will agree—that when the present Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) a new arrival, a man against whom there had been no reproach in the past, was taxed with all the unfortunate circumstances of this contract, it was the duty of the ex-Minister of the Interior to attend in this House, and to give to the House the explanation which he alone could give, or if he could not do that—if there was inevitable absence—what prevented him, I would ask, from communicating with the House or with the Minister of the Interior himself and saying frankly: 'You are attacked upon this point: here are the facts.' No member will say that this is an unjust or unfair position to take. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sifton) knows all about the facts. Mr. Smart tells us in so many words in his evidence that from the beginning the hon. gentleman knew what was going on in Europe and that he, Mr. Smart, had the approval of the minister in all these transactions. What then, is the explanation, not only of the personal absence of that hon. gentleman, but of the absence of any explanation, written or otherwise, from him, upon this question, which, I think, every one will admit reflects little credit upon him.

Now, I do not wish to prolong this discussion. I only wish to call the attention of the House to what has transpired since the investigation began. It seems incredible—I could hardly believe it myself—that the witness about whom so much has been said has re-appeared before one of our committees and declared that all the private papers he had in connection with this affair when he was deputy minister, and all his letter-books, have been by him destroyed. Surely, that circumstance alone, if there were no others, would justify us upon looking upon this transaction as a most suspicious one. But, when all the other circumstances have been disclosed. with the unwillingness appearing everywhere to give us the true facts in connection with this transaction, I say that the burning of these papers is one of the most damning circumstances that could be possibly conceived.

I referred a moment ago to what I called the good Oliver. Let me quote to the House the language which that hon. gentleman used a few years ago when he was member of this House, but not Minister of the Interior—when he was fresh from the West and conversant with circumstances as they existed in that part of our country. I find that he is reported in 'Hansard' 1899, page 8523, as follows:

Now, it would be a very simple matter to overcome any particular settlement in the Northwest by a foreign population. Every settlement in that country stands in danger from that influx of population, if it is not checked. The whole of the Northwest Territories stand in danger.

Then at page 8524, he said:

It is said that those people settle where other people will not, but in my part of the country they settle where other people have settled, and where other people would settle in larger numbers, were it not for these Galicians. In fact where these Galicians have settled, some of the others have moved away.

An hon. MEMBER. Why?

Mr. OLIVER. Because they are not desirable neighbours.

Mr. MONK. And in 1901, my hon. friend spoke as follows—page 2937 of 'Hansard':

In regard to the Doukhobors, I wish to say, speaking of course without having such an intimate knowledge of them, but speaking on the general principle, that any people that are too good to conform in the laws of this country are too good to live in this country, and we do not want them at any price.

Then at page 2939:

There is another question that the people of the west feel more strongly on than this immigration question, and there is nothing that they more earnestly resent than the idea of settling up the country with people who will be a drag on our civilization and progress. We did not go out to that country simply to produce wheat. We went to build up a nation, a civilization, a social system that we could enjoy, be proud of, and transmit to our children. And we resent the idea of having the millstone of this Slav population hung around our necks.

And in 1902, he said:

Our social system, our political system, our religious system are those which we have inherited and under which we are trying to improve ourselves. Then if it is worth while to organize all these systems for the purpose of improving ourselves in this country, it is surely worth while to take means that our efforts shall not be to a certain extent rendered useless by the introduction of an element into our population which will have a contrary effect. If you will fill those prairies with people of different ideas, different aspirations and different views from our own, you are simply placing yourselves under a yoke; you are swerving your country from that destiny which your fathers intended it, and which you fondly hoped you were achieving.

I say that every undesirable settler who enters the Northwest, who is, we will say, inferior to ourselves in his knowledge of the government, in his ideas of liberty, is a detriment to this country. . . . I am given to understand that a new system is being adopted in regard to immigration from the British isles. I am not familiar with the details of that system, but I will say that there is no possibility of adopting any system which could be less effective than that which has prevailed during

the past years. I am satisfied that any system that is adopted will be an improvement.

Mr. Speaker, I said when I began my remarks that not only does the resolution before the House raise the particular question of this unexplained contract, this singular arrangement, but it raises the whole question of immigration. We have for years been increasing the sums which we devote to immigration. How do we spend these sums ? We employ agents in Europe, in the British isles, we spent last year I believe over $200,000 in advertising in the United States ; and there is an item in the Auditor General's Report of $30,000 spent on a single newspaper, an issue of a million copies circulating through the United States. I venture to assert that an investigation, a careful and unbiased investigation of our immigration work, not only on the continent, a part of which has just been brought to light, but in the United States and England as well, will show that the time has arrived in our history for a complete change of system. There can be no doubt whatever that we must abolish the bonusing system. We have outlived that system, it produces nothing but abuse. We should abolish that system without delay. It costs hundreds of thousands of dollars every year, and it brings nothing good to this country. If you will allow me, Mr. Speaker, I will take up a little more time by quoting from the report of the inspector of prisons for the province of Ontario. I quote it because I have no doubt whatever that what is stated in that report could be corroborated in the province of Quebec by our city police and judges, and by all those who have anything to do with the punishment of crime. This is what I find in the 36th Annual Report of the Inspector of Prisons and Public Charities and Hospitals, for the year ending 30th September, 1905 :

> There is marked evidence that public attention should be called to the large number of undesirable and unsuitable immigrants that are being induced to seek a shelter in Ontario. This has been found nowhere more noticeable than in the city of Toronto where more than half of the indigent casuals who have had to be provided for, belong to the immigrant class. When they arrive here they are carefully and kindly looked after and provided with employment. In many instances, however, they prove quite incapable and, when winter comes on, they drift into cities and are not slow to find the location of the charitable institutions. The whole fault for this condition must be placed where it belongs, namely, in the system that permits and encourages immigration without a proper discrimination. The present policy of Canadian immigration agents in Europe would seem to be to secure the number and pay no heed to the quality of persons urged to seek a haven in this country. The present system of the Dominion government in bonusing agents to send out in an apparently indiscriminate manner a class of people totally unfit to provide a livelihood for themselves, is deplorable.

There is much more to the same effect,

I have other documents here from which I could read, and which demonstrate that our system of bonusing requires an immediate reform. Mr. Speaker, I trust the government will not only give us the full facts in connection with this contract, reveal to us the persons with whom they have made that contract, and to whom they have paid such large sums of money, but will pursue with willingness the investigation they have begun. I believe it is high time that we should adopt in this country the system which has prevailed in the United States for years past—respect for our country, a desire to prevent undesirable immigrants, a system of inspection, no catering, no advertising, no begging for immigrants in other countries ; but on the contrary a dignified position with regard to those immigrants, making sure before they arrive in this country that they are not going to be an element to degrade, an element to lower us, an element to imperil our future, but that they are in every respect worthy to form a part of this great nation.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS (Yale-Cariboo). The hon. member for Jacques-Cartier (Mr. Monk) flatters himself that he belongs to the attacking party. I think he will find before this discussion is finished that he belongs to the defensive and defenceless party. However, I must congratulate him upon the fact that he has substituted 'the comity of nations' for the old flag. In days gone by when the Conservative party made some pretense of having a platform and a policy, they used to wave vigorously the old flag when argument was lacking. But in this case, as there is no argument to justify the resolution, they exploit 'the comity of nations.' They tell us that His Majesty the King is to have no supply because the North Atlantic Trading Company has smashed into smithereens the comity of nations. Now, Sir, why so much ado about this contract at the present time ? It is no new contract. It has been in force for a great many years, it has been before this parliament for a great many years. Why, Sir, in the annual report of the Department of Agriculture for the year 1901-1902 there are no less than four, five and six pages dealing with this particular contract. The details of the contract are set forth, the conditions under which the North Atlantic Trading Company are operating are set forth. I also find that before the Committee of Agriculture and Colonization for the same year this contract was under review. How is it that it is only in the session of 1906 that these gentlemen have discovered that it is an awful contract, that suspicious circumstances surround it on all sides? I will tell you why it is. About a month ago it was suggested in this House that this contract was under review by the Department of the Interior. It was known to the great majority of members, at least, that the Minister of the Interior had decided that this company was not living up to all

the conditions of the contract, and he was making an inquiry into the conditions under which it was being operated. Well, the Conservative party thought this was a splendid opportunity for them to assert themselves. Although this contract had been before the House for five long years, they thought that the present was a splendid opportunity for them to attack it. So they said, we will attack it now, we will forestall any action the Minister of the Interior may take, and we will show that it is a bad contract. Now why did not these gentlemen at any time during the last five years, tell the people of this country that it was a bad contract ?

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. We did last year. We moved to cancel it last year.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Oh, you did. Well I am very glad to find that the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) was good enough, in the interests of the country, to move last year to cancel this contract which had been four years in operation. However, that does not destroy my argument that this contract was in force for five years and that they had plenty of opportunity, at any time within those five years, of bringing it before parliament. The leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden) says now that he moved to cancel the contract last year. I was not aware of the fact, I do not remember the fact. However, it seems to me that if the contract was a bad one, this discussion should have taken place long before it was known to the members of this House that the Minister of the Interior had the contract under review. I am not one of those who believe that the contract is a bad one. I believe it was a good contract, I believe it was a contract in the best interests of this country and while it is a very easy matter for hon. gentlemen to criticise it now, at the same time, if we take the results from this contract what do we find ? We find that we have secured immigration under this contract cheaper than by any other means that have been suggested to secure immigration to this country. Take the results in the year 1904-5. We find that this year the total immigration from the continent of Europe was 35,923. We find that from the countries under the contract the total immigration was 28,596. The total number of immigrants of the farming classes under the contract was 13,554. The total immigration from the restricted countries under the contract was 8,794. The numbers of immigrants of the farming classes from the restricted countries was 6,167. The Department of the Interior allowed on these 6,167 a bonus only on 5,000. The net number allowed for bonus after deducting 482, who went to the United States and upon whom no bonus was allowed was 11,905, making a total of $57,858 for which we got 13,076, or $4.42 per head.

I need not to go into details in regard to 1903-4. In that year, bonus was paid on 11,790, making a total of $57,299 for which we got 14,221 of the agricultural class or at the rate of $4.03 per head. In 1902-3 we got, of the agricultural class, 15,632 for whom we paid $3.69 per head. In 1901-2 we got, of the agricultural class, 11,049 for whom we paid $3.86 per head. In the four years we paid to this company $216,555 in bonuses, and £750 per year conditional upon the company expending £1,000 per year in Scandinavian work making an average of $4.21 per head for the four years during which this company was operating for our farming classes from these countries. The question was asked by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) the other night : Why don't we send our own agents in there, why don't we distribute our own advertising matter, why don't we do our own immigration work in those countries ? Let us see the result in the countries in which we have continued the old line system of carrying on immigration work. I shall give the details of the cost of our immigrants from the British Isles in the year 1903-4. The total arrivals were 50,374. The number of farmers, farm servants and domestics was 17,570. The total expenditure in the British Isles for immigration work in the year 1904 was $236,000. The cost per head for all the immigrants we got from the British Isles was $4.68. The cost per head for the farming class from British Isles was $13.43 against an average of $4.21 per head for the agricultural classes we got from those continental countries of Europe. Let us take Belgium and France where we have our own immigration agents. What was the cost there ? The total arrivals from France in 1903-4 was 1,324, from Beligum 356, making a total of 2,398. The total number of farmers from France was 693, from Belgium 347, making a total of 1,039. We expended in those countries on immigration work, $30,000. The cost per head was $12.54. The cost per farmer was $28.87 against $4.21 under this contract. Take it in the United States. We expended there last year $205,000. That made an average cost for the farmers we secured from the United States of $4.73 against $4.21 under the contract with the North Atlantic Trading Company, so that you see, Mr. Speaker, in all these countries where this plan has been adopted it cost us more for our immigrants than it did under this contract with the North Atlantic Trading Company.

The statement was also made the other evening by the hon. gentleman for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) that conditions were favourable for immigration work on the continent under this contract, that :

> In parts of those countries you have grinding taxation, which tends to disperse its population to free countries and freer conditions. In those countries you have ferocity of religious

and race persecution, which, rising into violence and even murder at times, sends waves of people out of these countries to seek an asylum in freer and better countries.

Now, Sir, I would like to ask the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) if these conditions have become worse since this contract was entered into? Is this persecution any more severe now than it was before the contract was entered into? Is taxation any more grinding? What is the result? Before we entered into this contract, in the year 1898, we received from the countries under the contract 5,499 immigrants. In the year 1903, under the contract, we received 27,048 immigrants. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) must find some other excuse for this increase in the immigration from those countries because the same conditions obtained there in 1898 as obtain to-day.

There were two factors which most largely contributed to the development of the Northwest; one was the contract with the North Atlantic Trading Company; the other was the contract with the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company. I am not one of those hidebound partisans who believes that credit should not be given to an opponent where credit is due. I am free to admit there was nothing particularly original about either scheme for we borrowed both of them from the Conservative party. We were not the first to begin the work of getting immigrants from continental Europe nor the first to pay bonuses on European immigrants. That eminent Canadian statesman Sir Charles Tupper, must be given credit for having originated this scheme. He offered bonuses to shipping agents for securing immigrants from continental Europe and more than that, he sent his man John Dyke to work up emigration to Canada with the result that poor Mr. Dyke went to jail and for six months languished in a Hungarian dungeon until the British government got him out. When the Liberal government came to power they perfected that scheme, and made it workable, so that it was possible to secure immigrants from these countries without anybody going to jail.

Mr. WARD. Because you could not find them.

Mr. SPROULE. You could not find them with a search warrant.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Whom do you want to find?

Mr. WARD. The North Atlantic Trading Company.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. Very well, I will deal with that. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) made a good deal of the fact that the incorporators of this company were an hotel keeper, lawyer's clerks, and persons of that kind, but I can go to the office of the registrar of joint stock companies in the city of Victoria and I can find there at least half a dozen companies with which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) is connected, and the incorporators of these companies are the printers in the offices in which the articles of association were printed, no others who could be conveniently found to sign the articles. The hon. gentleman knows perfectly well that in the mere formality of registering a joint stock company, the names of the subscribers to the memorandum of association are usually picked up in the most convenient manner. And by the way, if I wanted to go into that matter I could tell a very very sad tale, (a tale almost as sad as the tale about the Amsterdam office of the North Atlantic Trading Company) about the success attending the mining operations of the hon. member for North Toronto.

Mr. FOSTER. There are others.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. There is another phase of this question, Mr. Speaker, with which I shall deal briefly. The hon. member (Mr. Foster) has evidently adopted a policy of vilifying the work of the Department of the Interior and it is quite evident he has stampeded the Conservative party in the same effort. It is only a short time ago that he discussed here the contract of the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, and again I give the Conservative party due credit for having originated the plan of inducing settlement in the Northwest by means of colonization companies. They had colonization companies, plenty of them about 20 in all. But the trouble with their colonization companies was that they would not work; they never brought in settlers, the friends of the member for North Toronto, when he was in power, got the land but the Northwest didn't get the settlers. The Liberal government did business with one colonization company, viz., the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company. They entered into a business arrangement with men of expert knowledge in the work of placing settlers of a good class on the land and the result was we got the settlers. They brought settlers there who had money, settlers who had experience, settlers having knowledge of the conditions in the Northwest, settlers who purchased the land and made a success of farming, settlers who sent the good news to their friends in the United States, and it is this which is responsible for creating such a flood of immigration to the Northwest from the United States, as did in a measure offset the drain of our best blood to that country during the dark days of Conservative rule. I shall deal very briefly with some of the colonization—immigration schemes of the Conservative government, of which my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) was a member. Let us take first the Temperance Colonization Society Limited, which comprised some very near

and dear political friends of the hon. gentleman. That society entered into a contract with the Conservative government for something like 217,000 acres of land on condition that they would within five years :

> Colonize this tract within five years from the date of the contract by placing two settlers on homesteads on each even numbered section and two settlers on each odd numbered section.

This contract was made in the days when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) had a prejudice in favour of cold water, and he was particularly anxious that the Temperance Colonization Society should receive every encouragement in getting this 217,000 acres in the Northwest. They got the land. What happened in 1891 when the hon. gentleman from North Toronto was a member of the government? Hear the sad story of that Temperance Colonization Society, as set forth in this order in council passed on the 21st of April, 1891. In the meantime the hon. gentleman had a moment of weakness and he took a 'scunner' to cold water, and the Temperance Society did not flourish in the west. Let us see what became of the land. Its story is set forth in the order in council. During these five years, according to the report of Mr. Rufus Stephenson, inspector of colonization companies, there was in 1887, one year after the contract went into effect, 90 bona fide settlers on the land granted to this colonization company ; and four years after that, Mr. Stephenson states with a flourish of trumpets that this company succeeded in getting 11 additional settlers upon the land, making 101 settlers all told. And the government was so grateful to this company at having in five years' time put 101 settlers upon 217,000 acres of land that by order in council they gave the company a bonus of $100,000 for having done so. The hon. member for North Toronto shies at a bonus of $4.09 a head for immigrants from continental Europe, but he never blinked an eye when he gave the temperance colony a bonus of $1,000 a head for putting settlers on those lands.

But that was not all. The company asked for payment of an expense bill—here it is in the order in council—amounting to $222,737.18 in connection with putting the 101 settlers on those lands. Even the hon. member for North Toronto could not stand for that, so they made an even number of it, and gave them an allowance of $100,000 in part payment for 100,000 acres of land. And what became of the land ? It remained unsettled until the present government came into power. They could not sell it ; they could not do anything with it ; but as soon as this government adopted an aggressive and systematic policy of settling the Northwest, as soon as they entered into a contract with the North Atlantic Trading Company, as soon as they entered into a contract with the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company, as soon as they got immigration pouring in there, the friends of the hon. member for North Toronto sold their lands. Go into the office of the hon. member for West Toronto Mr. Osler) today, and what do you find ? You find them selling the land of the temperance colony in the Northwest under the names of these trustees : Mr. E. B. Osler, Mr. Charles Bailie Powell, Mr. J. C. White, Mr. A. M. Nanton ; and at what price are they selling the lands ? At $7 or $8 an acre that horrified the hon. member for North Toronto the other day ? Not much. They are selling the land which was given by the Conservative government to the temperance colonization society at from $75 to $100 per foot front in the town of Saskatoon and at $1,500 and $2,000 an acre. The hon. member for North Toronto howls because the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company sells its land at $7 and $8 an acre ; but he has not a word to say when his dear Conservative friends sell the lands they secured in violation of an agreement with the Conservative government at $1,500 and $2,000 an acre. The gentlemen who are today manipulating this temperance society of hon. gentlemen opposite are E. B. Osler, Charles Bailie Powell, J C. White and A. M. Nanton.

Mr. SAM HUGHES. Perhaps the hon. member will now give us the names of the directors of the North Atlantic Trading Company.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I do not know the names of the directors of the North Atlantic Trading Company, and I do not care. All I care about is whether they have done the work for the money which was paid to them.

This brings me back to another phase of the situation in connection with the contract with the North Atlantic Trading Company. The hon. member for North Toronto and the hon. member for Jacques Cartier wonder if they were responsible for the immigrants which we secured from those European countries. It is a matter of wonder to these hon. gentlemen whether the fact that the company did work, that they distributed literature, opened up offices and carried on a propaganda in those countries, is responsible for the immigration that we got from there. Why, Sir, was such an absurd question ever asked before ? It is truly Fosterian in its absurdity. There is a firm in Montreal, the Slater Shoe Company, who make shoes. They spend nearly $1,000,000 a year in advertising. Does Mr. Slater discontinue to advertise because John Jones at Metlakatla in British Columbia does not send him a letter like this : 'Dear Mr. Slater, I saw your advertisement in such and such a paper and I am going to buy your shoes' ? He cannot trace the direct effect of his advertising in a single instance, but he knows that he is selling shoes, and

he continues to advertise. We knew that we were getting the immigrants, and we continued to do business with the North Atlantic Trading Company.

But I am not through with the hon. member for North Toronto and his policy of the land for the settler. I find that since he got into the cold shades of opposition, the expert knowledge which he acquired as a member of this government in connection with land deals in the Northwest, has been exploited to his own advantage and the advantage of his friends. I find that some few years ago he and his friends got possession of 40,000 acres of land adjoining the village of Tisdale in the province of Saskatchewan on the line of the Canadian Northern Railway. They got both the odd numbered and even numbered sections—in fact, every acre in two townships except the lands of the Hudson's Bay Company and the school lands. Although he had been approached numerous times by the owners of the lands in adjoining townships, with the offer that they would let him select from their lands lands as good or better if he would only release the ever numbered sections so that they could be thrown open to entry of free homesteads—notwithstanding these offers and the protests of the people in that district, and to the great detriment of the village of Tisdale, he persistently held on to the lands, with the result that there is not a single settler in either township; and the hon. member for North Toronto to-day enjoys the distinction of being the manager of the only two townships of arable land between Winnipeg and Prince Albert which remain unsettled, and which he is holding at $3 or $4 an acre above the market price. And this is the hon. gentleman who howls in this House about the land for the settler.

But there is another land deal in which the hon. member for North Toronto is interested. A few years ago when a certain railway company was very much afraid that the monopoly which they secured under the Conservative government, and which they had enjoyed for a good many years would be destroyed. By some mysterious method, certain Conservative members of this House became possessed of some 200,000 acres of Canadian Pacific Railway lands in the Northwest. Not having the experience of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) in land dealings, they immediately went to him to manage the affair, and no sooner did he get his clutches on it than a new nest of traitors was organized—a nest of traitors among the land speculators; and those poor members of the House who were not seasoned birds like the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and the Hon. Dr. Montague, and Mr. John A. McGillivray, ex-M.P., and Robert Birmingham and J. H. Spence, were thrown out of the nest. And these gentlemen are trying to get back by process of law. I hold in my hands the statement of claims in the case between A. A. Lefurgey, W. H. Bennett—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh. oh.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. That name seems familiar. The hon. gentleman from East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) must have been trying to secure a balm for his disappointment at not having some years ago got a slice of public domain upon easy terms. A. A. Lefurgey, W. H. Bennett and Arthur Penthin, plaintiffs, and the Great West Land Company, Limited, Rufus Pope and George W. Fowler, defendants. As I read this statement of claims I am very much impressed with the fact that the Conservatives, even in their land dealings and speculations, cannot trust each other, they cannot play fair among themselves. They were all right until they came under the blighting influence of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). Until then they were a happy family, but just as soon as he began to complicate matters, they had to go to law to get their rights. Now, what do we find? In the statement of claim, the plaintiffs allege the formation of a syndicate of only five members namely, Lefurgey, Bennett, Penthin, Pope and Fowler. It was contemplated at first that the syndicate should be composed of ten, but they found the scheme would work so beautifully that five could get along first rate. Messrs. Pope and Fowler, being the more seasoned birds, managed the affair and made a contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway for the purchase of 200,000 acres of lands in the Territories. The plaintiffs—here is the point—upon the call of Pope and Fowler duly contributed their share of the moneys for the said purchase. Pope and Fowler made a contract for the sale to the New Ontario Farm and Town Site Syndicate for a portion of the lands. This last company transferred to the Great West Land Company, Limited, the last mentioned contract, which was for 202,572 49-100 acres of land. The Great West Land Company, Limited, was composed of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and Conservative friends of his who were out of a job—Dr. Montague, John A. McGillivray, Robert Birmingham and J. A. Spence, who I understand used once to be a Liberal, but when he came into the Fosterian cult he developed into a real good Conservative. These are the men who formed the Great West Land Company, Limited. The plaintiffs go on to recite that the syndicate, that is these five persons, were thus entitled to receive for the land, stock in the Great West Land Company amounting to $63,320, besides a large sum of money in cash. The stock in the Great West Land Company has not been issued, and Messrs. Pope and Fowler claim to be entitled to seven-tenths of the stock so to be issued, but the plaintiffs claim to be entitled

each to one-fifth. The claim goes on to recite that Pope and Fowler have received from the defendant company on account of said sale $50,484.36, and they have assumed to retain for their commission in respect of the said sale the sum of $20,000 and also assume to retain therefrom seven-tenths of the remainder of the money divisible amongst the members of the syndicate.

These gentlemen wanted to take $20,000, they wanted to take seven-tenths of the balance and then divide among the syndicate the small remaining portion, and our poor dear friends from Prince Edward Island and East Simcoe will come in after this division is made. Bearing in mind that in that statement of claim the plaintiffs say that they contributed their share of the moneys for the said purchase, we now turn to the defence of the said Pope and Fowler. They even deny the syndicate of five members. They deny the contribution by the plaintiffs of any money. They say the syndicate was composed of ten persons to purchase 193,937 acres of land along the North Saskatchewan river from the Canadian Pacific Railway at $3.50 per acre, in which the plaintiffs have each one-tenth interest and contributed one-tenth of the expense. They say they got the option from the Canadian Pacific Railway for the purchase of the land solely by their own exertions—I wonder what exertions they put forth to get land for about $3 an acre less than the market price. But here is the point. The defendants say that the plaintiffs contributed only $200 each and had no trouble about getting the option, but you will mark that in their statement of claim the plaintiffs hold that they put up their share. Consequently if they were telling the truth, each of the members of this syndicate of five only put up $200, and through the manipulation of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) they sold some 200,000 acres of Canadian Pacific Railway land to this company at a profit of $1 an acre. One would think there was enough in that to go round. But no, the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) is never mixed up in anything without developing a nest of traitors. He did not want to divide up on an even basis, but wanted to squeeze the two neophytes who could not live in the same nest with himself and Dr. Montague and Mr. Birmingham and the rest.

Now, Mr. Speaker, regarding this North Atlantic Trading Company, I took the trouble to follow very closely the investigation in the Committee of Agriculture and Colonization and have endeavoured to secure as much information as posible in connection with this contract.

Mr. SAM. HUGHES. Which contract ?

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS. I am speaking of the contract with the North Atlantic Trading Company. The hon. gentleman has heard of it before, I presume. And I am bound to say that while the Minister of the Interior has found it necessary, because of the violations of the conditions of the contract, to give notice of its cancellation, it was a contract in the best interests of the country. The contract itself was a good one, but of course it is for the Minister of the Interior to say whether the conditions have been lived up to or not. And, notwithstanding the denunciation by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) of the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) notwithstanding his denunciation of the ex-deputy minister of the Interior, I am bound to say that so far as the west is concerned, nothing has so strengthened this government as its administration of the Department of the Interior, and no men receive so much credit for having initiated a policy of progress and development in connection with that department as these two gentlemen. It is all very well for the member for West Toronto to vilify the ex-Minister of the Interior in his absence, but let him go out to the west and let him find what the people there think of the ex-minister and his administration of his department. Let him consider if he will the by-elections in the Northwest during the last few months. Let him consider the fact that two members supporting this government were returned by acclamation, and that, yesterday, there was introduced into this House another member whose opponent lost his deposit. There he will find his answer to his vilification of the ex-Minister of the Interior.

In reference to this contract, I say that we in the west have entered upon an era of railway development such as this country has never seen. The Canadian Pacific Railway Company is building hundreds of miles of railway in the west. The Grand Trunk Pacific another transcontinental railway is now under construction. Mr. J. J. Hill has announced that he is going to build still another transcontinental railway through Canada. The Chicago, Milwaukee, and St. Paul Railway Company is building a line from the Missouri river to the coast. And these are only a few of the railway projects in that country. Now, I hold that so far as the Grand Trunk Pacific at least, is concerned, we should secure the very highest percentage of the best Canadian citizenship from the expenditure of the large amount of money necessary to construct that road. That road must be built by one or other of two classes, for in these days there are only two classes of people who engage largely in railway work. One, is composed of the Finlanders, Swedes, and other people from the north, and the other is composed of Italians, people from the south of Europe. It was announced yesterday that Mr. J. D. McArthur would require at least 10,000 men to complete his contract from Winnipeg to Superior junc-

tion. I have no hesitation in saying that it will require an army of 100,000 men to construct the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway within the time set for its completion. Whence are these men to come? If you destroy your system of regulating immigration into this country, your railway contractors will become aggressive immigraion agents and, if you put a time limit upon them for the completion of their works, you cannot restrict them as to the places whence they shall bring their labour or as to the class of labour they shall secure. They will bring in Italians, because it is more convenient to procure them. And these Italians will not settle upon the land, but will congregate in your cities to become a menace to the other citizens of those places. But, if the people from these other countries are given work on the railways, it will be an encouragement for them to come in here, and they will settle upon the land. For my part, I would like to see the people who construct these railways of the same class as those who built the state of Minnesota which is to-day one of the most prosperous states in the union. For this reason I hope that, if this contract is to be cancelled the Minister of the Interior, will lose no time in making some other arrangement to regulate the immigration into this country. We would like to get the people who will not only engage in railway work, but will also remain here and settle upon our lands and make good citizens.

It seems to me quite plain that the resolution proposed by the hon. member for North Toronto is merely part of a campaign which the Conservative party in this House has evidently adopted since they came under his blighting influence. It is a campaign of slander a campaign of mudslinging in the hope that some of it will stick. They know perfectly well that public opinion in this country will tolerate nothing but honest administration of public affairs; and so from their places in this House, through their party press and otherwise, they carry on a systematic campaign of abuse in the hope that the public of this country will accept their reiterated statements, though there is not a tittle of evidence to substantiate them. But I am afraid that by the blundering, if brilliant tactics, which have always characterized the chequered career of the hon. member for North Toronto, he has led his friends into a cul de sac from which there is no escape. They are surrounded on all sides by the awful record of his own administration, not only in reference to immigration, not only in reference to the administration of the Northwest lands, but in reference to the administration of every department of the public service. And this record is an impenetrable and insurmountable wall. When the hon. member for North Toronto introduces resolutions of this kind he should not forget that he belongs to a party of the past, a party with a record. The hon. gentleman got his answer in 1896, in 1900 and 1904. And, so long as he is the chief apostle of political purity on that side of the House, so long will the answer of the people be the same. The ugly chickens which he hatched between 1888 and 1896 are still coming home to roost. He will get no sympathy from this side of the House, and, what is still more galling, he will get no sympathy from his own side.

Mr. W. B. NORTHRUP (East Hastings). Mr. Speaker, I trust I shall receive the indulgence of the House, if I venture to recall to the recollection of hon. members the subject which is before the House—a matter to which their attention has not been called for the last three-quarters of an hour. I trust that I shall receive indulgence at your hands, if, through ignorance of the rules of debate and procedure in this House, I should transgress. In my humble ignorance I have always understood that speakers on the floor of parliament were to confine themselves to the subject before the House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I have always thought so, Sir, though I see from the laughter of the hon. member from Cape Breton (Mr. A. Johnston) that there is one member of the House who differs from me on that point. But I am ready to leave it to the arbitrament of the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) that, at least, it used to be considered the duty of members of parliament, when speaking, to confine themselves to the subject before the House. And I trust that this will be the last time when, with the right hon. leader of the House present three-quarters of an hour of the time of this Chamber shall be occupied by a discussion of private matters between members who sit side by side and by the reading of one-sided quotations from a case—yes, and a case that is actually now pending in the courts of the province in which we sit. I venture to say that a more humiliating spectacle was never seen in this legislative body. And, Sir, I blame not so much the hon. gentleman himself to whom I give full credit for speaking with perfect sincerity though with dense ignorance; but I blame the right hon. gentleman who leads this House that he should allow our time to be fritted away and attempts to be made to draw the attention of members of this House away from the question before them, a question on which they will have to vote to-night and a question which it is the duty of hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House to consider well, so that when they are called to face the people of this country, they at all events cannot say that they did not understand the question on which they voted on the evening of April 24, 1906.

Now, Sir, begging pardon of the House for reminding them of the question before us, let me point out that the amendment moved by the hon. member for North Toronto was absolutely clear cut. The hon. gentlemen opposite may agree or disagree with it, but they have no right to rise in this House and profess to discuss it unless they at least know what it is, and if they will take the trouble to read that amendment they will find that there is not a single word in it of condemnation of the government on any other ground than on account of the particular contract known as the North Atlantic Trading Company's contract which is referred to in that resolution. When hon. gentlemen come to vote to-night, they are not called upon to vote in support of the gentlemen administering the government, they are not called on to vote even in favour of the immigration department of the government, but as between them and their constituents, they will have to stand up and vote whether or not the conditions of the contract made between this government and the North Atlantic Trading Company are 'injurious, improvident and absurd.' This is the question before the House, and any gentleman trifles with the dignity of parliament, any gentleman insults not only his opponents but those sitting about him, when he occupies the time of this House discussing any other question than that.

Now, Sir, I do not wish to be unjust to the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, and I quite understand perhaps why he devoted his attention to other topics than that before the House. He did make three references, and three only, to that subject, the amendment moved by the hon. member for North Toronto. Outside of these three references, every word he said this afternoon was like the flowers that bloom in spring, having nothing to do with the case. When I listened to the first two statements the hon. gentleman made, I wondered what in the world he would say next. I must congratulate him at all events on his wisdom in leaving the subject on which he shows much deplorable ignorance. I do not know whether to congratulate him more on the length of his memory or the depth of his forgetfulness. He commenced his remarks by attacking hon. gentlemen on this side because, through all these long years, we had sat here idle, crouching under the weight of this North Atlantic Trading Company. Why had we not done something before to-day ? Why, at this time, do we suddenly rise and attempt to cancel this most righteous contract ? Why, Sir, I see the hon. gentleman has left his seat, I suppose he is afraid that possibly he might learn something about this contract. Now, if he thinks the opposition was to blame because we did not attack this contract in days gone by, he gives proof of a very short memory. Let me refer him to the 'Hansard' debate of last year. I find that on the 2nd of July a resolution was moved by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Osler) in the following words :

> That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable to give notice of the government's intention to terminate the agreement with the North Atlantic Trading Company according to the terms of the contract.

Could anything be more clear cut than that ? And a vote of this House was taken, and gentlemen on this side voted that the government should cancel that contract, and gentlemen on the other side voted that the government should not cancel that contract, and among the gentlemen voting not to cancel the contract was the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Duncan Ross). Unfortunately, Sir, the rules of parliament to which I wish to adhere, prevent me from referring to the proceedings in another branch of this legislature within a week or ten days, otherwise I could accumulate evidence as to what the hon. gentleman supporting the government thinks of this contract. Then the hon. gentleman said that the only reason we moved now was because everybody knew a month ago that the government had decided to cancel this contract, and therefore we on this side of the House, knowing that the government intended to cancel the contract, decided to steal their thunder and thereby gain a little cheap popularity. Now, I do not say that the hon. gentleman did not speak sincerely, but I wish to congratulate him on his memory. This is more than a case of memory, it is a case of even more than mind reading, more than second sight, because, although the government had decided to cancel this contract they did not decide to cancel it until the 14th of April, as we are told by the Minister of the Interior page 1901, of the 'Hansard', in answer to a question of the leader of the opposition.

> The conclusion was reached, I have said, on the 14th of April.

So, I hope the hon. gentleman will apologize to gentlemen on this side of the House and admit that he was wrong when he said that we brought up this motion because everybody knew a month ago that the government had decided to cancel this contract. Now, Sir, the question, as I have said, is not one concerning the general administration of the government, and members cannot shelter themselves under that pretense when they go back to their constituents. The question is this, is this particular contract an excellent contract, is it one that should be maintained, or is it one that should be cancelled ? I can quite understand the embarrassment of hon. gentlemen opposite who, in this painful dilemma, are obliged to stand up and tell their fellow-members that this is a righteous contract,

and at the same time say that, righteous as it is, beneficial as it is to the people of this country, desirable as it is that it should be maintained and perpetuated, still the government decided on the 14th of April last to cancel it. Surely members of this House were never placed in a more embarrassing position than that. Now what is this contract about which so much has been said ? The contract is in the possession of all the members. It commences by correspondence in the fall of the year 1899, and is closed by a letter of the 4th of November, 1899, signed by W. T. R. Preston, agreeing to the terms. If hon. gentlemen will take the trouble to read that contract they will find that this North Atlantic Trading Company only agrees to do one thing, and in consideration of that one thing they are to be paid certain bonuses. They are to be paid :

17 shillings and 6 pence sterling per capita on any number less than ten thousand in each year ;

20 shillings sterling per capita on any number between ten thousand and fifteen thousand in each year ;

25 shillings sterling per capita on any number exceeding fifteen thousand in each year.

They are given the whole continent of Europe, and no matter from what country people may come to Canada, no matter what reasons brought them here, no matter who the agents were, booking agents or otherwise, who called Canada to their attention, this happy trading company, coming into existence at the close of 1899, is to receive from the 1st of January those sums on every immigrant which came to this country, provided that the immigrants landed in Canada and were registered at the ports of Halifax, St. John, Quebec and Montreal, and were over twelve years of age. Now that seems like an attractive contract. That company could step in and have this advantage without having expended, or being able to expend, anything up to the beginning of the year. They are to be paid those sums on all immigrants who came to this country bound for Manitoba and the Northwest, provided they were over twelve years of age. Now what was the company to do ?—for something surely must come from the company in consideration of this valuable franchise. What was the company to do ?

We will undertake to bring Canada to the attention of people residing in continental European countries——

That is not very serious, 'to bring Canada to the attention of the people residing in continental European countries.'

They agreed further in answer to queries to furnish reliable information regarding the climatic conditions and resources of Canada, and, where it is the intention to emigrate, to point to Canada as a desirable field for settlement.

And that is all they were to do. This North Atlantic Trading Company was not bound to spend one single dollar, under the first contract and yet from the time it was signed they were entitled to this sum per head for every immigrant. I would like to ask hon. gentlemen opposite if they think that was a business-like proposition ; I would like to ask hon. gentlemen opposite if there is any one of them—and I will admit frankly there is not any member on this side of the House—who would not be delighted to receive a contract from the Dominion of Canada under which he would be entitled to receive these sums on every immigrant over twelve years of age going to Manitoba and the Northwest provinces for five years without the slightest undertaking on his part to expend one dollar or to expend any exertion except to advertise Canada to those who come to inquire, to answer questions and if people are inclined to emigrate to point out the peculiar advantages of Canada as a land for settlement.

That is the contract in its initiation and I would like hon. gentlemen calmly to consider whether or not they can endorse the statement of the hon. gentleman who last spoke (Mr. Ross) that it was a good contract. But the contract did not remain in that position ; there was one weak spot in the contract from the standpoint of the company. The immigrants on whose heads the bounty was to be paid had to be over twelve years of age, a very wise provision. I think about the only wise provision there was in the contract made on behalf of the country. But the contract had not been in existence more than two or three months before, by a quiet side arrangement between Mr. Smart and the company, an arrangement communicated by Mr. Smart to the pay masters, it was decided to pay this bonus on every man, woman and child, although under the original contract these sums were to be paid only on immigrants over twelve years of age. I find on looking through the papers, that in one year there was question about the amount of money that the Galicians brought into this country, and in order to ascertain how much per head they brought in an investigation was held as to the number of men, women and children and it was found that in that year, among the Galicians alone, one single nationality out of a dozen, 2,087 children were brought into this country of Galician parentage on whom this country had to pay $5 per head. I would like to ask hon. gentlemen opposite if they think that was an improvement in the contract. The first contract was for a limited time, five years. That was not satisfactory to these gentlemen, whoever they are, composing the North Atlantic Trading Company and so, by successive changes—and I do not wish to weary the House by going into the changes because I want to adhere to the main point—the con-

tract was made more favourable to the company. The original contract in November, 1899, was not approved by order in council, but as far as we can see from the papers brought down an alleged copy was sent to the Auditor General, and acted upon by him at the time being represented to him by the deputy minister to be the contract, although it was not the contract, and the result of this was that money was paid on the children as well as on the adults. There was a change in 1902, by which the term was extended ten years with the requirement of two years' notice of cancellation. There was a change again in 1904, small changes each time, but on each occasion giving greater concessions, greater advantages to this company, and the greatest advantage of all was that each time there was a change the contract was continued for another ten years. When the change was made in 1902, two years of the term had elapsed, and the term had then became eight years. It was again extended ten years and the right of cancellation was only to exist after four years. Without going into further details I think I may say that when we find a contract of this kind, no matter with whom made, which in its inception does not require a dollar to be put up by the company, which later required £3,000 a year to be spent in literature but which did not require a pound to be spent until the company had been in existence long enough to have gained five or ten times that amount out of the government, so that it did not have to pay out a dollar of its own money, and when we find the company called upon to pay a thousand pounds for additional work in Scandinavia the government put up £750 a year and we find that, year after year, the accounts were not audited because they could not be audited by the officers of the government, then we have some reason to be suspicious, and have reason to say that the contract is absurd, iniquitous and unjust as is stated in the amendment to the motion for the House to go into Committee of Supply.

Now, having said so much about the contract let me refer to a few remarks of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) the other day which were repeated by his humble follower to-day. The Minister of the Interior followed a course that I think was probably quite legitimate as a matter of political argument, but I do not think it was patriotic. The duty of the minister is to try and secure the best bargain he can for this country, and I am sure there is nobody on the Treasury benches or on the seats behind them any more than there is on this side of the House, or in the country, who really believes it is any answer to a charge of wrong-doing made against hon. gentlemen opposite for them to say : Your predecessors, the Conservative party, ten years ago did as badly as we did. Our party was turned out of power by the people of this country because they thought we were not doing the best and you were put in power to carry out the promises you made to do better than we did, and therefore you know perfectly well it is no answer to say : You gentlemen opposite, on the opposition benches, in the day of your power did as badly as or worse than we have done. But what does the Minister of the Interior say ? He says a contract was made by the Conservative party when in power, and he gives the contract in order that there should be no possibility of difference of opinion about it. He quoted a letter written by Mr. Low and another by the Hon. John Henry Pope, the latter being Minister of Agriculture at the time. This contract was made in 1882, and the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) triumphantly says : Why gentlemen here was your immigration system established by the Conservative party away back in 1882, maintained by them until they went out of power in 1896, and faithfully, but with improvements, continued by us ever since. Now, that statement is accurate or it is not accurate. If it is not accurate I think a withdrawal would be very fitting and becoming on the part of the Minister of the Interior who used this language :

> This was the rule in 1882 under the Hon. John Henry Pope, Minister of Agriculture, but it is not the rule in 1902 under the Hon. Clifford Sifton, Minister of the Interior.

Now, if the cases are entirely dissimilar, if there is not the faintest shadow of resemblance between the policy of the Conservative party and the policy of the present administration, I think we might fairly ask the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) as the member of the government whom hon. members on this side have always said desired to be honest—I think I can ask him to withdraw his statement that he has followed the policy initiated by his predecessors in office, and after I have proved it I cannot say to the hon. gentleman because his term of an hour a day in the House seems to have expired, but to his colleagues I hope that they will carry the news to him, that there is no similarity whatever between the contract made in 1882 and the contract made in 1899 and frequently amended from that day to this. In the first place if one looks at the contract made in 1882, that is the letter written to the agent of the Erie Railway Company, it is written by Mr. John Henry Pope to the General Passenger Agent of the Erie Railway Company, New York. There is no dispute there as to the party with whom the contract was made, there is no doubt in the world with whom the government is dealing, and one of the reasons given in this letter for the government in making the contract with this particular railway company was the ramifications of their business that extended throughout the

continent of Europe. On one hand we have the Conservative government making a contract with one of the greatest railroads in America because of its ramifications in Europe and in the other case we have this government making a contract with Heaven only knows whom, for after years and years of endeavour, we have not found out and hon. gentlemen will not let us find out. If you look at the contract made in 1882, you will find it is a contract for emigration work in only two countries, Germany and Scandinavia are the only two countries.

These are the two countries which the correspondence on the file again and again points to as affording the best class of immigrants. Therefore the government of 1882 picked out the two best countries of Europe and made arrangements for emigration from them to Canada. The contract made by the present government hands over the whole of continental Europe to this company and obliges us to pay the same bonus per head on desirable and undesirable immigrants alike. Surely that is one striking difference between the two contracts. Then under contract made in 1882 payments were for adults only, the reason stated being that eighteen years was the age at which land could be taken up by any settler and consequently on no one under the age of eighteen was a bonus of $5 paid according to the contract made by the Conservative government. Under the terms of the contract made by this Liberal government they pay the bonus on children in arms. Is there not a vast difference there? Under the contract made by the Conservative government the bonus was not paid until the immigrant arrived in Manitoba and had produced a voucher showing that he had come there to settle, whereas under the contract made by this government the bonus was paid on the arrival of the immigrant in Canada. Surely there is a difference between the two contracts there. And there is another difference. The contract made in 1882 could be cancelled at any time and it did not bind Canada for a day longer than the government chose to maintain it; the contract made in 1899 and the successive amendments to it, bound this country first for five years—if a deputy minister had power to bind the revenues of the country which had not been voted by parliament, and which I very much doubt—at all events it professed to bind this country for five years, and from time to time the contract was amended each time care being taken that the ten years extension was continued so that there was no time they had not their ten years ahead, unless that under the four years clause we could cancel it on giving four years notice. Now, I have shown the difference between the two contracts—first the contract made by the Conservatives was made with a responsible company, while the contract made by the present government was not made with a responsible company. Second, the contract made by the Conservatives was for Germany and Scandinavia alone; the contract made by the present government is for the whole of continental Europe. Again, the contract made by the Conservative government was to pay for adults over eighteen years, whereas the contract made by the present government was for payment on those over twelve years of age and even then they proceeded to pay on every infant in arms, and within a few months the contract was changed so that they were bound to pay for these infants. Again, the contract made by the Conservative government provided for payment only on the arrival of the immigrant in Manitoba and the production of a voucher that he intended to settle, whereas under the contract made by the Liberal government the bonus was paid the moment the immigrant sets foot in Canada. And lastly, the contract made by the Conservative government could be cancelled at any time, whereas that made by the present administration is subject to the four years clause and otherwise for 10 years.

Surely I was justified when I called on the Minister of the Interior to establish the truth of his assertion, that he was following out the policy of the Conservative government when he made such a contract as this. Having said so much about the contract itself; having found that the contract was made with an unknown company, having found that every attempt made by gentlemen of this side of the House to obtain information about that company was obstructed in every way, it is not unreasonable that we should state to the House what information we have been able to gather. I regret we have not more information. We have, however, certain reliable information some of which was obtained from the files of the department and some from the examination of the late deputy minister. Beyond all question this is good evidence because it comes either from the files of the department or from the mouth of the ex-deputy minister who is the present manager of the company, and that being so the evidence can be relied on even by hon. gentlemen opposite. We find in the first place that this offer was suggested by one W. T. R. Preston. I am not here to attack this man Preston; I want to try to discuss this question calmly and dispassionately as a question of great importance in which this country is interested, and so I merely say that we find that the first suggestion that such a contract should be made comes from Preston. He states that he had been in communication with people on the continent who are important booking agents, able to do good immigration work for this country, and he writes Mr, Smart, the deputy minister, asking him to bring about such a contract. So far as we know the suggestion was then first broached to Mr. Smart, and he and Mr. Preston sat down

and made this contract of 1899. Without spending more time in discussing that question, the members of this House can consider for themselves as a judge or a jury would consider. Was there anybody looking after the interests of Canada in drawing up of that contract. It is evident beyond peradventure that counsel were there for the company. When a company is getting a valuable franchise and pledges itself to give or pay nothing in return, I am justified in saying that at this stage the company was represented. But there is no evidence before us to show that the Dominion of Canada or the people of Canada were represented at that conference when this contract came into existence. It purports to be made with a company called the North Atlantic Trading Company, and if I remember aright it is referred to in the first contract as a syndicate doing business under that name, and it is not described as being actually a corporation. The ink was hardly dry on this contract which was entirely in the interest of the company when it was suggested by the company in writing, that the payments should be made monthly. That was agreed to by the department and the payments began to be made monthly, although that was not provided for by the contract. Let me again ask who was acting for the country here ? It was surely in the interests of Canada that we should hold back this money until we saw what this company was doing to justify payments to them. But no—so fast as the immigrants came in the government paid the bonus on them monthly. Then a question arose between the Auditor General and the Department of the Interior as to whether or not infants should be paid for, the Auditor General pointing out that under the contract infants should not be paid for, and at once the deputy Minister of the Interior provided a new contract which said that infants in arms should be paid for, and so the Auditor General had to give up his contention. Without recapitulating the various changes in this contract I challenge hon. gentlemen opposite to say whether there was any change made in this contract from beginning to end in regard to which it could be honestly said that the people of Canada got the advantage. There is one very singular letter which sheds a great deal of light on this subject, and to which I shall refer when the House meets after the dinner hour.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Before you left the Chair, Sir, I had referred to the inception of the contract between the government and the North Atlantic Trading Company in the year 1899, and the successive changes that have been made in it, each, as I claimed, in the interest of the company, not of the government or the country. I gave my understanding of the original contract as I took it from that lying on the files. Hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House who have already spoken seem to have a slight difference of opinion as to the construction of that contract, and Mr. Smart, the ex-Deputy Minister of the Interior, in his examination before the Public Accounts Committee, also seemed to have the idea that from the very beginning the contract should be read as it eventually was altered to read, that the bonus should be paid on every individual, adult or infant, who came to the shores of Canada from the countries specified. I find on the files a memorandum from the Department of the Interior, whether to the minister or council does not appear, under date of 2nd February, 1900, and this memorandum, giving the understanding of the department as to the construction of the contract of the 4th of November, 1899, is as follows :

> Memorandum.—The old system of bonuses to booking agents has been abolished, and on the 4th November, 1899, an agreement was completed between Mr. Preston, acting for this department, and the North Atlantic Trading Company.

Therefore, when I said that the agreement was made by Mr. Preston I was borne out by the testimony of this memorandum. The names of a number of countries are then stated to which the contract relates, being all the continent of Europe. It goes on :

> It is observed, however, that these countries are not mentioned specifically in the written agreement, and that publicity in Canada regarding this agreement is deprecated.

I do not blame the minister for that.

> Finland, Norway, Sweden and Denmark are not included in the agreement——

Although the agreement itself shows that they are.

> —and not yet provided for.

I want the minister's attention particularly to what follows, because this memorandum gives the first genuine information which we have received as to who constitute this famous company. It continues:

> The company consists of certain of the continental booking agents and their friends (names not given).

It is rather significant that the expression 'certain continental booking agents and their friends' is in quotation marks, showing that somebody, either Mr. Preston, Mr. Smart or the minister, whoever drew this memorandum, had been informed that the parties entering into this contract were certain continental booking agents and their friends.

> The company is to receive a per capita bonus on all immigrants to Canada, male and female, destined for Manitoba and the Northwest Terri-

tories, and who are twelve years of age or over. Children under twelve years of age are not taken account of. The company is to receive its bonus as soon as the immigrants are registered at the ports of Halifax, St. John, Quebec or Montreal via these ports, or via Portland and New York in the United States. The agreement is to be regarded as very confidential.

Now, Sir, when we find an agreement entered into between a deputy minister and a myth called a trading company, when we find a memorandum sent either to the minister or to council stating that the agreement is really with certain booking agents and their friends, and when they find that the publication of the agreement in Canada is deprecated, and that the agreement is to be regarded as very confidential, I think members of this House may be justified in being a little suspicious as to the terms of such an agreement and as to the parties with whom it is made. Perhaps before I finish my resumé of the facts which I have been able to elicit from the correspondence every member of the House will agree with me that those who have been inclined to be a little suspicious from the inception of this matter have long ago been proved to be amply justified in their suspicions. The next document I find to which I will refer the House is a telegram from Mr. Smart to Mr. Preston—not to the North Atlantic Trading Company, although the matter being one affecting that company, one would have thought that the telegram would have been sent to it. But the agreement having provided, as that agreement was interpreted by the memorandum laid before the minister or council, that the bonus should be paid only on immigrants over twelve years of age, the next step is this telegram from the Department of the Interior:

Ottawa, July 17, 1900.

Preston, London.

Re arrangement of continental bonus. One pound allowed on immigrants, excepting Galicians. No bonus on latter, except families possessed of $20 above transportation. Am writing fully.

SMART.

So we find that although there was a binding contract under which this company was not bound to spend a dollar, and under which it was only entitled to 17s. 6d. on certain immigrants, the department voluntarily, without apparently laying the matter before council, increased that amount to £1 per head; and so jubilant was the deputy minister over this success that he could not even wait to write, but had forthwith to cable, not to the company, but to his friend Mr. Preston, in London. Can we who are acquainted with the past history of Mr. Preston not well understand the glad refrain that arose from his joyous lips after be received in London this cable ? We can well understand that he should then have burst into song, as he did on a famous occasion in Canada when he carolled : There is sunshine in my soul to-night.

This telegram of July 17 was followed by a letter, for we find on the files a letter from Mr. Smart to Mr. Preston of that date. I shall not read the whole of it, but will merely call attention to this clause :

You will observe——

And mind you Mr. Speaker, these were two government employees corresponding with one another.

You will observe that the government has rearranged the bonus so that there will be a decided advantage reaped by your company in connection with all except the Galicians.

Here, Sir, were these two gentlemen, who were supposed to be safeguarding the interests of the people of this country—the deputy minister, Mr. Smart, acting for the government on the one hand, and Mr. Preston on the other,—and we find Mr. Smart gratuitously increasing the bonus to be paid this company and then notifying by cable, not the company whose headquarters were in Amsterdam, but Mr. Preston, whose headquarters are in London, and saying your company. Can there be any conceivable reason why this cable message should have been sent to Mr. Preston unless he was interested in the news it bore ?

A couple of years rolled on and another agreement was made in 1902. Into its details I shall not enter but merely repeat what I said this afternoon. First that, every agreement gave substantial advantage to the company ; and secondly, that in connection with this agreement of 1902, which was approved by the Privy Council, whose report was approved by His Excellency on May 31, of that year, it is recited in that order in council :

The minister observes that about two years ago the Immigration Department made a tentative arrangement with an organization known as the North Atlantic Trading Company.

Therefore, in 1902, the minister understood he was dealing with an organization known as the North Atlantic Trading Company. The next change was made in 1904, and I have before me the contract then entered into, under which the company has since carried on business, but which the minister has promised to cancel by virtue of one of the terms thereof. There is a significant feature in this contract to which I would call attention. The contract bears date November 28, 1904, and is made :

Between His Majesty the King, represented herein by the Minister of the Interior of Canada, hereinafter called the minister, which expression includes also the successors in office of the minister. His Majesty, as so represented, being hereinafter referred to as the government, of the first part, and the North Atlantic Trading Company, of Amsterdam, Holland, a body corporate and politic, hereinafter called the company, of the second part.

Are there any legal advisers of this government at all? Was there any check to be put on the rapacity or recklessness of some of the subordinate head officers of the department? Was no step taken to see what had been done, and where and how it was that this company, described in the previous contract as an organization known as the North Atlantic Trading Company, suddenly blossoms out a full fledged body corporate with headquarters at Amsterdam? And this document I find winds up with these words:

In witness whereof the corporate seal of the company has been affixed hereto and this agreement has been signed by the manager and secretary of the company, and has been signed and sealed by the Minister of the Interior of Canada on behalf of the government.

I would like to ask the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) what he has to say about such a contract as that, entered into by his predecessor, for which he is politically, legally, and constitutionally just as responsible as his predecessor would be were he occupying his seat to-night. What is the meaning of this document, purporting to be made with an incorporated company, purporting to be sealed and signed by its manager and secretary, when we know—as we only learnt within the last forty-eight hours—that at the time this document purported to be executed, there was not such a company in the world and there is no such company to-day. It seems to me that the minister is in this unfortunate dilemma. Either this document was sealed and signed as it purports to be or it was not. If the minister accepted this document as signed and sealed by an incorporated company, it is his duty to prosecute those who obtain from the government certain concessions under false pretenses. If, on the other hand, the document was not signed by the company, I would ask the hon. minister what the government has to say of such a way of doing business as to make a contract with some persons, who might or might not become a company, and then wait seven or eight months until the company was incorporated and it was in a position to affix its seal to the agreement. We have on this document the seal of the company and the signatures of its manager and secretary. I would ask whether that seal and those signatures were affixed on the date this document bears or was the document held over in abeyance for seven months until incorporation was obtained in another country?

When we look at the circumstances surrounding the inception of this company, and when we examine its record, we cannot help being convinced that the whole thing was a scheme of a most suspicious character. The company, having been thus formed, proceeded to business, and one of the first things it did was to send in a bill to the government. Its bills came in from year to year, and there is no great difference between the bills of one year and another. I have seen probably all, or nearly all, on the files, and I can see no great difference among them, but I selected one year in particular because it was the year before the deputy minister made his famous trip to Amsterdam and because the account is one which, for other reasons, the House should hear about. I am taking the account for the year ending June 30, 1902. The company only began operations practically in January, 1901, so that at the end of a year and a half they sent in their bill. The bill is rather a remarkable one on its face, but is still more remarkable by virtue of the facts which occurred afterwards. Here are the items of expenses between July 1, 1901 and June 30, 1902:

	Marks.
1.—Office rent, salaries to clerks, postage and commission, Amsterdam office	32,529 15
2.—Travelling expenses in Belgium, Holland, Russia, Austria, Hungary, Roumania, &c.	9,250 28
3.—Literature	19,202 00
4.—Libau offices	6,900 00
5.—Austrian business	10,103 00
6a.-Scandinavian business	12,335 00
6b.-Finnish bsiness	2,680 00
7.—Remuneration to different sub-agencies for postage and propaganda	12,325 00
Total	105,325 00

The deputy minister was asked in the committee about this bill and about his visit to the office in Amsterdam, which visit was so vividly described by my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) the other day, and the House will remember that the deputy minister visited Amsterdam on a tour of inspection, paid for, not out of his own pockets, but by the people of this country, because he went there to ascertain all about the company, and the House will remember that he wandered about Amsterdam until he found the office, but could not remember what story the office was on. He did remember, however, when he reached it, the door was locked and there was no one about the premises. But on making subsequent inquiries it turned out that things were not quite so bad as they appeared, because every few days a boy did come to take the mail from the door. According to the then deputy minister, Mr. Smart, the expenses of that office from July 1, 1901, to June 30, 1902, were as follows:

Office rent, salaries to clerks, postage and commissions, 32,529.15 marks.

And when he was asked an explanation of that, he said it was because postage was a very heavy item, and postage and all the other items would naturally be charged up against the head office. But his attention was called to the last item, remuneration to different sub-agencies for postage and

propaganda 12,325 marks. It is for the House to consider whether, in view of the evidence of Mr. Smart—not a statement made by a member of the opposition, not a canard published in the Conservative press, not a story that may have floated across the Atlantic coming no one knows whence and received by no one knows whom, but the sworn evidence of the ex-deputy himself, who made an official visit at the expense of the people to find out the state of affairs at Amsterdam—I say it is for the House to judge, in view of this, whether this contract has been duly carried out and whether these charges have been properly made.

There is another significant feature about that account. The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who leads this House, may remember that in the year 1903 he received a letter from one Ennis, asking him to use his best endeavours with the Canadian government to see that he, poor, unfortunate, unpaid Ennis, should receive the remuneration to which he was entitled under his contract with the North Atlantic Trading Company. It turned out that he had been the agent of this company in Denmark, Norway, Sweden and Finland, and though he had done their work, and done it well, the company refused to pay him. He was pressing them for payment, and there is a letter on file from the company showing that they had advised him to write to Ottawa because they had not been paid all that was coming to them from Ottawa. And so Ennis wrote to the Prime Minister, and the Prime Minister referred the matter to the Department of the Interior. The letter from Ennis is on file showing that he feels grievously hurt because he has not been paid for his services as representative of the North Atlantic Trading Company in the four countries I have named. And what was the contract between Ennis and the North Atlantic Trading Company? The documents on file show that for every emigrant from Denmark, he was to be paid 4 kroner, or $1.04 and for every emigrant from Norway, Sweden or Finland, he was thankful to receive 2 kroner, 52c. per head. Does it strike the members of this House that the ex-Minister of the Interior (Mr. Sifton) made a business arrangement, that he acted with that sagacity with which he is credited, that he acted with that honesty which he ought to possess, when he made a bargain with this company which they were able to sub-let so profitably that, whereas they received $5 per head for doing nothing, the man who did the work was to receive 52c. for work in any of the three countries, and $1.04 for the other?

Now, when the ex-deputy minister went to Amsterdam and visited this office, he knew of this letter from Ennis, for it had been in his possession for a year. That was enough, surely, to make him suspicious as to the manner in which the affairs of the company were being carried on. But, more than that, he had also this account for 105,000 marks which I have just read. A report on that account had been sent to the department on that account by Mr. W. D. Scott. And, if I might be allowed to diverge for a moment from the strict line from the subject before us, I would like to say, in justice to the sub-ordinate officials of the department that, after a considerable time spent in reading the files in connection with this case, I am deeply impressed with the fact that, whatever the heads of the department may have done, or may not have done, the subordinate officers of the department have diligently, laboriously, and faithfully striven to do their duty in the positions in which they are placed. I say there is a report on this account from Mr. W. D. Scott. It is dated June 11, 1903. In this report Mr. Scott criticises pretty severely this bill of 105,000 marks which had been sent by this company. He criticised it so severely that Mr. Smart had to write to Mr. Preston on the subject, and, in writing, he repeats the figures given by Mr. Scott. And so we see that, at the very time when Mr. Smart visited this office in Amsterdam, in 1904, he had in his mind—or should have had—the apparent fraud that had been perpetrated by this company as shown by the analysis of their account of the previous year made by Mr. Scott. Mr. Scott calls attention to the facts in this way:

> Of the whole 105,325.10 marks, which is equal to $25,067.37, I find that the main part of this account is for office rents, salaries of clerks, postage, commissions, sub-agencies, and that of this total 19,202.10 marks or $4,570.10 has been actually used for advertising.

And what kind of advertising?

> I find the large portion of the advertising is not of the character at all that the department could approve if it had been submitted in accordance with the agreement before the publications were made.

The House, is perhaps aware, that under the terms of the agreement the publications had to be submitted to the department before they were made. And they were not so submitted, nor can we find evidence in the files that they were submitted afterwards, notwithstanding the protest of Mr. Scott. Mr. Scott's report is embodied in a letter from Mr. Smart to Mr. Preston, a part of which reads:

> The point is that a large part of the advertising is simply steamship advertising not directed by the North Atlantic Trading Company at all, but by Mr. Karlsberg and Mr. Falck, and it would appear to me that a large portion of the former—that is the cost of the office rent, &c.—covers steamship offices, which are established for the general ocean business not only to Canada but to all portions of the globe, at all events for steamers represented by these individual steamship agents,

and consequently we cannot be getting the advertising we expected when entering into the arrangement with the company.

This letter of Mr. Smart follows word for word the report that Mr. Scott had sent to him. And so, we find that in the month of June, 1903, Mr. Smart, then deputy minister, knew that the accounts sent to him were not proper accounts, that the money supposed to be spent was not being spent as it should be. And the additional fact remains, that from that day to this, so far as I have been able to discover from the laborious search of the files, no practical attempt has been made by the government to obtain genuine vouchers for the expenditure of that money. It was well to provide that the company should spend £3,000 a year, but was not the spirit of those who entered into the contract on the part of the government displayed in the arrangement that, while the company was bound to spend £3,000 a year, on the other hand the government has to pay on the immigrants reaching Canada monthly. And the company was not called upon to make return until the end of the year, and the vouchers sent him were the certificates of their own officers. Not only was Mr. Smart, at the time he visited Amsterdam, aware that the accounts of the company were in the unsatisfactory condition which his subordinate had reported, but he knew also that the very reason of the contract—the settlement of Manitoba and part of the Northwest—was not being carried out by means of this company. We listened to a dissertation this afternoon by an hon. gentleman opposite upon the wonderful success of the present policy of the administration. We heard the Minister of the Interior, the other evening dilate at great length upon the glories of that policy. But the practical question before this House, the question upon which hon. gentlemen must vote this evening, is not the general policy of the government; it is not even the immigration policy of the government—hon. gentlemen must vote on the particular contract made by this government with the North Atlantic Trading Company and the various amendments and additions thereto. When Mr. Smart went to Amsterdam in 1904, he had in his pocket, or in his mind—or should have had—certain reports that had come from Winnipeg about the beginning of 1903. I find that in going over the files, Mr. Geo. A. Johnston—I do not know if he is the statistician, but it matters little, for he in this case, only started the ball rolling—wrote, under date of 30th of December, 1902, to the effect that while on an immigrant special, after great trouble he had found seven families of Russian-Germans ticketed to Winnipeg, but whose destinations and addresses were North Dakota and Minnesota. He says that he only ascertained this by examining their tickets and addresses. These parties, had received specific instructions as to their destination and were very reticent about giving information.

He further advised that these parties had specific instructions as to their destination and were very reticent about giving information.

And he advised the department to look into this matter. The department thereupon wrote to the Winnipeg agency, and the next letter I find is dated January 6, 1903, from Winnipeg. It says :

Numbers are coming to Winnipeg en route to the United States and say the steamship officers told them that was the cheapest way. They arrive in mid-winter and are a heavy burthen.

Then began a singular list of communications, the department at Winnipeg apparently being determined to drive into the heads of the Department of the Interior at Ottawa, that their immigration system, instead of being a glorious success, was a most dismal failure. Here are the letters :

There is a report from Mr. Moffett of the 8th of January, 1903, inclosing Stemshorn's report showing that 556 booked for Winnipeg departed for the States between October 21, 1902, and January 6, 1903.

556 booked for Winnipeg and paid for by the department under this contract, left Winnipeg forthwith. This is interesting because——

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. How does the hon. gentleman know that the bonus was paid on these people ?

Mr. NORTHRUP. I have read the files, which the hon. gentleman perhaps has not ; and there has never been a dispute in all the letters filed, or any question that the company was not to be paid on every adult and every child which reached this country.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. The hon. gentleman knows that the bonuses were to be paid only to those who belonged to the agricultural classes, and it is possible, and a fair presumption, that not one of these people belonged to the agricultural classes —unless the hon. gentleman can give some proof of it.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I thank the hon. gentleman for saying that, I was hoping somebody would raise that point to give me an opportunity of telling him and telling the House that whoever will take the trouble to search the files will find that these officials at Winnipeg not only gave the names of the families and the ages of the individuals, but gave the names of the vessels in which they came out, and the officials protested in their letters against immigrants coming there who were routed for the States and this company getting bonuses for them. The government has never repudiated the obligation to pay bonuses on these people. The government has not closed up all its

accounts, there are some disputes as to the accuracy of some of the figures, but as to the principle there is no dispute.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN. I am not talking about the principle, I am talking about what took place; and I say the hon. gentleman cannot give any evidence that will substantiate his statement.

Mr. NORTHRUP. I refer the hon. gentleman to the files, and I tell him that he will find in the files the names of even the vessels in which these people came out, and the complaints that they were being sent to Winnipeg when they were routed to the United States. Now I take it for granted that the officials of this government have some ideas of their duties, some idea as to what they should do in the position in which they are placed. Read this series of reports, and you will see whether or not the officials at Winnipeg considered that this country was being defrauded by every immigrant that left this country. Here is a letter of the 13th of January, 1903, from Mr. Smith, commissioner :

He has gone further into matter and finds that during the last six months of 1902 nearly 1,500 are recorded in their books as destined for United States.

There is a letter from Mr. Smith, commissioner at Winnipeg, dated the 13th of January, saying that of the number who came in 1902, nearly 2,300 souls were recorded in their books as having come to Winnipeg who were really destined and had gone to the United States.

He explains the reason why. He explains that the Canadian Pacific Railway rate to Emerson was so much cheaper than the American rate to Pembina that the people were sent through by way of Winnipeg when they were going to Minnesota or Dakota. They were ticketed to Winnipeg, cared for by the department there, and the company were entitled under the terms of this contract to payment for them ; because there is nothing in the contract about settlement in this country, the moment they reach this country they entitle the company to a bonus. That number of 1,500 went to the States during the last six months of 1902. That went on from day to day :

On the 15th of January, 1903—	
Male, adult..	26
Male, children..	7
Female, adult..	16
Female, children..	11
	60
Another lot 16th January, 1903—	
Male, adults..	2
Male, children..	3
Female, adults..	1
Female, children..	2
	8
Another lot 17th January, 1903—	
2 men and 21 women.	
Another lot 19th January, 1903—	
Male, adults..	3
Male, children..	2
Female, adults..	2
Female, children..	3
	10

Then there is a telegram from Mr. Smart, dated January 22, from this same Mr. J. Obed Smith, saying :

During last year records show 2,094 immigrants ticketed to Winnipeg or similar Manitoba points destined for the States. Of these 21 Icelanders, 151 Scandinavians, 1,922 Russian-Germans. Doubtless several hundreds of other Russian Germans, although ticketed to Winnipeg, left immediately for the States without declaring such as their intention.

Then again on the 26th, three days later on, he gives statistics for a party of 80 that had gone to the States that day. Now when we find the Minister of the Interior, comparing this contract with the contract made by his predecessor, and when we find that under the contract made by the Conservative government they were only bound to pay on adults when they reached Manitoba, whereas the present government are bound to pay on every adult or infant coming under the agricultural or domestic class the moment they reach the shores of this country, surely there can be no doubt as to which is the better contract. Mr. Smart, knowing these facts, having his attention called to the fact of these reports when he went to Amsterdam the following year, should have been doubly careful to see that a company which so easily earned its money when the gain to the country was so slight —he should have been doubly careful to see that the company was doing its duty in every possible way. Now, Sir, here are certain facts that are discoverable from the files brought down before the Public Accounts Committee, and I say there are certain inferences one can fairly draw from them. We know in the first place now that Smart and Preston entered into a contract, no doubt about that. We know that that contract entered into by them was not made known in Canada, that is expressly stated in a memo. to council, or to the minister. It was a secret contract made between Preston and Smart, which was not to be made known in Canada. We know that a few months after that contract was made it was changed greatly to the advantage of the company, apparently by Mr. Smart alone, who that very day cabled and wrote to Preston triumphantly telling him the contract had been changed to the advantage of the company. We know that Smart's attention had been called, first to the character of the accounts sent in by him and their lack of verification, then to the fact that the immigrants were not remaining in this country, and he, knowing all these facts, went to Amsterdam and found

the position there in such a state that if he had been a man anxious to do his duty by his employer, he would have been prompted to make every inquiry. But we find he did not even bother to make any report to Mr. Preston, or to Mr. Sifton, his minister. Then we find Smart coming back to this country, knowing from the facts I have stated that the company was not faithfully carrying out its duty, and entering into another agreement in 1904, still further changing the conditions to the advantage of that company, and giving them a hold on this country for a still longer period.

And then, Sir, we find, after 1904, when Mr. Smart thought he had riveted this company on this country for ten years, when it required four years' notice to break the contract, that Mr. Smart writes to a member of this syndicate, and he will not tell his name, saying that he, Mr. Smart, intends to resign his position as deputy minister. Now, that is a pregnant fact ; there are few men in this country who would not like to retain the position of deputy minister. I believe the salary is now $5,000 and in Mr. Smart's case it has been shown that it included a trip to the old country whenever he desired to go. He was assured of a good position and a good salary for life, and here we have Mr. Smart resigning his position and the only reason he could give in the committee was that he had such a love for immigration, that he was bound to devote the balance of his shattered life to that cause. Why, surely as deputy minister of this country he would have far wider scope for his devotion and usefulness to the cause of immigration than as the manager of any company. It is true the profits might not be as great, but the usefulness unquestionably would be greater. Mr. Smart writes to a member of this syndicate that he is going to resign, and of course a wink is as good as a nod to a blind horse and no one ever accused Mr. Preston or any friend of his, of being a blind horse. Shortly afterwards, Mr. Smart resigns and is appointed manager of this company, whose history I have tried to trace. Could anything be more clouded with suspicion than that ? But there is something more. When Mr. Smart, was being examined, inquiry was made as to letters he had written as deputy minister of the department, while in receipt of the people's money for the discharge of the duties of that office. He was asked to produce letters to this syndicate and refused, the only reason he gave was that they were private, but this morning he came back to the committee and what had come over the spirit of his dream, I know not, unless it is the old principle that whom the gods wish to destroy they first make mad. This morning, he came before the committee and told us he would not and could not produce his letters, because he had burned them and his letter books. I am not here to attack Mr. Smart, but there are many business men on the opposite side of the House, and I would ask any hon. gentleman opposite, if he were sitting on a jury in a court of law and a question arose as to the contents of a letter and it was admitted, all the evidence being produced by the accused, that while in a public office, enjoying public pay, he had written to a member of a trading organization to which he had certainly given phenomenal privileges, announcing that he was going to retire, surely after he retired, giving up a magnificent position to accept the humble position of manager of a simple trading company, and we find when he is asked to produce the letters he simply refuses, because they were private letters and might injure other parties, and later says he could not produce them because he had burnt his letters and letter books—surely not the only letters in the letter books, because he must have many letters to others than members of his company—I ask the members if this does not seem to shed further light on the transaction investigation here to-day ?

The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) tells us frankly that there is no difference between such a company as this and the Canadian Pacific Railway, he says : Who knows the shareholders of the Canadian Pacific Railway he cries ? If I were about to enter into a contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway would I think of asking who the shareholders were? What are we to think of a defence such as that from a minister of the Crown ? Must there not be an utter absence of all right, of all evidence, of all justice or sense of justice, when a minister will calmly compare such a company as this with the Canadian Pacific Railway ? If the minister does not know the difference I will tell him. If this government chooses to enter into a contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway they need not have the slightest anxiety in the world but that the Canadian Pacific Railway can be made to carry out its contract. The Canadian Pacific Railway has a list of officers whose names he who runs may read. The Canadian Pacific Railway has a charter of incorporation found on the statute-book of our country ; it has a list of shareholders which any man can find. There is no secrecy and the Canadian Pacific Railway has assets which make it a matter of utter indifference who the officers, shareholders or directors may be. Surely there is a difference between a contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway or a corporation like the Bank of England, and a contract with a nebulous myth like this organization called the North Atlantic Trading Company, an organization which solemnly describes itself as a body corporate, in November, 1902, and signs itself with a corporate seal and the name of its secretary and all the time

there was no such organization. Surely the Minister of the Interior can see the distinction between these two companies. Then the minister tried, as I think, rather to draw a herring across the scent, by referring to the immigration results under the old and the present government. I do not intend to be dragged off into that discussion. I simply ask him to consider the effect of some of his own figures. According to his own figures, in 1896 the Conservative party spent $120,000 in immigration. Out of that $6,710 was spent on immigration from continental Europe. According to his own figures we spent $6,710 and got 4,451 immigrants from continental Europe ; $1.50 a head, was all it cost. Was that not a better scheme than the scheme in force to-day ? And was there no difference in the state of this country in 1896 when world-wide depression clouded every civilized land and the conditions in the last few years, when there has been prosperity here and all the world over, and yet at that time we spent only $6,710 and got 4,451 immigrants from continental Europe. What did we do in 1904-5 ? We spent $972,000 in immigration, and of that we spent, according to his own figures (I am not committing myself to figures I may wish to attack later on) $86,967 on European immigration. We got, so he says, 37,255 immigrants from continental Europe in consequence. I am afraid if we have had 37,255 immigrants from continental Europe to Manitoba and the west, and we paid $5 a head we will find that we have not got off for $86,967. I take the minister's figures and I ask him this, can he maintain the stand in this House, and give all the credit as he and my predecessor in the debate do, to the Sifton bargain with the North Atlantic Trading Company for filling all the Northwest when according to the figures given out of $972,000 only $86,000 went to fill up the Northwest What about the other $972,000 iess $86,000 ? What about the $886,967 spent on behalf of immigration ? Had that no effect ? Surely the minister must think the people of this country blind, that all he has to do is to draw a herring across the scent and the people will forget issues such as the present which it will be well for the government to consider and take warning by ere it be, for them, too late. The Minister of the Interior in this debate said that the policy of the Liberal party and the Conservative party was the same. I think I answered that this afternoon. The gentleman who spoke this afternoon said that the policy of the Conservatives and that of the Reform party were the same both along the lines of this question we are discussing and the question of the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company which he tried to drag in. I decline to wander from this discussion and assure the hon. gentleman he will have plenty of opportunity to ventilate his views on the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company question before the session is much older.

If the Minister of the Interior be right when he says that in this matter the Liberal government has followed the policy of the Conservative government, then the truth must be that as in the case of the fiscal policy of the Conservative party, which they also adopted, they so mutilated it and cut it up that in every single respect in which they changed it they changed it for the worse. And as to the trade policy, it is only the other night that the Solicitor General delivered one of the most able and eloquent and patriotic speeches on protection which was ever delivered even in the city of Toronto, he adopts the trade policy of the Conservative party and to the extent that he does adopt it he is pursuing a sane and a safe course.

I have nothing more to say, Mr. Speaker, on this question except to ask hon. gentleman before they vote to calmly and carefully consider the amendment which is before the House. The Minister of the Interior and his followers who have spoken have carefully abstained from discussing the question before us, and have wandered far afield to deal with other matters with which we have no immediate concern. I have no doubt that the issue before the House is so distasteful to them, that gentlemen on the other side who may speak later will continue to steer clear of the question, but I trust that gentlemen on this side of the House will take care that they stick to the text. Will the Minister of the Interior or any of his supporters explain how it is that on the one hand he can tell us that this is a good contract, and on the other hand he announces that it is so bad that he is going to cancel it? There is no clause in that contract under which he can cancel it except clause 12, which provides:

> This agreement shall continue in force for ten years from the date thereof, subject however to the right of the government to cancel it by notice in writing under the hand of the minister if it shall appear to the satisfaction of the minister that the company is failing to carry out its obligations. But either party has the right to abrogate the agreement by four years' notice.

It has appeared to the satisfaction of the minister that the company has failed to carry out its obligation and he has written to the company giving his reasons for cancelling the contract, and the reasons which he gives are simply, that because immigration is less than he expected from certain countries he therefore infers that the company cannot have been carrying out the contract. It would seem that the further this contract goes the worse it gets. If the minister is sincere in his declaration; if this is a good contract; if it is a contract in the interests of this country, why in Heaven's name does not the government do its best

to have the company carry it out and thus secure the benefits which they say will result to Canada from it. What are we to say of a minister who declares that this is a good contract, but because immigration is not as great as he expected it should be from two countries, he cancels the contract without considering whether it is not possible to have it faithfully carried out. From the way in which he has proceeded the minister may find that on top of all his other difficulties he has simply brought the country into a lawsuit by professing to cancel a contract while according to his own letter written to the company he had no grounds for cancelling except his suspicion based on the fact that the returns were not as great as he had expected. And, if that contract should be rescinded because the company is not carrying it out, why does the government not rescind it at once? Why pay this company another dollar of the public money of Canada ? What right have the members of this syndicate ; of their bonus of $5 per head ; what right has Mr. Smart to sit in his office in Montreal and draw his salary for six months more if that company has forfeited its rights under the contract ? Let the minister come out in a manly way; let the government do one right thing in connection with this contract, even though it be the last; if this contract has been conceived in inquity and carried out in misfortune, let there be one redeeming feature about it, let them cancel the contract at once if it is a bad contract. But if, as they say, it is a good contract, then let them retain it, let them make the contractors do their duty to this country and let Canada enjoy the benefits of this contract which they declare is such an excellent one. We are here representing the people of this country and we owe the duty to our constituents that if the government has made a contract that is injurious and absurd, to so declare by our vote. How can the members of this House vote down the amendment of the hon. member for Toronto which declares that this contract ought to be cancelled, and then hold up both hands to praise the government which forthwith cancels the contract and cancels it in the most objectionable and illegal way? I trust that gentlemen on both sides of the House when they come to vote will bear in mind that this is the kind of thing that is liable to undermine the whole of our public life. If it be true that this company is the bogus company it apparently is, then the good name of Canada at home and abroad requires that the condemnation of this House should be visited on those who made such a contract and on those who participated in it. If on the other hand a majority of the members of this House should deliberately vote that this contract is not injurious, is not improvident, is not absurd, and that immediate steps should not be taken to terminate it, then, Sir, I shall be deeply sorry for the effect that such a vote as that will have on the good name of this House and on the good name of the people of Canada in countries outside the borders of our Dominion.

Mr. D. W. BOLE (Winnipeg). I desire to engage the attention of the House for a short time to-night, and in doing so I am afraid I shall incur the displeasure of my hon. friend (Mr. Northrup) who has counselled us to keep close to the text. I am afraid I shall incur the displeasure of the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) who told us last night that we on this side of the House had no business in reply to the irrelevant charges made against us by gentlemen on the other side. However that may be, it is my intention to briefly review the general immigration policy of this government. My justification is a paragraph in the resolution introduced by the hon. member (Mr. Foster) and his declaration of the policy of the opposition with respect to immigration, and because the hon. member for Jacques-Cartier (Mr. Monk) in his speech dealt with the same general question. I represent the city of Winnipeg, which above all other cities in Canada has profited by the immigration policy of the present government, and I feel I would fail in my duty if I did not uphold that policy, and at the same time raise my voice in protest against the character of the campaign which hon. gentlemen opposite have directed against it.

The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) made a very excellent speech on Friday night last. I listened to it with mixed feelings of pleasure and disappointment—pleasure because of the beauty of the speech, and disappointment at the things that were not in it. The speech of the hon. member was very much like the fig-tree planted in the vineyard, that was beautiful to look upon, but had no fruit. The back and front, the head and foot of the hon. gentleman's criticism was that certain contracts entered into by this government with the North Atlantic Trading Company lacked definiteness and that they were not reported to parliament. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have had some experience in immigration work, I have been engaged in it for some years; and I assert that it is impossible to have definiteness in a contract with respect to immigration work. It is impossible for the hon. gentleman to dictate a contract that will state that John Jones or some one else lives in Austria, and that he must be transplanted from Austria to a certain section in the Northwest Territories. The hon. gentleman must know that a contract with any company that is working in the immigration field can only be effective by producing a certain atmosphere in a country from which we may hope to receive immigrants. The other portion of the hon. gen-

tleman's criticism is that this contract was not reported to parliament. I am surprised to learn from the remarks of the Minister of the Interior that like contracts existed during the regime of the hon. member for North Toronto, and that he sat as Minister of Finance writing cheques—as he so dramatically described my hon. friend the present Minister of Finance—to certain companies, and that those contracts were not reported to parliament. Now, what is the policy of the opposition with respect to immigration? I think I can fairly accept the statement of the hon. member for North Toronto of that policy, and I am quite sure the hon. leader of the opposition will not repudiate my statement that hon. gentlemen makes with respect to general policy. The hon. member for North Toronto states that poverty exists in those continental countries, that the people there have been subject to religious and race persecution, and therefore he says 'they will come anyway.' 'They will come anyway,' Mr. Speaker, is the policy of the opposition with respect to immigration. I want to inform the hon. member for North Toronto and the hon. leader of the opposition and every hon. gentleman who may hope at some future time to be associated with him in the administration of the affairs of this country, that the west, for which I speak to-night, will not stand for any such policy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if you will allow me to digress for a few moments, I would like to say that I deprecate very much the character of the campaign that has been put up against the administration of the immigration department of this government and against other departments. It consists in the constant cry of 'graft,' 'graft.' Mr. Speaker, I do not believe a word of it. I have not been able to distinguish one particle of convincing evidence to substantiate the charges of graft which have been made this session and the last session I had the honour of sitting in this House. Nearly every question of public policy discussed by the government or by members of this side of the House is answered by hon. gentlemen opposite with the cry of 'graft, graft.' In regard to public works, dredging, immigration, and almost everything else, their cry is 'graft.' Failing to convince the people and the members of this House as they signally failed last night, when they discussed the trade policy of this government, they have started a campaign of graft, which is not creditable to them. These charges of graft are very largely manufactured out of stories heard here and there on the street; and I am sure that hon. members of this House will justify me when I state that the hon. member for East Simcoe (Mr. Bennett) is not entirely blameless in this respect. A story has been circulated in this House and on the streets last night and to-day with respect to that gentleman. I refuse to believe that story, and my chief cause for disbelief is the fact that that gentleman is an hon. member of this House. It was reported in this House last night that the hon. gentleman had undertaken to fix a certain jury in a certain trial in which he was interested in his own county. It was reported that he had endeavoured to secure a Conservative jury in order that that jury might acquit him of the charge that was laid against him. Now, what are the earmarks of probability? That jury was Conservative, every man of them; yet I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member for East Simcoe conspired to get a Conservative jury to try him. Still, I have a suspicion that if any such circumstance attached to any member of this government, the cry of bribery and intimidation would be raised against him. If I desired to review the history of graft in this country, I am afraid I could not leave out the friends of the hon. gentlemen opposite. I will take second place to no hon. member of this House in standing for purity in the administration of public affairs. At the same time, I will take second place to no man in holding ministers and officials guiltless until the charge is proved against them.

Now, I desire to review briefly an almost hackneyed question—a question that has been referred to by almost every speaker on either side of the House— the question of the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company's deal. I am prepared to state, because I am acquainted with the facts, that that deal has received the endorsement of every thinking man in the west to-day. I was not acquainted with some of the land deals that have become history in this country until they were recited in my hearing to-day. I had no notion of bringing to the attention of the House any such land deals; but I am here prepared to defend the deal with the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company.

The Saskatchewan Land Company purchased from the Dominion government 250,000 acres of land at $1 an acre. Therefore it follows necessarily that somebody has enjoyed the luxury of graft. It has been intimated by certain hon. gentlemen that there are members on this side who enjoyed that graft. I do not believe a word of it. The simple fact that a business transaction was entered into with a responsible company, such as the Saskatchewan Land Company, is no evidence that graft existed, and I do not believe it did. The advantage of that deal with that company was this. The government is spending $700,000 or $800,000 a year on its immigration policy. It costs a large amount of money to place every settler we get on the land. The deal with that company provides that we shall receive from it $250,000 in hard cash, and in addition they are obliged to put 32 settlers on

every township they receive. It has been charged that the company stole these settlers from the government after the government had paid the expenses of bringing them out. I know that that charge is not true. I know all the circumstances connected with the colonization of that tract of land, and the facts are that the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company has over 3,000 agents of its own in the United States, and every 32 settlers placed on each township came from the United States through the instrumentality of the agents of this company.

When the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was discussing this question, he referred in a very sarcastic manner to this tract of land as having been a desert yesterday and a garden to-day. Let me say Mr. Speaker, that I have lived many years within thirty or forty miles of that district, and it will surprise hon. gentlemen when I tell them that the hon. member's description of that land as a desert yesterday and a garden to-day is literally correct.

Mr. FOSTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BOLE. That district, Sir, for years presented a freak of nature. It was a phenomenon which none of us could account for, but the fact was undoubted that that phenomenon did exist and that for a great many years the district north of Lumsden, for 90 or 100 miles was a veritable desert, but three or four or five years ago, when the rains began to come again that particular district became converted into what it is to-day, one of the gardens of the Northwest.

With respect to the North Atlantic Trading Company, it is not my desire to discuss that particular phase of the immigration policy at any length. But I intend to express, at some risk perhaps of disagreeing with the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), my understanding of that transaction. As I view it, the reason why secrecy is observed was because in certain countries of continental Europe there are laws prohibiting immigration propaganda, and although this company appears to be composed of men of straw, the names of whom were read by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) on Friday night last, it is really a company represented by men of substance but who do not desire that their names should be known, in consequence of the laws that exist in these countries. Rather than have their names made public, they would have the contract cease.

My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior has told us that in addition the contract had not been properly carried out and therefore it has been cancelled. But after all, Sir, was the contract a bad one ? As I have said, it is impossible to measure immigration work except by the general results. We know that during five years of the life of that contract, 128,000 people came from the countries covered by it, and 49,000 were paid for at $5 per head. Well, if the 128,000 immigrants from continental Europe are worth $1,000 a head—and that is the valuation which was put by hon. members opposite when they were in power—we have, as the general results of that contract, the fact that this company has increased the valuation of our country by $128,000,000.

The bringing of cheap immigrants, immigrants without money, immigrants who are the so called scurf of continental Europe, has been deprecated in this House and out of it. The Doukhobors and the Galicians have been reviled by hon. gentlemen opposite, and I believe the Minister of the Interior had something to say with regard to the latter in previous years, but I am bound to dissent from hon. gentlemen and the Minister of the Interior on that point. I say that cheap immigrants without money are as necessary to the development of this country as immigrants with money who are prepared to go on the land. What are the requirements of this country at present ? Contracts have been already let to a fellow citizen of mine, which will call for the employment of 10,000 men. Are you going to get monied men to do this manual labour from England or Scotland ? No, we shall have to go to the countries covered by this contract. Contracts have been let in Quebec and eastern Ontario which will require 5,000 to 6,000 men. Contracts are let by the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian Northern in our western country requiring 4,000 to 5,000 men. I have figured up the total requirements for railway construction this year alone at 20,000, and I calculate that the crops, which are now almost in throughout the West will, if no misfortune happens, require 30,000 labourers to harvest them. We therefore shall require 50,000 men. We cannot look for labour of that kind from people who come here with large sums in their pockets.

A good deal has been said in the House and the country in deprecation of the Doukhobors who came here seven or eight years ago. It has been said that they are not educated and do not desire education. Well, I wish to state that contracts have been let to provide 128 school-houses for the education of these people.

Is the bonus system a good one ? I am prepared to admit that it is a fruitful source of trouble and perhaps of peculation, and that if we could possibly conduct an immigration propaganda without it, we should do so. But I believe it is simply impossible to divert the flow of immigration to this country without the bonus system. It is acknowledged by hon gentlemen opposite that the bonus system is a proper one because they inaugurated it themselves in

1882. I also find that other countries have adopted it. For instance, the Argentine Republic, in addition to giving a bonus, have been able to secure passage rates for immigrants which will enable them to be brought to that country very much cheaper than they can be from the same place to Canada. The Australian commonwealth have been paying one pound per head for immigrants ; and in addition to this amount, paid by the general government, the various States of that commonwealth also contribute largely to bring out immigrants. So, too, with New Zealand. With opposition of that kind, it seems to me to be impossible for this country to continue to divert the flow of immigrants to our shores unless the bonus system is continued.

Now, I desire, for a moment or two, to review some figures which are certainly very interesting to me. During the last five years for which we have the figures of this government—1900-1 to 1904-5 inclusive, there were 521,489 immigrants of all classes came to our shores. We find the statement made in this House that we are neglecting the immigration of our kinsmen of the United Kingdom. But the facts are against that statement. I find that during this five-year period, 186,594 immigrants came from the United Kingdom and 182,729 from the United States, a total of 369,323 of Anglo-Saxon origin. From continental Europe came 152,166 immigrants in that time. Now let me give you the figures for the last five years of Conservative rule. I give first the number of immigrants from continental Europe for five years ending 1896 :

1892	8,360
1893	9,562
1894	4,825
1895	3,834
1896	4,451

This is the result of the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite when they were in power. These people in continental Europe are suffering persecution and poverty, and the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite is to say that they can come to Canada if they wish to do so. And we see the results of that policy. What were the results of that policy with respect to immigrants from the United Kingdom. Here are the figures :

1892	22,636
1893	20,071
1894	16,004
1895	14,956
1896	12,384

Now, for the nine months of the present fiscal year, that is from 1st July last to March 31, 1906, there arrived from the United States 30,971 immigrants as against 25,240 for the same period last year. From the United Kingdom the number of immigrants was 37,576, and from continental Europe 17,202 a total from Europe of 54,778, against 50,880 for the same period last year. For the month of March last, there were twice as many immigrants came into Canada as during March, 1905. I have a letter here from a friend of mine who is secretary of the Western Canada Immigration Association, and it will perhaps be interesting to the House to hear a passage from it. It is dated Minneapolis, March 27, 1906 :

> Immigration from the States into Western Canada this year is apparently going to be tremendous. I think there will be at least 60,000 people in the movement. A week ago Monday, there were 704 carloads of settlers' effects held up at North Portal awaiting government inspection.

Seven hundred and four carloads of immigrants effects in one day. The contrast between the policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite and that of the present government with regard to immigration is most strikingly seen in its results. Let me quote a few figures showing the progress of the city of Winnipeg, in which I live under one policy and under the other. First I will give a statement of the post office receipts for the city of Winnipeg of the last five years of Conservative administration, and then I will put in contrast to these figures the returns for the last five years under the present administration.

The returns for the last five years of Conservative rule were as follows :

1891-2	$86,069 56
1892-3	93,211 56
1893-4	91,815 01
1894-5	85,721 90
1895-6	91,417 34

You see it comes up and down, and there is a total increase of something like $5,000. Now let me give the figures showing the post office receipts in Winnipeg for the last five years of the administration of the present government :

1900-1	$123,864 73
1901-2	156,734 36
1902-3	201,906 62
1903-4	256,519 17
1904-5	319,378 22

The policy of the hon. gentlemen opposite is to allow immigrants to come if they wish; the policy of the present government is to bend every energy we can to secure people for this country. And these figures show the different results. There are other evidences of prosperity. If any hon. gentleman opposite thinks it worth while to reply to these figures, no doubt he will at least attribute some of this prosperity to Providence, and perhaps, to other causes. But I want to tell this House that the conviction down in the hearts of the people of the west is that the prosperity that blesses Canada to-day is due very largely, almost wholly to the Siftonian policy of immigration which was criticised by the hon. gentleman for North Toronto (Mr. Foster).

The Siftonian policy of immigration was the policy which carried the elections of

1904 in that great western country. It is due to the Siftonian policy that something like 20 members support the right hon. gentleman in this House, as against 6 or 7 who sit behind the leader of the opposition. Now, I want to repeat and impress upon this House, and I want to warn this government, that if they allow themselves to be stampeded by any attack of hon. gentlemen opposite to withdraw from the policy that has been followed for the past ten years, if they relax any of their efforts, if they withdraw any of the agencies that have been conducive to the inflow of immigrants from foreign countries to the Canadian west, the people of the west will not hold up their hands. I can assure them that the recent great success, political and otherwise, in the western country is very largely due to the immigration policy of this government.

Now, I have some other figures. It will not be news, I suppose, to any hon. member in this House to know that we have a custom house in the city of Winnipeg. I am sure hon. gentlemen opposite will agree that there is no better indication of the prosperity and the consuming power of a population than the customs receipts. Here are the figures during the last five years of the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite:

1891-2	$ 649,169 31
1892-3	591,925 68
1893-4	517,978 63
1894-5	411,885 71
1895-6	528,589 41
	2,699,548 74

Mark these figures, Mr. Speaker. In 1891-92 the receipts of the custom house in Winnipeg were $649,169, and five years afterwards, during the Conservative administration, the receipts had shrunk to $528,589. Now, what is the record of the present government during the last five years of their administration:

1900-1	$ 920,074 33
1901-2	1,400,367 55
1902-3	1,803,304 50
1903-4	2,498,856 37
1904-5	2,629,937 45
1905-6 (9 months)	2,685,240 21

Now, if we are to believe that immigration is responsible for the growth of these receipts, the immigration policy has certainly been a successful one. We find that the receipts during the last five years of this administration increased from $920,074 to $2,629,937.45; whereas, during the last five years of the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, the receipts actually decreased. Now, let us take Inland Revenue. I think you will agree that the Inland Revenue receipts also are an indication of the consuming power of the people, although it may not always be in the right direction.

1891-2	$376,665 55
1892-3	412,345 15
1893-4	414,426 11
1894-5	379,581 89
1895-6	423,762 40

You will observe that there is a slight increase during the last five years of their administration from $376,665 to $423,762. Now, what is the result under the administration of the present government:

1900-1	$ 537,958 36
1901-2	637,881 28
1902-3	775,783 02
1903-4	913,611 46
1904-5	1,000,259 55

You see that whereas there was an increase of something like $40,000 during the last five years of the administration of hon. gentlemen opposite, there was an increase of nearly half a million dollars during the same period under the present government. Now, Mr. Speaker, there are other indications of progress and prosperity in the western country. I can remember when, in the city of Winnipeg, you could purchase lots at $10 to $15 a front foot that are selling to-day at $200, $300 and $400 a front foot. Perhaps those valuations are too high, but I do not think they are, in certain districts, but I am here to state that, generally speaking, land in the city of Winnipeg is about at its proper valuation. Another indication of progress is the value of buildings erected. In 1900, in the city of Winnipeg, the buildings erected were valued at $1,352,000; in 1901, $1,718,000; in 1902, $2,365,000; in 1903, $5,689,000; in 1904, $7,225,000; in 1905, $10,500,000. I am informed, Mr. Speaker, that the indications are that there will be $15,000,000 worth of buildings put up in the city of Winnipeg this year. And I want to tell this House that if you go on the streets of Winnipeg and ask any boy you meet what is the reason of the phenomenal increase in that city, he will tell you that it is the Siftonian policy with respect to immigration. In 1901, when the official census was taken, the population of the city of Winnipeg was 42,000; to-day I am credibly informed and verily believe that the population of that city is considerably over 100,000. During the past 6 or 7 years the assessment value of the city of Winnipeg has increased by over $26,000,000.

I have some other figures, I hope I am not wearying the House, but certainly these figures are interesting to me. If there is any visible indication of the success of an immigration policy it is surely the records with respect to homestead entries. Now, what are the results of the last five years of the administration of our hon. friends opposite in regard to homestead entries:

Year.	Homestead entries.
1891-2	4,738
1892-3	4,175
1893-4	3,568
1894-5	3,030
1895-6	1,888

Mr. Speaker, the policy of 'come if you will' inaugurated or pronounced by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), with the sanction, I believe, of the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden), who hopes at one time or other to be the premier of this country, I say the policy of 'come if you will' has resulted in five years of their administration in a decrease from 4,738 homestead entries in the first year of the period to 1,888 in the last year. What is the result of the policy of the present government, which we all consider to be a policy of activity, of well directed energy, of proper information, a policy that has had no peer under any other government that I have studied. The result of the administration of the Interior Department during the past five years of the administration of this government is as follows:

Year.	Homestead entries.
1900-1..	8,162
1901-2..	14,673
1902-3..	31,383
1903-4..	26,073
1904-5..	30,819

Or an increase in the last five years, under the administration of this government, from 8,162 to 30,819, and I am credibly informed that the homestead entries of this year are going to exceed in number any two years in the previous history of this country. I think I have said sufficient to convince this House, at least some members of it, that the immigration policy of the present administration is a well and intelligently directed policy, and I want to warn the hon. gentlemen opposite that the people of the west will not stand for the policy that has been enunciated by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), the policy of 'come if you will,' and I want also to repeat my warning to this government that the people of the western country will not stand for one moment for any relaxation of the well directed energy that the government have put forward during the past ten years with respect to the immigration policy.

Mr. GEORGE H. PERLEY (Argenteuil). Mr. Speaker, I regret very much that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have not seen fit to confine their attention to the amendment now before the House. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) gave us a lot of figures about what the Conservatives have done in the past, as did also the hon. gentlemen who followed him. The member for Yale (Mr. Ross) submitted to the House some statements regarding certain members of this House who had bought land from the Canadian Pacific Railway. I fail to see what that has to do with the discussion now before the House. The hon. gentleman from Winnipeg (Mr. Bole) has made what to my mind is a most unfair remark regarding a certain member of this House. I do not see he is called upon in any way to introduce that matter into this discussion as nothing of a personal nature had been brought into it before. If the hon. gentlemen opposite wish to have a field day on immigration, it is very easy for them to get it; in fact they will find they will have it anyway, on the general question of the estimates, without bringing it in here.

The figures given by the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Bole) are no doubt very interesting, but I fail to see that they have any bearing on the North Atlantic Trading Company. I would ask the hon. member for Winnipeg whether he can say in fairness that the $15,000,000 worth of new buildings being put up in Winnipeg this year were brought about by the North Atlantic Trading Company or the little office in Amsterdam? It seems to me that the hon. gentlemen are either ashamed or afraid to discuss the particular question at issue. The fact of the matter is they have so far seemed unable in any way to refute the arguments of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and they are trying by speaking about these other matters to draw away the attention of the people of this country from this most scandalous and unfortunate contract. I have listened carefully to this debate from the beginning and I have been puzzling myself a good deal as to why the government does not accept the amendment of the member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and let us have a unanimous vote on the subject and get through with this debate. As a matter of fact every section of the amendment of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has either been accepted in principle by the minister and members on the other side of of the House or else they have made no effort whatever to disprove it. I would like to bring attention back to the amendment before the House and to discuss the different sections. Section No. 1 as moved states:

> That the contracts entered into by the government of Canada with the North Atlantic Trading Company were made without the authority and knowledge of parliament.

I think that no one disputes this section of the amendment; in fact, the Minister of the Interior on page 1,888 of the 'Hansard' last Friday evening said:

> However, perhaps it was not so much the terms that he (Mr. Foster) complained about as the fact that the contract was entered into without the authority of parliament.

In other words, the minister himself has acknowledged that this contract was entered into without the authority of parliament. That disposes of that section. The second section of the amendment states:

> That the engagements thus undertaken cover a possible period of nearly thirteen years and involve the payment by the country of about $1,000,000 without any reasonable compensating advantages.

This is a very mild statement of the case. The first contract was entered into in November, 1899. I need not go into particulars; they have already been laid before the House. The second contract was approved by order in council, May 31, 1902, and the third contract in November, 1904, was made for a period of ten years with the right of four years' notice of cancellation. In other words, this contract would run from November, 1899, to November, 1914, a period of 15 years, two years longer than the term stated in the amendment.

This section of the amendment states that the amount expended was about $1,000,000. According to the Auditor General's Report (page L—26) the amount paid to this company for three years was $194,340.98, on the basis of which the amount for fifteen years would be $971,705 if there were no increase in the number of immigrants, but as the number of immigrants has been increasing there is no doubt that had this contract lasted the payment to the company during its term would have amounted to over $1,000,000. The Minister of the Interior in replying to a question (' Hansard,' page 191) gave the number of immigrants for 1904-5, and I have calculated from that statement that there were 28,957 immigrants from the countries mentioned in the contract with the North Atlantic Trading Company. We have no means of knowing what proportion of these people would be paid for under the contract, but I believe there is no question at all that under the terms of this document the company would have received $1,000,000. The amendment further says that the payments have been made to this company without any reasonable compensating advantages to this country and I think it is now generally admitted that such is the case. We have had no evidence whatever to show that the North Atlantic Trading Company has spent any money in bringing these people to Canada ; no proof has been offered by the company that they have had anything at all to do with bringing in these immigrants. A great mass of papers was brought down in connection with this matter, so great that it was impossible to analyse them closely, but in looking over the documents I was surprised to find that no particulars were given of the payments made to this company which seems to have been treated entirely differently from the regular booking agents in England and the United States. In the Auditor General's Report (L—26) you will find minute details of the payments made to immigration agents in Great Britain, the United States, and other countries, but the payments to the North Atlantic Trading Company are simply set out in bulk and no particulars whatever are given. We can also find proof that this contract has been made without any reasonable compensating advantage to Canada, in the fact that the company is paid far more per head for immigrants than the other immigration agencies. The Minister of the Interior told us the other day (' Hansard,' page 188) that the booking agents in Great Britain received 7 shillings for adults and half price for those under twelve years of age ; he told us that the Salvation Army which I am glad to see brings in a very fine class of immigrants receives 12 shillings for adults and half price for those under 12 years of age ; he told us that the Women's Domestic Guild receives three dollars for each servant, that a bonus of two dollars per head is paid to philanthropic societies, and he told us also that agents in the United States receive a bonus of three dollars for each adult male, two dollars for each adult female and one dollar for each child under eight years of age. But when we come to the North Atlantic Trading Company it is given a bonus of £1 per head for every man, woman, and child brought to Canada, and most of them come from south eastern Europe. I submit that these very figures prove that his contract was made with the company without any reasonable compensating advantage to us. The third clause of the amendment says :

> That the contracts were made under a pledge not to disclose the personnel or agents of the alleged company who are either unknown to the government, or if known to the government have not been disclosed to parliament notwithstanding various attempts to secure the information.

This declaration in the amendment has been proven by the evidence given by Mr. Smart before the Agriculture Committee. In fact, when the Minister of the Interior was asked on Friday last who were the North Atlantic Trading Company he replied : I have not the slightest idea. The Minister of the Interior does not care who they are, but when the money of this country is going to such a company it seems to me that he ought to care and that he ought to help the members of this House and the taxpayers of Canada to discover to whom we are paying our money. The fourth clause of the amendment states :

> That it does not appear that the alleged Trading Company had any corporate existence, any recognized headquarters, any known directors or officers, that it has any vessels afloat, or possesses any trading or operating facilities of any kind or any agents or agencies effective or otherwise.

This assertion is amply proven by the cable receivd from Lord Strathcona. It is shown that this company was not incorporated until June 1905, and that from 1889 to 1905 although the company was being paid from the taxes contributed by the people of Canada, it had no corporate existence whatever, it had no officers or directors and I fancy that nobody has ever claimed it had any vessels afloat. The Minister of the Interior seems

to have the extraordinary idea that the opposition in this parliament are not entitled to any assistance from the government to get at the bottom of this matter. In reply to the leader of the opposition he said on Friday night last:

> That is not a matter which concerns me in the administration of my department. I have no objection to hon. gentleman taking any means within their parliamentary rights to find out anything they wish, but they must not expect me to go out of the way of my ordinary administration to gratify what appears to me to be idle curiosity on their part, or a scent for scandal which so far has failed to locate its victims.

In other words, the Minister of the Interior does not propose that the people of this country shall receive any assistance from the department to enable them to discover who are at the bottom of this plot to get the money of the people of Canada without giving any return for it. I submit that the hon. minister should not take that position, but that it is in the interests of the government as well as of the opposition that a matter of this kind should be probed to the bottom. Section 5 of the amendment is:

> That no evidence has been given to parliament of the efficiency of its plans and methods of operation, or that it has been primarily instrumental in sending one single immigrant to Canada.

This statement has been made by the hon. member for North Toronto, and no evidence whatever has been submitted to the contrary. It seems to me that if the department had any evidence whatever among their voluminous papers to disprove this statement, they would have brought that evidence before the House. But they say nothing about it. On the contrary, the contract provides that 'it shall be sufficient for the company to send in at the end of the year their account for $15,000 and a receipted voucher or other reasonable proof of the same.' I ask hon. members if they think that people who could get their money by sending in an ordinary receipt would take any other means of proving their claim. I submit that this section 5 is one of the most important of all, and no effort has been made to disprove it. I take for granted that there is no evidence in the department that would go to disprove this section, or the hon. minister would have so stated to the House. Section 6 of the amendment, says:

> That the conditions of the contract are injurious, improvident and absurd.

The reason I claim that this section has been proved to the House is in the first place that the bulk of the immigration for which this North Atlantic Trading Company has been paid, has come from the south and the east of Europe. I have nothing to say at this time regarding immigration from that part of the world, but it is a well recognized fact that it is not as desirable as immigration from the north and west of Europe. On looking over the returns brought in from the hon. Minister of the Interior, I find that in 1904-5 20,739 immigrants came in from such countries as Austria, Bohemia, Galicia, Hungary, Roumania, Russia, &c. These people would all come within the terms of the contract with the North Atlantic Trading Company, and they represent the bulk of the people for whom that company was paid, the total from all the countries covered by the contract being 28,957.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we might learn something from the experience of the United States. This is not a question of following their example. In many cases it would not be wise for us to do that; but we might at any rate learn something from their experience. The United States, for many years, were only too glad to get in all the immigrants they could. I fancy that there was nothing but a sense of exultation throughout the United States at the great number of arrivals prior to some forty years ago. They came in to increase the wealth of the country, and the United States provided an asylum for the poor and the oppressed of other countries, and delighted in so doing. In 1864 an Immigration Act was passed by Congress to promote and not to restrain immigration. This was repealed in 1868. On August 3, 1882, the first restrictive Act was passed by the United States, but only to bar out criminals, insane, paupers, &c. Foreign convicts, lunatics, idiots, and those liable to be a public charge were to be returned at the expense of the vessels' owners. On February 26, 1885, a much more drastic law was passed, and there has been other legislation from time to time since. At present, I believe there is a head tax imposed on immigrants going into the United States. On March 3, 1903, legislation was passed requiring preliminary inspection at the point of departure, and the right was retained to deport immigrants at any time within two years of their arrival. This legislation has been going on in the United States for the past twenty years. They found that the people coming in from south eastern Europe were not desirable, and that they were coming in such large numbers that in self-protection they had to pass legislation of this kind. The character of the immigration from Europe had greatly altered, a larger proportion of people coming from southern and eastern Europe than had been the case a few years before. The following figures show the immigration of people of Teutonic and Anglo-Celtic origin as compared with that of people from the south and east of Europe:

	Teutonic and Anglo-Celtic.	South and East European.
1871-1880	1,914,341	179,982
1881-1890	2,494,171	926,116
1891-1900	1,615,718	1,841,581
1901-1903	393,195	1,365,070

In other words, the experience of the United States has been that people from the south and east of Europe are coming in vast numbers without any effort being made by the United States to bring them in. On the contrary, an effort has been made by the United States to prevent them from coming. I commend these facts to the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Bole), who made so much of the present immigration policy with regard to bringing people into the Northwest. I am not now arguing in any way against using some efforts to bring people into this country; but I certainly think we should stop our expenditure for that purpose in the undesirable parts of the world. There are plenty of desirable immigrants to come to this country. We are getting large numbers from the United States and also from the United Kingdom, and I see no reason why we should any longer spend money for the purpose of encouraging the undesirable sections of the old world's populations to come here and settle on our lands. The hon. member for Winnipeg will please take notice that the immigration into the United States in the year ending June 30, 1898, amounted to 229,299, whereas in the year ending June 30, 1903, it amounted to 857,046. In Canada the immigration increased from 49,149 in 1901 to 146,266 in 1905. In other words, the increase of immigrants into the United States has been just as great in proportion as it has been into Canada, notwithstanding the fact that the United States impose a head tax on these people and spend no money on booking agents.

I would like the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Bole) to tell me how it is, if this Siftonian policy is such a good thing that the number of immigrants to the United States has not fallen off but has instead increased in proportion just as fast as the immigration to this country.

I claim that many of these people from the south and east of Europe will come here anyway. The stream has been started and they will keep on coming even if we stop soliciting them or sending to them. It seems to me that we will get enough of them in this country without spending any more money for that purpose; and without belittling them in any way, I would like to read an extract from a certain report concerning this question in the United States. That report says:

> In pauperism there can be no question that the foreigners, mostly coming with nothing and having no friends to care for them, swell the pauper population immensely. In 1890 there were over three and three quarter times as many foreign as native born paupers. As to insanity, there is a considerably larger tendency to it in the foreigner than the native, most likely from greater average debility of constitution, which shows in the brain as well as in other organs. Between the ages of 25 and 55, the period which furnishes most of the patients, there was in 1890 a percentage of insane foreigners more than half as large again as that of natives.

I simply mention these facts to show that what we require is to keep if possible for our own children this country, and have it inhabited with as good a class of people as we can get. The more we get of our own Anglo-Saxon race and our own French Canadian race and the inhabitants of the north of Europe and our friends in the United States, the better. But why should we spend thousands of dollars in bringing people from the south and east of Europe, now that immigration is flowing in as it is? In the Hansard of last year I notice at page 9320—and I give this for the benefit of my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Bole)—a quotation with reference to a trial by jury in Winnipeg of certain foreigners for murder. The jury added a rider to its verdict as follows:

> And this jury wishes to place on record its opinion that it considers the importation of undesirable immigrants from southern Europe, of whom we find so many amongst us in this province and Winnipeg in particular, to be most undesirable and should be discontinued in the best interest of this country. We find that most of the serious crimes, such as we are called upon to investigate this evening, are committed by this foreign element in our midst.

That, Sir, is not my opinion but it is the opinion of some of the constituents of the hon. member for Winnipeg. Another thing I wish to point out in this connection is the difficulty that Canadians have to encounter when going to settle in the Northwest. It is harder for a man from eastern Canada to go to the Northwest and take up land than it is for a Galician. He gets no encouragement, he has no agent to solicit him, he is not served with any of the papers or notices given to foreigners, and he has to pay full fare and find out all about these things for himself. I submit that many of our young men who now go to the States would go to our Northwest more gladly if they were only given a better chance or put on an equal footing with the Galicians.

Section 6 states that the conditions of the contract are injurious, improvident and absurd. Well, I claim they are injurious for many reasons, and among others because they result in bringing into this country largely immigrants from the most undesirable sections of Europe. I claim that the contract is improvident because too high prices were paid for the services and there is no check whatever to show whether the

work has really been done or not. The contract is absurd because we are paying for these people from the south and east of Europe more than for the people of our own blood from the United Kingdom.

The other section, section No. 7 asks that immediate steps be taken to terminate and cancel the contract. I do not think there will be any difference of opinion on either side regarding this section. The opposition has been trying to get information throughout this session with regard to this North Atlantic Trading Company, and after a great deal of difficulty they did manage to find out something and brought in this amendment asking for the cancellation of this contract. The result of this is that the hon. minister said on Friday that the government had decided to give notice of the cancellation of this contract. But I ask in all fairness whether it would have been cancelled if the opposition had not taken up this matter and fought it out line by line and inch by inch in this House. The minister says: You have your remedy; find out the best way you know how. That is what we have had to do. But the right hon. the First Minister knows—nobody knows better—how difficult it is to get at the facts when you are in ignorance at the start and have to keep on asking questions to find out. I submit therefore that this contract would never have been cancelled if the oppsition had not taken the course they have to try and get at the facts.

I do not intend to weary the House. I have simply endeavoured to bring the discussion back to the amendment at issue. I claim it is one which ought to have the support of both sides. It is in fact supported by both. I am confident the minister of the Interior believes that every word in that amendment is quite right. I am confident that the hon. gentlemen opposite share that opinion. In private life it is not considered wrong to acknowledge you have done something you should not have done. This is the time when the government should join the opposition and pass this amendment without a dissenting voice. There is nothing about it which hon. gentlemen opposite have disproved, and I would like to ask what position they will occupy before the country should they vote down this amendment which they themselves have practically agreed to be correct.

Mr. J. BUREAU (Three Rivers). I have no intention, Mr. Speaker, of taking up much of the time of the House, but cannot refrain from expressing my satisfaction that this great storm, which was to put in the shade the eruptions of Mount Vesuvius and the earthquake of South California, has passed over so harmlessly. My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has fired his threatened bomb-shell and it missed fire. True it exploded but it exploded in the wrong direction, and the pieces are flying back on the Conservative side. But out of the incident have come certain things which should tend to our education. That bombshell, Sir, bears all the marks of Fosterianism. Every birth mark is clearly defined. A supreme disregard shown for the protection of parliamentary dignity, an utter contempt for parliamentary decorum, an entire ignoring of the question at issue and substituting therefor a stream of oratory, an ignoring of the facts and substituting for the facts a flow of epithets of which he is the acknowledged king—and an effort to make up for lack of strength in his case by a great mise en scène.

We are here, as my hon. friend from Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) who has just taken his seat has said, to analyse a contract. And he tells us that we are not to talk immigration, not to talk politics, not to talk figures. He tells us: If you want a field day on immigration, let us have it, but it is not the subject of discussion now. And then in a few moments he himself goes on to tell as that a young man from his own riding cannot go west as easily as a Galician—and so he goes on discussing immigration. What is there in this that hurts hon. gentlemen opposite so much? This contract was made for the simple and only purpose of promoting immigration. It is a contract made with the North Atlantic Trading Company by the Department of the Interior to help in bringing in immigrants. And what is the question that we are to discuss? The question is: Have they lived up to their agreement or not? —was it a good contract or was it not? Now, the hon. gentlemen, after all their inquisitiveness, after all their searches can only say it is a shame for this country to have good results if you have not the name of the parties to this contract. They want to find some scandal, some shame, but they cannot find it. And so they ask us not to talk about the facts, not to talk about the results. But what are the facts? They are very simple. In 1901 a contract was entered into between the Department of the Interior and the North Atlantic Trading Company. This contract was varied at different times, but the results have been, as shown by the Minister of the Interior, that we have flooded the country with immigrants, that we have brought prosperity to Canada, that, as shown this afternoon by my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. D. Ross) lands which our predecessors thought were fit compensation for a disappointed company and which were given away for nothing are now sold at high prices. I can readily understand that the feelings of hon. gentlemen opposite are hurt. I realize that my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was in great need of delivering himself of some of his oratory. I was pleased to see him rise for I greatly admire his facility in put-

ting words together, and, as I am anxious to learn as much of English as I can, I always listen to him with attention and great pleasure. But one thing that struck me was that, although the hon. gentleman was discussing a subject of great importance, his words lacked seriousness. Wishing to learn some details about this North Atlantic Trading Company, he thought that he would take us on a little trip to Amsterdam, to Damarack street in Amsterdam. With his histrionic abilities, he told us of a small building, a dusty stair, a closed door with a knob that would not turn—and so on. As he spoke, I asked myself whether he was drawing upon his imagination, or whether he was able to make this word picture so vivid because of his experience in this kind of thing. Has he, in carrying on any of his enterprises, walked up some dark street, climbed a dusty stair, sought to turn the knob of a door that would not open, and struck it resounding blows with his manly first without gaining any response ? If so, it was not across the Atlantic that the hon. member went. Had he crossed the ocean the cool breezes would have fanned his burning brow and might have cooled his fevered imagination. But he did not seek the continent of Europe ; he betook himself to the state of Illinois and to the city of Chicago. With his experience as Minister of Finance and with his success in always balancing the credit of this country on the debit side, he thought he could improve his financial standing. I recall that on one occasion, the hon. member for North Toronto in this House said to the right hon. Prime Minister. Let me pluck a few of your feathers that we may see what kind of a bird you are. I know that the hon. gentleman knows nothing but the golden rule, he must have treated others as he wishes others to treat him. So he will not object if he is deprived of some of his feathers. My hon. friend (Mr. D. Ross) has taken some of his plumage as a land speculator. Let me show something of the hon. gentleman as a financier—let me take some of his feathers that we may see what kind of a bird he is. The hon. gentleman is always refering to newspapers for his information, so I suppose he will not be mad if I do the same. On a stormy day in January 1905, by chance, I laid my hands upon a copy of the New York ' Herald.' It is dated the 27th of January of that year. I suppose it is as good an authority as the Yukon papers with which my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) informs and inspires himself when he wants to throw suspicion or insinuate anything wrong against a fellow-member of this House. The article to which I refer had a big heading, and was as follows :

Chicago bank fails because its president was snowbound.—He was on his way from this city with funds for the relief of the institution, but the blizzard stopped him.

New York ' Herald,' January 27, 1905.—(Special despatch to the ' Herald ').— Chicago, Illinois, Thursday.—With its president stuck in a snow bank on the Hudson—an imprisoned passenger on the Twentieth Century Limited—the Pan-American Banking Company, No. 185 Dearborn street, closed its doors to-day because of the failure of the head of the institution to arrive from New York with funds to meet the demands made at the cashier's window.

The bank was closed by Constable Moore, of Justice Wolfe's court, on complaint of a depositor who was unable to get his money. Meanwhile the company's president, W. H. Hunt, carrying relief to the concern, was endeavouring to keep warm on board the belated Lake Shore train.

The fact that the bank suspended payment caused no excitement in banking or financial circles. It has a capital of $500,000. W. R. Travers, secretary and treasurer of the company, and the offices of both Mr. Travers and Mr. Hunt are given as 91 Wall street, New York.

At the doors of the bank J. N. Heldman, an attorney, met all customers and assured them that they would be paid as soon as Mr. Hunt arrived. But the snow storm in the east interfered. Following the posting of the notice of suspension at the bank to-day some of the depositors expressed themselves in forceful language, but there was no other demonstration or excitement. William H. Hunt is the head of a private bank at No. 91 Wall street. As W. Hill Hunt he was the promoter and active head of the International Bank and Trust Company, a concern which failed about eighteen months ago.

W. Hill Hunt, who seems very much like the same man as Wm. H. Hunt, but with a slight change in the initials, was the promoter and active head of the International Bank and Trust Company.

It had branches on the Pacific coast, in Mexico, and its headquarters was located in New York. There were eight or ten Mexican branches, and the weak spot in the system of branch banking was discovered in Mexico. As in the present instance, Mr. W. Hill Hunt——

Wm. H. Hunt, it may have been then.

—was speeding to Mexico to relieve the strained situation in one of the branch offices, when the government took action. The office was closed, and thereafter the various branches suspended. The International Bank and Trust Company failed for nearly $1,000,000. Mr. Hunt attempted to reorganize the Bank Trust concern, and the result of his efforts was the formation of the Pan-American Banking Company.

This is very important.

It is a West Virginia corporation with $500,000 capital, of which only $80,000 has been paid in. With this amount of money as a basis, several branch offices have been opened. The directors are W. Hill Hunt, D. B. Helm and Robert Leslie Moffatt, of New York ; H. L. Turner, of Chicago, and——

Last but not least,

—Geo. E. Foster, former Canadian Finance Minister, of Toronto.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not wonder at the hon. gentleman expatiating so long on the fact that this concern was incorporated in the Isle of Guernsey, for there is a Chicago concern doing business in the state of Illinois and surrounding states, which got its charter from West Virginia. Now if there is any suspicion in the fact that the North Atlantic Trading Company, which I claim are in different circumstances entirely an account of the laws of the various countries—if there is any suspicion in the fact that they got their charter from the Isle of Guernsey, what may we suspect from the fact that this banking concern had to go to West Virginia to get its charter? Well, Sir, I do not wish to taunt the hon. gentleman with having drawn exclusvely on his imagination, because, as the House will see, he had some experience in similar matters, and this may have been the reason of his inspiration when he gave us such a vivid description of the deputy minister's wandering on Damarack street in Amsterdam. Now there is another thing that struck me in the hon. gentleman's remarks. After showing the great calamity that had struck this country he said:

> If it were not so important a matter that is at stake it would be the most ridiculous comedy that ever a comedian set himself to play, or a writer of comedies set himself to write. But it is serious.

Why, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has nothing to envy any writer of comedy. I think that speech of his is the best piece of comedy that was ever invented, and I do not think you could find anywhere a better comedian to act it than the hon. member for North Toronto. Unfortunately, whenever he made a mistake in some parts of his speech, the prompter did not act, and he had to refer to his paper. But there is one thing that we have a right to complain of, and that is that he should have chosen the floor of parliament on which to enact his comedy. Well, now that I have explained my views as to this great explosion of indignation on account of the North Atlantic Trading Company, and probed a little into the motives of the hon. member for North Toronto, I am willing to leave that part of the subject. But I must take exception to the way in which the member for North Toronto finished his speech. There is something in it—I do not know how to express it, my knowledge of English may be imperfect—but I would use the word 'wicked,' and if that is not parliamentary, I am willing to withdraw it. But in winding up that fine oration of his, he said:

> We have no sympathy with the right hon. gentleman who leads this government.

Why, Mr. Speaker, who would expect sympathy from the ex-Finance Minister of the Conservative government? He has none to give; if he has we cannot see it. When you consider the right hon. leader of this House, as a last resort, having recourse to the sympathy of the member for North Toronto, why, Sir, it requires a great effort of the imagination. This hon. gentleman has had quite a checkered political career, and knows what the lack of sympathy means. We saw him leaving the county of King's, N.B., because of a lack of sympathy, and he went to York, N.B.; and having gone to York, the same ideas prevailed with him, and he said, gentlemen of York, I thank you for your sympathy, you are too small for me, I will try the city of St. John. The hon. gentleman was like the lonely sparrow on the house top which we have heard mentioned in this House. He went from county to county in New Brunswick, finding no rest for the sole of his foot, and finally he came to North Toronto. That was the first place where he could find rest. And what success did he meet with? To use his own words in his speech, his success was 'nit.' Now let me tell the hon. gentleman that we are willing to dispense with his sympathy, and we are willing to dispense him from all the trouble he has taken to bring such a calamity on the Liberal party as he expects his speech and his bomb that he has exploded will be. He says: 'Not a little bit of it.' Well 'not a little bit' will be the success of his enterprise. In resuming my seat, Mr. Speaker, let me say that the right hon. the Prime Minister with his past record, in view of the verdict of the people of Canada, in view of the result of the policy that he has inaugurated and maintained, in spite of all that may be said to the contrary, can well do without the sympathy of the hon. member for North Toronto.

Mr. CRAWFORD moved the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR GENERAL—FURTHER SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance) delivered a message from the Governor General.

Mr. SPEAKER read the message as follows:

GREY.

The Governor General transmits to the House of Commons further supplementary estimates of sums required for the service of the Dominion or the year ending June 30, 1906, and in accordance with the provisions of the British North America Act, 1867, the Governor General recommends these estimates to the House of Commons.

Government House,
Ottawa, April 24, 1906.

Mr. FIELDING moved that His Excellency's message, together with the estimates, be referred to the Committee of Supply.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT—DECORUM IN THE HOUSE—BUDGET SPEECH.

Rt. Hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister) moved the adjournment of the House. He said : Mr. Speaker, I desire to state to the House that there is getting to be a great deal of confusion the moment the adjournment is moved, and that instead of hurrying out of the House, it would be far more seemly for members to wait until the adjournment is finally passed upon.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I might add that a predecessor of yours in the office of Speaker enjoined upon the House, that it was an improper thing for any member to move out of the Chamber upon adjournment until the Speaker and the mace had gone first. That is my idea of the proper decorum to be observed by the members of the House, and I think it would be more becoming if members would remain in the House and thus pay due respect to the Speaker instead of leaving their seats and scurrying out in advance.

I wanted to ask the Prime Minister whether or not his attention has been directed to a paragraph in the Toronto 'Globe' of yesterday, which speaks of the Alberta Land Company, capital £60,000 in pound shares as having been registered. Its objects are to adopt an agreement with J. A. Macdonald to acquire any lands or premises in Canada, the United States or elsewhere. Among the signatories are W. G. Morden, Montreal, and W. T. R. Preston, London. I do not know the object of this company, but apparently, it is to deal in western lands. I understand there is a rule expressed in the statute which governs the Department of the Interior, that no person employed in the department shall have any dealings in Dominion lands. I do not know whether this company proposes to do so or not, but one would judge from this item that it has that object in view. I would like to know whether the attention of the government has been directed to this paragraph and whether or not they have thought it of sufficient importance to make any inquiries.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My attention has been called to-day to this paragraph. I have had no opportunity yet of talking the matter over with my colleague, the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), but I will give an answer to-morrow.

BUDGET SPEECH.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the House adjourns, is the Finance Minister able to say yet, when he proposes to make his exposition of the budget ?

Mr. FIELDING. I would not like to make a definite statement, except that it will not be this week, but it will be as early as possible after this week, and in the usual way, an intimation will be given to my hon. friends several days in advance.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

INDEX

SECOND SESSION—TENTH PARLIAMENT, 1906.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following :—1°, 2° 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading ; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist ; *, without remarks or debate ; Accts., Accounts ; Adjn., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned ; Amt., Amendment ; Amts., Amendments ; Amalg., Amalgamation ; Ans., Answer ; Ass.; Assurance ; B., Bill ; B.C., British Columbia ; Can., Canada or Canadian ; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway ; Com., Committee ; Co., Company ; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence ; Consd., Consider ; Consdn., Consideration ; Cor., Correspondence ; Deb., Debate ; Dept., Department ; Depts., Departments ; Div., Division ; Dom., Dominion ; Govt., Government ; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General ; Hse., House ; H. of C., House of Commons ; Incorp., Incorporation ; Ins., Insurance ; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway ; Man., Manitoba ; Mess., Message ; M., Motion ; m., moved ; Neg., Negatived ; N.B., New Brunswick ; N.W.T., North-west Territories ; N.S., Nova Scotia ; O.C., Order in Council ; Ont., Ontario ; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island ; P.O., Post Office ; Par., Paragraph ; Prop., Proposed ; Q., Quebec ; Ques- Question ; Recom., Recommit ; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference ; Rep., Report, Reported ; Reps., Reports ; Res., Resolution ; Ret., Return ; Ry., Railway ; Rys., Railways ; Sel., Select ; Sen., Senate ; Sp., Special ; Stmnt., Statement ; Sup., Supply ; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary ; Wthdn., Withdrawn ; Wthdrl., Withdrawal ; Y.N., Yeas and Nays ; Names in Italics and parentheses are those of the mover.

Adamson, Mr. A. J., *Humboldt.*

Crown Lands, Administration of by Dept. of Interior, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 4418 (iii).

Dominion Lands, Administration of, by Govt., on Amt. (Mr. Ames) to Sup., 3155 (ii).

Lake of the Woods & Keewatin Milling Co.'s (B. 111) 1°*, 1576 (i).

Western Loan and Trust Co.'s incorp. (B. 35) 1°*, 443 (i) ; in Com., 3236 (ii).

Alcorn, Mr. G. O., *Prince Edward, Ont.*

'Arctic,' Str., Expenditure *re* Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3232, 3396 (ii).

Cinq-Mars, Before Bar of House, on Amt. (Mr. Aylesworth) 5282 (iii).

Express Companies (B. 82) 1° m., 999 (i); 2° m., 4734 (iii).

——— Discussion *re* (remarks) 2976 (ii).

——— Ref. to Com (remarks) 4538 (iii).

See 'Railway Act.'

Forest Reserve B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2881 (ii).

Hudson's Bay Co.'s Retired Employees, Land Claims, &c., on M. (Mr. McCraney) for Copies, 3748 (ii).

Hudson Bay Employees, Policy *re* Retirement Claims (Ques.) 1568 (i).

Judges of Provincial Courts, Arbitrators, &c., B. 13 (Mr. Lennox) in Com., 5380 (iii).

Lord's Day B. 12, in Com. (fishermen) 6653 ; (hiring rigs, &c.) 6643 ; (loading grain) 6651; (loading, &c. vessels) 6638; provincial Acts) 6555; (railways) 6371 (iv)

Mackintosh, Eileen Mary, Relief B. 185 (Mr. Northrup) on M. to ref. back to Com., 5443 (iii).

Alcorn, Mr. G. O.—*Con.*

Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 176 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5388, 5402 (iii).

Railway Act (express cos.) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 816 (i).

Railway Act Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 2582 (ii) ; 6184, 6239, 7079 (iv).

Railway Lands, Policy of Govt. *re* Selection by Ry. Cos. (Ques.) 570 (i).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Sale to A. D. Davidson, &c. (M. for Cor.*) 570 (i).

——— (Ques.) 1569 (i).

SUPPLY :

Lighthouse and Coast Service (gas buoys) 4895 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (maintenance of steamers) 3232 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (water service) 6765 (iv).

Ames, Mr. H. B., *Montreal, St. Antoine.*

Ahearn & Soper's Contract *re* Electrical Lighting of Observatory (Ques.) 1868 (i).

B. C. Land Sales, Conditions, Reps. *re* &c. (Ques.) 3971 (ii).

Brown, H. P., Transfer of Grazing Lease to Galway Cattle Co. &c. (Ques.) 5182 (iii).

Canadian Handicrafts Guild incorp. (B. 166) 1°*, 3314 (ii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Lands, Authority *re* Selection (Ques.) 3739 (ii).

——— Deptl. Letter 16th Sept., 1904 (Ques.) 3970 (ii).

——— Man. and Southeastern Ry Co. and Qu'Appelle, &c., Co., Cor. *re* transference of Lands &c. (M. for copies*) 208 (i).

Chateau-Richer Breakwater, Reconstruction, &c. (Ques.) 3969 (ii) ; 4708 (iii).

Ames, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*
Cornwall Canal Electrical Power, Delay in Hauling Vessels, Memorial *re* (M. for copy*) 3277 (ii).
Crown Lands, Administration of by Dept. of Interior, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 4595 (iii).
Davis Contract *re* Cornwall Canal, Electrical Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5350 (iii).
Dominion Lands, Administration of by Govt. (Amt.) on M. for Sup., 3101 (ii).
Dominion Lands Branch and Surveyor General Reps., Inquiry for, 716 (i).
Dussault & Lemieux, Contractor for Harbour Works (Ques.) 1377 (i).
Electric Lighting Parliament Buildings, Contract *re* (Ques.) 1567 (i).
See 'Ahearn,' &c., 'Ottawa.'
Forest Reserves B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 3321, 3339, 3548 (ii).
G.T.P. Branch Lines B. 75 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 5488 (iii).
Grazing Leases in Alberta and Sask., Names of Persons, &c., Area, Location, Rental, &c. (M. for ret.)* 208 (i).
Handbook of Townships in Man., Sask. and Alberta, Compiling of (Ques.) 583 (i).
Homestead Entries, 1904-5, Reps. of non-compliance, cancellation, &c. received by Dom. Lands Office, Action taken, &c. (M. for ret.*) 208 (i).
——— Inquiry for, 2235 (ii).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 170 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5202, 5230 (iii).
Information Bureau Concord, Advertisements in British Press (Ques.) 574 (i).
I.C.R., Fundy Coal Co., Quantity of Coal purchased (Ques.) 3244 (ii).
——— Moncton Land Purchase from Mr. Hewson (Amt.) to Com. of Sup., 5818, Neg. Y. 46; N. 89) 5856 (iii).
——— Strathcona Coal Co., Quantity Coal purchased (Ques.) 3244 (ii).
——— Ties purchased from John Mahoney, and J. & D. Buckley, Number, &c. (Ques.) 2270 (ii).
Lands in B.C. Sale of, Conditions, &c. (Ques.) 5752 (iii).
See 'B.C.'
Land Grants Patents, Total Number issued in Man., Sas. and Alberta from 1872 to 1905, &c. (M for ret.*) 209 (i).
Land Patents issued in Man., Sask. and Alberta, from 1901 to 1905, &c. (M. for ret.) 2275 (ii).
——— Inquiry for ret., 1855 (i).
Lands sold in Alberta and Saskatchewan for Irrigation Projects, Area, Location, &c., Prices, &c. (M. for ret.*) 208 (i).

Ames, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*
Lord's Day B. 12 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5658, 5699, 5764 (iii); (Jews) 6347 (iv).
McLeod, Roderick A., Homestead Entry Duties, &c. (Ques.) 5503 (iii).
Montreal Harbour (reorganization) Commissioners B. 124 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 2626 (ii).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Amounts claimed *re* Bonus, &c. (Ques.) 328, 830 (i).
——— Number of Immigrants deported, Payments to Govt. by Co., Form of Deposit, &c. (Ques.) 2452 (ii).
Northwest Land Patents, (M.) for ret., 2927 (ii).
Ottawa Astronomical Observatory, Electric Wiring, &c. (Ques.) 764 (i).
Paquet, Jos., Reinstatement as Pilot, &c. (Ques.) 3970, (ii).
Parke, Mr. Philip, Sale of Land to, Location, Conditions, &c. (Ques.) 1865 (i).
Porcupine Mountain, Dom. Reserve, Ref. to in debate on B. 47, 3548 (ii).
Quebec Harbour Works, Contract of Dussault and Lemieux (Ques.) 1377 (i).
Quebec Pilots, Examination in 1905-6, Reinstatement of J. Paquet (Ques.) 3970 (ii).
Ry. Act (express companies) Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 6198 (iv).
Ry. Land Grants, Selection by Ry. Cos., Govt. Policy *re*, on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) to Com. of Sup., 921 (i).
Ry. Subsidies (lands) voted by Parlt. in Man., Sask. and Alberta, Number of Acres, &c. (M. for ret.*) 209 (i).
Ray's Creek Wharf, Location of (Ques.) 2926 (ii).
Returns to Parl., Preparation of (remarks) 2937 (ii).
St. George, Mr. E. C. S., Sale of Land, to, Conditions, &c. (Ques.) 1866 (i).
School Lands Exchange B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 3912 (ii).
School Lands sold by Govt., in Man. and N.W.T., 1905, Amounts paid to Provs., Quantity yet unsold, &c. (Ques.) 191 (i).
School Lands disposed of by Govt. in Man., Sask. and Alberta, six months 1905, Average Price, &c. (Ques.) 192 (i).
SUPPLY:
Lighthouse and Coast Service (carbide supplies) 4881 (iii).
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, &c.), 5116 (iii).
Ties, delivered at Rogersville, Inspection of (Ques.) 2723 (ii).
——— Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 2950 (ii).
Timber Berth Leases, Original Tenders not produced (remarks) in Com. on B. 47, 3579 (ii).

Armstrong, Mr. J. E., *East Lambton.*

Apples, Dried and Green, Change *re* German Duty (Ques.) 978 (i).

Atlantic Fast SS. Service, Contract *re*, Report, &c. (Ques.) 198 (i).

Bell, Dr., Apptmnt. as Director of Geological Survey (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 409 (i).

Butter and Cheese Public Weigher at Montreal, Appmnt., &c. (Ques.) 4704 (iii).

Coal purchased by Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3613 (ii).

Exports to Germany of Farm Produce from 1896 to 1905 (M. for ret.*) 773 (i).

Fruit Conference at Ottawa, Printing of Rep. (Ques.) 5503 (iii).

Fruit Marks Act (apples) Amt. B. 101 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2164, 2550 (ii).

German Discriminatory Duties on Green and Dried Apples, Changes *re* Rates (Ques.) 978 (i).

German Surtax, Restrictions, Rates, &c. (Ques.) 325 (i).

German Tariff on Canadian Goods, and American Goods, &c. (Ques.) 989 (i).

German Tariff in Relation to Canada, Cor., &c. (M. for copies) 1871 (i).

German Tariff, Translation of (remarks) 4994 (iii).

German Tariff, Changes, &c., Inquiry for, 3713 (ii), 7359 (iv).

Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. 207 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 5895; in Com., 5896 (iii).

House of Commons Rules, in Com. on Special Rep., 7477 (iv).

Immigrants *re* Contract with North Atlantic Trading, Investigation *re* SS. Tickets, Destination, &c. (Ques.) 4703 (iii).

——— Investigation *re* Destination, Names of Official, &c. (Ques.) 5184 (iii).

Imperial Institute, Explanation *re* Vote (remarks) on M. for 1° of Supply Bill, 666 (i).

Indemnity to Members and Pensions, &c., B. 18 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 2976 (ii).

Indian Affairs, Number of Employees, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 1097 (i).

Indian Agents, Yukon Indians, Indian Reserve, Land disposed of, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2949 (ii).

Indians, Non-Treaty Expenditure, 1904-5 (Ques.) 5006 (iii).

Indian Schools, Complaints *re* Studies, Qualifications of Teachers, &c. (Ques.) 3249 (ii).

Indian Trust Fund, Amount collected (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1250 (i).

Intercolonial Railway, on Annual Statement (Mr. Emmerson) 296 (i).

London Ry. Mail Service, Apptmnt. of Supt., &c. (Ques.) 3405 (ii).

Armstrong, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*

Mail Shipments from American Ports, Canadian Ports, &c. (Ques.) 198 (i).

Montreal Harbour (reorganization) Commissioners' B. 124 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 2226 (ii).

Preferential Trade with Britain, False Declarations *re*, &c. (Ques). 2548 (ii).

Public Works, Expenditure by Provinces, Total Amount, &c. (Ques.) 3248 (ii).

Quebec Bridge, Obstruction to Navigation in St. Lawrence, on M. to adjourn, Cor., &c. (read) 216 (i).

Quebec Harbour (deep water) Commissioners B. 174 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 3927 (ii).

Ry. Act (crossings) Amt. B. 8 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 857 (i).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 7067 (iv).

Returns, Inquiry for, 1008 (i).

School Lands Exchange B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 3920 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 7376; (crop bulletins) 7381; (dairying industries) 7412; (experimental farms) 7388; (Year-book) 7382 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Geological Survey (salaries) 409; Public Works (promotions) 7030 (iv).

Dom. Lands (mines, salaries) 5941 (iii).

Fisheries (dog-fish) 3707; (hatcheries) 3701, 3709 (ii).

Indians—B. C. (medical attendance) 1080; (schools) 1087; Yukon (medical attendance) 1207 (i).

Interior (mining institute) 5950; Miscellaneous (boundary surveys) 5858 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies) 3604; (lighthouses) 3617; (oil supply) 4140; (repairs) 4140 (iii).

Marine Hospitals (buildings, &c.) 3686 (ii).

Militia (rifles, &c.) 7166 (iv).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 4836 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Point Edward) 6990, 7048; Miscellaneous (Red River Commission) 7053; Telegraph Lines—Yukon (Ashcroft—Edmonton) 7021;

Public Works—Transportation Facilities (Montreal harbour) 7036 (iv).

Scientific Institutions (hydrographic surveys) 3685 (ii).

Steamboat Inspection (inspectors) 3691 (ii).

Thames River Floods, Relief for, Cor., Plans, &c., on M. (Mr. Clements) for Copies, 780 (i).

Toledo Glass Co.'s Patent Relief B. 110 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3736 (ii).

Tower of West Block, Collapse, Inspection *re* Building, on M. for Sup., 1272 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 7030 (iv).

Yukon Indian Schools, Officials, &c. (Ques.) 2271 (ii).

Avery, Mr. M., *Frontenac.*
SUPPLY :
Indians—Ont. and Que. (schools) 721 (i).
Weights and Measures (inspections) 2602 (ii).
Tower of West Block, Collapse, Inspection by Dept. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1278 (i).
Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 14 (Mr. Campbell) on M. for 2°, 879 (i).

Aylesworth, Hon. A. B. (Minister of Justice), *North York, Ont.*
Amaranth Tp., Establishment of Post Office, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 990 (i).
'Appeal to Reason' Newspaper, Prohibition of (Ans.) 1867 (i).
'Arctic' Debate, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden), Pairs on Division (remarks) 3800 (ii).
Bell's Rapids Post Office, Establishment of (Ans.) 201 (i).
Blooming Point Post Office, Pet. *re* Establishment of (Ans.) 332 (i).
Brantford Postal Revenue, Postal Notes, &c. (Ans.) 339 (i).
Brantford Post Office, Total amount of Salaries, Wages, &c. (Ans.) 340 (i).
B. C. Land Sales, Conditions, Reps., &c. (Ans.) 3971 (ii).
Brothier, Desiré, Convict, Release of from B. C. Penitentiary (Ans.) 5183 (iii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7526 (iv).
——— (remarks) *re* Prerogative of Crown, 5324 (iii).
——— Release of, (remarks) 4993 (iii).
Campeau, Michel, Employmt. by Govt. (Ans.) 835, 1374 (i).
Canadian Northern Ry. Lands, Selection of, Patents *re* &c. (Ans.) 2725 (ii).
Cannington Postmaster, Amount of Salary for 1903-4-5 (Ans.) 453 (i).
——— Charges against, Investigation *re* (Ans.) 421 (i).
——— Removal, Charges *re* &c. (Ans.) 190 (i).
——— Suppl. Answer, 225 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Cor., 2472 (ii).
Chateau Richer Breakwater, Reconstruction by Govt. (Ans.) 3969 (ii).
Chatham, Street Mail Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 551 (i).
Cinq-Mars before Bar of House, on M. (Mr. Jackson) to translate article, 4795 (iii).
——— Summoned for further examination, (amt.) 5269, Agreed to (Y. 82; N. 47) 5288 (iii).
Coffin, David T., Postmaster at Hillsboro Head, Dismissal &c. (Ans.) 3065 (ii).
Coldwater and Lawson Mail Service, Amount paid contractors (Ans.) 330 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 530 (i).

Aylesworth, Hon. A. B.—*Con.*
Criminal Code (Independence of Parlt.) Amt. (B. 4) in Com., 7648 (iv).
——— Rep of Com. (remarks) 7064 (iv).
Dorion and McAfee, Dismissal and Reinstatement (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 526 (i).
Election Committees, Reps. *re* Election Amendments (remarks) 4802 (iii).
Free Press, Man. and 'Der Nordwester Publishing Cos., Payments to (Ans.) 991 (i).
Gagné, Judge, and connection of two sons with legal firm of Price & Co. (Ans.) 7371 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry., Construction work, Protection of Labourers (Ans.) 337 (i).
G.T.P. Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 61 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 4540, 4748; on Amt. (Mr. Sproule) to M. for 3°, 4996 (iii).
Grimsby Park, Collection of Fees (remarks) in Com. on B. 12, 6670 (iv).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 170 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., on Amts., 5416 (iii).
Immigration to Canada, False Representations *re* Labour Market, on prop. res. (Mr. R. Smith) 2962 (ii).
Insurance Commission, Instructions to Commissioner *re* Methods of Action (remarks) 5445 (iii).
International Postal Congress, Canadian Representative, *re* Instructions &c. (Ans.) 2729 (ii).
Interpretation Act Amt. (B. 171) 2° m., 5556 (iii).
Judges of Provincial Courts (arbitrators, &c.) B. 13 (Mr. Lennox) in Com., 5365 (iii).
Judges of Provincial Courts, Discussion *re* (remarks) 5084, 5185 (iii).
Kettlebey Postmaster, J. M. Walton, Place of Residence (Ans.) 3405 (ii).
Letter Carriers Uniforms, Names of Contractors, &c. (Ans.) 1747 (i).
Little Current Postmaster B. H. Turner, Dismissal of, Charges *re* (Ans.) 2727 (ii).
London Ry. Mail Service, Apptmnt. of Supt., &c. (Ans.) 3405 (ii).
Lord's Day B. 12 (M. in Com.) 5622, 5696 (iii); (coming into force) 6674; on Amt. (Mr. Pringle) *re* destination of trains, 7276 (iv); (electric rys.) 5755 (iii); 6643; on Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* electric rys., 7247; (fishermen) 6652; games, on Amt. (Mr. T. Martin) *re*, 7239; games (M.) to strike out Amt. (Mr. T. Martin) *re*, 7277; (hiring of rigs) 6641; (industrial plant) 6602; (industrial plant) Amt., 6619; on Amt (Mr. D. Ross) *re* industrial processes, 7216; on Amt. (Mr. Galliher) 7254; (Jews) 6293; (loading grain, &c.) 6633, 6645; (maple sugar) 6658 (iv); (newspapers) 5743 (iii); (pleasure grounds) 6663; (provincial acts) 6555; (pro-

Aylesworth, Hon. A. B.—*Con.*
vincial legislatures) 6561; (rys.) 6366; on Amt., (Mr. Guthrie) *re* rys., 7252; (shooting) 6249; on Amt. (Mr. Borden) *re* shooting, 6269; (24 hours rest) 6660 (iv).
Lord's Day (B. 12) 3° m. and (M.) to ref. back to Com., *re* Amts., 7277; agreed to (Y. 79; N. 42) 7286; on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to M. for 3°, 7356; on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) to M. for 3°, 7333; on Amt. (Mr. D. Ross) to M. for 3°, 7202; Amt. to Amt. (Mr. D. Ross) to ref. back to Com., 7206; on Senate Amts., 7664; 7697 (iv).
Mackintosh, Eileen Mary, Relief B. 185 (Mr. Northrup) on M. to ref. back to Com., 5443 (iii).
Magazines, Canadian-American, Advance *re* Postal Rates, &c. (Ans.) 2271 (ii).
Mail Shipments from American and Canadian Ports, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 198 (i).
Man. Appeal Court (Bill 195) in Com. on Res., 5007; 1°*, 5082; in Com., 5556 (iii).
Members' Indemnity: *See* 'Senate and House of Commons.'
Midland and Vasey Mail Service, Tender *re* Contract (Ans.) 1376 (i).
Ministers and Deputy Ministers practising in Courts, on prop., Res. (Mr. Lennox) 2765 (ii).
Mission Road and North Sequin Mail Service, Amount paid to Contractor (Ans.) 422 (i).
Money-Lenders Act Amt. B. 11 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6805 (iv).
Montmagny Postmaster, Complains *re*, Other Occupations, &c. (Ans.) 3404 (ii).
Montreal Post Office Employees, Absence, Payments for overtime (Ans.) 340 (i).
Montreal Post Office Improvements, &c (Ans.) 335 (i).
Mount Vernon Mail Service, Pet. *re* (Ans.) 1567 (i).
Newspaper Criticisms, *re* Municipal Ownership Discussion: Ques. of Privilege, 7367 (iv).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Mr. Preston's Refusal to answer Questions, on M. (Mr. Monk) 4492 (iii).
Oak Point Mail Service, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 1102 (i).
Orillia Postmastership, Apptmnt. to (Ans.) 329 (i).
Palmerston Postmaster, Apptmnt. of (Ans.) 2454 (ii).
Peck, L. C., Dismissal of Postmaster at Hopewell Hill, N.B. Investigation *re* (Ans.) 1375 (i).
Peel County Postmasters, on Inquiry for Ret., 1749 (i).

Aylesworth, Hon. A. B.—*Con.*
Peer, John Albert Relief B. 169 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 5453 (iii).
Penitentiary Act Amt. (B. 176) 2°, and in Com., 5387 (iii), 5402 (iii), on Senate Amts., 6818 (iv).
Pisquid Road Mail Service, Pet, *re* (Ans.) 1565 (i).
Plasterers' Labourers, Non-payment by Contractors (Ans.) 1372 (i).
Postal Grievances, Deputation *re* Legislation (remarks) 3796 (ii).
Postal Rates on Magazines, (remarks) *re* Answer to former Question, 2824 (ii).
Postmasters Duties, Policy of Govt. *re* (Ans.) 329 (i).
Postmaster General's Rep. (presented) 211 (i).
Postmasters, Pets. *re* Duties and Remunerations (Ans.) 1374 (i).
Postmasters' Salaries, Policy of Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 538 (i).
Post Office Boxes, Regulations *re* Rentals, (Ans.) 423 (i).
Post Office Clerkships, Additional, on M. (Mr. Barker) for Rep., 771 (i).
Post Offices, System *re* opening on Sunday (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 554 (i).
Prince Albert Mail Service, Contract from Station to Post office (Ans.) 1746 (i).
P.E.I.Ry. Mail Service, Terms *re* Contract (Ans.) 2267 (ii)
——— News Agency, Contract *re* (Ans.) 2266 (ii).
Privy Councillors Repeal (B. 220) 2°*, and in Com., 7619; on M. for 3°, 7651 (iv).
Question of Privilege: *See* 'Newspaper Criticisms'.
Ry. Act Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 1589 (i); 6240, 7098 (iv).
Railway Mail Clerks appointed from North York (Ans.) 330 (i).
Rock Hill Post office, Name, &c. (Ans.) 836 (i).
Rondeau Harbour Improvements, Tenders, Advertisement for (Ans.) 983 (i).
Rural Mail Delivery, Free, U. S. System, Information *re* (Ans.) 216 (i).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 713 (i).
——— Return (remarks) *re*, 1573 (i).
St. Aubert and St. Pamphile Mail Service, Expiration of Contract (Ans.) 2266 (ii).
St. Hypolite Mail Service, Pets. *re* Improvement (Ans.) 2268 (ii).
Seaforth Public Buidlings, Rentals paid (Ans.) 1567 (i).
Senate and House of Commons Act (members indemnity) Amt. (B. 97) in Com., 7118; on Senate Amts., 7570 (iv).

Aylesworth, Hon. A. B.—*Con.*
Senate and House of Commons Act (fees) Amt. B. 10, in Com., 7648; on Sen. Amts., 7695 (iv).
Statutes, Revised, Completion of (remarks) 6678 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice—Yukon (living allowances) 7518 (iv).
Civil Government—Justice (contingencies) 7529 (promotions) 7538; Post Office (salaries) 401 (i).
Justice—Miscellaneous (Canadian Law Library) 7529; (litigated matters) 7528; (revised statutes) 7527 (iv).
Penitentiaries—Kingston (binder twine) 7529 (iv).
Post Office (contingencies) 550; (letter carriers) 527; (mail service) 529; (outside salaries) 525; (Yukon) 558 (i).
Supreme Court of Judicature, N.B. (B. 224) 1° m., 6790; 2°*, and in Com., 7143; 3° m., 7188 (iv).
Terrebonne and Ste. Thérèse Post Office, Revenues *re* (Ans.) 2721 (ii).
Thessalon Postmaster's Name (Ans.) 2273 (ii).
——— Rentals from P. O. Boxes, &c. (Ans.) 2728 (ii).
Thorndale Post Office, Removal of Postmaster &c. (Ans.) 989 (i).
Toronto Post Office Fire, Destruction of Mail (remarks) 2239 (ii).
Vaughan, Wm. Napoleon, Relief B. 85 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 6035 (iii).
Victoria Harbour Postmaster, Complaints *re* Duties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 544 (i).
Walsh, Patrick, Dismissal from East Romans, Post Office, N.S., Pet. *re* (Ans.) 769 (i).
Whitefish Indian Reserve, Sale of (Ans.) 2724 (ii).
Wilton Post Office, Dismissal of L. L. Galligher, and Apptmnts (Ans.) 835 (i).
Winnipeg 'Free Press," Amount paid by Govt. 1904-5 (Ans.) 3969 (ii).
Winnipeg Printers Complaints, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 1378 (i).
Winnipeg-Selkirk Mail Service, Tenders *re* Contract (Ans.) 3405 (ii).
Winnipeg Street Car Strike, Settlement *re* (remarks) 1259 (i).
Woods, Co., Limited, Payments to by all Depts. (Ans.) 980 (i).
Woodstock, N.B., Apptmnt. of L. C. Smith as Postmaster (Ans.) 1564 (i).
——— Leave of Absence of Postmaster L. C. Smith (Ans.) 1378.

Barker, Mr. S., *East Hamilton.*
'Arctic,' Str., Expenditure *re* Supplies, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3207 (ii).
Eastern Ry. Supply Co., &c., Contracts with Govt., Tenders, Cor., &c. (M. for ret.*) 207 (i).

Barker, Mr. S.—*Con.*
Eastern Ry. Supply Co., (Ques.) 173 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 716, 840 (i).
'Galveston' Dredge, Purchase by Dom. Govt. (Ques.) 2456 (ii).
Gobeil, Mr., Dep. Minister of Public Works, Payments to *re* Arbitrations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 397 (i).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 84 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 2252 (ii).
G. T. Pacific Telegraph Co.'s incorp. B. 61 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 2717 (ii).
House of Commons Rules, in Com. on Rep., 7466, 7606 (iv).
Immigration Agents in G. B. and Ireland, Charges *re* Irregular Payments, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1870 (i).
Immigration Irregularities in G. B., &c., Charges *re* (Ques.) 1672 (i).
I.C.R., Coal Depots, Establishment *re*, Purchase of Land, &c. (Ques.) 1863 (i).
——— Denning's Siding at Pugwash, Expenditure *re* Total Receipts, &c. (Ques.) 2077 (ii).
——— Freight Rates, Control of by Ry. Commission, ref. to in Com. on Ry. B. 62, 2569
——— Investigation by Public Accounts Com. *re* Expenditures (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7484 (iv).
——— Langile's Platform at Pugwash Branch, Expenditure, Accommodation, &c. (Ques.) 2078 (ii).
——— Number of Employees, Charges to Different Accounts (Ques.) 976 (i).
——— Oil supplied by N. B. Petroleum Co., Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 172 (i).
Interior, Deptl, Rep., Inquiry for, 715 (i).
Lodge, Mr. M., Purchase of Land for I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7484 (iv).
Lord's Day Observance B. 12 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. to ref. to Special Com., 1205 (i); in Com., 5675; (trains, &c.) 5702 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. T. Martin) 7255; on M. (Mr. Aylesworth) to strike out amt. (Mr. T. Martin) *re* ball games, 7285; on Senate Amts., 7669 (iv).
N. B. Petroleum Co., Incorporation, Capital Stock, Directors, &c. (Ques.) 978, 1670 (i).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 2415 (ii).
——— Mr. Preston's Refusal to answer Questions, on M. (Mr. Monk) 4485 (iii).
Peterborough Lift Lock, Reps. Documents, &c, *re* Defects (M. for copies*) 1871 (i).
Post Office Clerkships, Additional, Rep. *re* (M.) for Copy, 771 (i).
Postmasters' Salaries, Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7446 (iv).
Public Accounts Com., 10-15th Reps. (remarks) *re* printing, 7458 (iv).

Barker, Mr. S.—*Con.*

Pugwash Wharf Repairs, Expenditure *re*, Inspector's Qualification (Ques.) 1862 (i).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan, &c. Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Carvell) in Com., 2704 (ii).

Ry. Act (express cos.) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 797 (i).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. 2569 (ii).

Speers, C. W. and A. D. Davidson, Sale of Land, Reps. Maps, &c. (M. for copies*) 1571 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 1855 (i).

SUPPLY :

Administration of Justice—Yukon (living allowance) 7525 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Finance Dept. (salaries) 7453; (postmasters) 7446; Post Office (salaries) 402; Public Works (salaries) 397 (i).

Ocean and River Service (maintenance of Strs.) 3207 (ii).

Railways — I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 7502 ; (expenditure) 7484 ; (Moncton shops) 7501; Miscellaneous (Gov. Gen.'s car) 7512 (iv).

Toronto, Niagara and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 134 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 4393 (iii).

Vancouver and Lulu Island Ry. Co.'s B. 29 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 1142 (i).

Veterans of Fenian Raids, Claims for Compensation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 624 (i).

Western Loan and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 35 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 3237 (ii).

Barr, Mr. J., *Dufferin.*

Address, on The, 120 (i).

Amaranth Township, Pet. *re* Establishment of Post Office (Ques.) 990 (i).

'Appeal to Reason' Newspaper, Prohibition of (Ques.) 1867 (i).

——— Removal of Postal Ban (Ques.) 5615 (iii).

Electric Power and Gas Exportation Regulation B. 145 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 3080 (ii).

Fruit Marks Act (apples) Amt. B. 101 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2178 (ii).

Georgian Bay Island Indian Reserves, Surveys of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 725 (i).

Glanders, Quarantine of Animals (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2683 (ii).

Hay Trade Regulations, Penalties *re* Violation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beauparlant) 4013 (ii).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 170 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5212 ; on Amts., 5408 (iii).

Immigration Agents, Ont., and Dom. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1347 (i).

Immigration to Canada, False Representations *re* Labour Market, on prop. Res. (Mr. R. Smith) 2966 (ii).

Immigration from Belgium (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1644 (i).

Barr, Mr. J.—*Con.*

Imperial Institute, Explanation of Vote (remarks) on M. for 1° of Supply Bill, 693 (i).

Indemnity to Members, ref. to in deb. on Address, 120 (i).

Land Patents in Alberta, Man., &c., on M. for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 2948 (ii).

Lord's Day B. 12 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5645, 5739, 5808 (iii); on M. (Mr. Aylesworth) to strike out Amt. (Mr. T. Martin) *re* ball games, 7282; (Jews) 6292 ; (pleasure grounds) 6670 (iv).

Lord's Day B. 12, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Monk) *re* Discussion of Principle, 6263 (iv).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co's Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6141 (iv).

Members and Privy Councillors Indemnity Repeal B. 18 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 2539 (ii).

Milk Cans: *See* 'Weights and Measures.'

Money Lenders Act Amt. B. 11 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6806 (iv).

Palmerston Postmaster, Apptmnt. of (Ques.) 2454 (ii).

——— Apptmnt by Reform Executive (remarks) *re* Par. in 'News,' 2326 (ii).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 2600 (ii), 6184, 6226, 7091 (iv).

Ry. Subsidies B. 214 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 6141 (iv).

Senate and House of Commons Act (fees, &c.) Amt. B. 10, in Com., 7649 (iv).

Sharbot Lake and Bathurst Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6144 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 7407 (iv); (Year Book) 2682 (ii).

Civil Govt.—Geological Survey (salaries) 405 (i).

Electric Light Inspection (salaries) 2608 (ii).

Immigration (agents, &c.) 1347 (i); (agents and employes' salaries) 5968 (iii); (agents, G. B., &c.) 1635, 1644 (i); (printing, &c.) 5517 (iii).

Indians—Man. (implements) 735 ; N. S. (seed grain) 734; Ont. and Que. (medical attendance) 720; (Robinson annuities) 722; (schools) 717 ; (surveys) 725 ; (Treaty No. 9) 734; Yukon (medical attendance) 1206; (relief) 1206 (i).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 4865 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Mar. Provs. (generally) 6728; Ont. (London military buildings) 6735; Ottawa (Parlt. Buildings extension) 6713; Que. (Chicoutimi) 6728 (iv).

Quarantine (animals health) 2682 (ii).

Railways—I.C.R. (bridges) 5023 (iii).

Weights and Measures (electric light inspection) 2608; (inspections) 2602; (metric system) 2607 (ii).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 14 (Mr. Campbell) on M. for 2°, 876; on M. for 3°, 2974 (ii).

Wilson, Mr. Alex., Apptmnt. as Special Immigration Agent (Ques.) 1864 (i).

Beauparlant, Mr. A. M., *St. Hyacinthe.*
Lord's Day B. 12, in Com. (shooting) 6249 ; on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) to M. for 3°, 7342 (iv).
Hay Trade Regulation (B. 116) 1° m., 1576 (i).
Hay Trade Regulations, Penalties *re* Violation (prop. res.) 3997 (ii).

Beland, Mr. H. S., *Beauce.*
Lord's Day B. 12 in Com. (maple sugar) 6657 (iv).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (D'Israeli wharf) 6954 (iv).

Belcourt, Hon. N. A., *Ottawa.*
Duryea, Chester Burnell, Patent Relief (B. 79) 1°*, 999 (i) ; in Com., 2194 (ii).
Gray, Franklin Montgomery Patent Relief B. 122 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 4946 (iii).
Imperial Intelligence Office, Establishment of, Cor. *re* (M. for copies*) 427 (i).
King's Most Gracious Majesty, Invitation to visit Canada, Address from Houses of Parliament (M.) 1679 (i).
Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s (B. 57) 1° m., 743 (i).
Pacific Bank of Canada (B. 50) 1° m., 656 (i).
Pacific and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 205) (M.) to receive Pet. 1668 (i) ; 1°*, 5556 (iii).
Public Accounts Com., 2nd Rep., (M.) to conc, 4247 (iii).
——— (M.) to sit concurrently with sittings of Hse., 5529 (iii).
Speaker's Appartments, H. of C., Stmnt. of Goods supplied from 1886 to 1906, (M. for ret.*) 2950 (ii).
Standard Trust Co.'s B. 147 (Mr. Bole) in Com., 4945 (iii).
United Empire Bank of Canada, incorp. (B. 52) 1°*, 656 (i).
Wurts, Henry Patent Relief (B. 106) 1°*, 1465 (i) ; in Com., 2205 (ii).
Yukon Concessions, Bronson and Ray's. Claims, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Sup., 1521 (i).

Bennett, Mr. W. H., *East Simcoe.*
'Arctic' Expedition, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) to conc. in Rep. of Special Com., 6428 (iv).
——— Expenditure *re* Supplies, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3201 (ii).
Aylesworth, Hon. A. B., acting as Counsel since Appmnt. as P.M.G. (Ques.) 425 (i).
Blood Reserve, Lease to McEwan Cattle Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 955 (i).
'Boynton', Tug, of Sault Ste. Marie Tug Co., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4093 (iii).

Bennett, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*
Cannington Postmaster, Dismissal of Mr. Talbot, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Cor., 2481 (ii).
Coldwater and Lawson Mail Service, Amount paid *re* contract (Ques.) 330 (i).
See 'Lawson.'
Collingwood Dock Co., Amount paid as Bounty (Ques.) 419 (i).
——— Valuation *re* Bounty (Ques.) 574 (i).
——— (M. for copies*) 774 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 1367 (i).
Conmee and Bowman, Charges *re* Dredging Contracts, Ref. to in deb. on Tower of West Block, 1303 (i).
Crown Lands, Administration of by Dept. of Interior, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 4384, 4399, 4654 (iii).
Dredging in Prov. of Ont., Amounts paid, Work performed, &c. (M. for ret.*) 773 (i).
——— (Ques.) 417 (i), 2721 (ii).
Fishery Conditions on Great Lakes, Board of Investigation (Ques.) 575 (i).
Flour for Penitentiaries, Tenders *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 940 (i).
French River Lighthouse, Construction of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3601 (ii).
French River Water Power Privileges (Ques.) 5003 (iii).
Georgian Bay Island Timber Lands, Leases to Peter Ryan, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 932 (i).
German Tariffs in Relation to Canada, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 1922 (i).
——— Ques. of Order, *re* Statement of (Mr. A. Johnston) as to 'criminal courts,' 1931 (i).
Giant's Tomb Island, Sale of Timber, &c. Cor., &c. (M. for copy*) 1380 (i).
——— Mis-statements by Supt. General of Indian Affairs (remarks) 5333 (iii).
——— Lease of Timber lands to Peter Ryan, &c. (remarks) Com. of Sup., 932, 1228 (i).
Great Lakes Dredging Co., Charges *re* Dredging Contract (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1303 (i).
——— Payments for Tugs in Thunder Bay, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3583 (ii).
Hope Island Timber Reserve, Removal by Mr. M. Chew, Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 419 (i).
Imperial Pulp Mill Co.'s Water Power, Sale of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 943 (i).
Kettlebey Postmaster, Place of Residence, (Ques.) 3405 (ii).
Lake Ocebe Lighthouse, Construction of, Payments to Employees, Cor. *re* (M. for copies*) 997 (i).
Lawson, Coldwater, &c., Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 529 (i).

Bennett, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*
Light and Fog Alarms, Ont. Ports, Contracts and Supplies (Ques.) 4706 (iii).
Lord's Day B. 12, in Com. (industrial plants) 6620; (loading, grain) 6644; (loading, &c., vessels) 6635 (iv).
Magnetawan Lighthouse, Construction of, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 422 (i).
——— Contract *re* Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4118 (iii).
——— Charges against Member for Parry Sound, Investigation by Dept., Inquiry for Rept., 6793 (iv).
——— Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 1677 (i).
Mail Contracts, Tenders, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 529 (i).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 470 (i).
Midland and Vasey Mail Service, Tenders *re* Contract (Ques.) 1376 (i).
Midland Dredging, Number of Tenders *re* (Ques.) 1868 (i).
Ministerial Changes, on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 265 (i).
Mission Road and North Sequin Mail Service, Amount paid to Contractor (Ques.) 422 (i).
Money-Lenders Act Amt. B. 11 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6817 (iv).
Montreal Harbour (reorganization) Commissioners B. 124 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 2648 (ii).
Ontario Lumber Co., Lighthouse at French River, Erection, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 1867 (i).
Orillia Postmastership, Apptmnt to (Ques.) 329 (i).
Parry Sound Mail Service, Amount paid to Contractor (Ques.) 422 (i).
Penitentiary Salaries B. 176 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 4083 (iii).
Port Arthur and Fort William Dredging, Advertising for Tenders (Ques.) 3503 (ii).
——— Expenditure *re* in 1902-3-4-5 (Ques.) 3243 (ii).
Port Arthur Dredging, *re* Great Lakes Dredging Co., Contract, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3804 (ii).
Port Colborne Breakwater, Amount expended, &c. (Ques.) 447 (i).
Postmaster Duties, Policy of Govt. *re* (Ques.) 329 (i).
Prendergrast, H. W., Basis of Payments to *re* Dredging at Matchedash Bay (Ques.) 2454 (ii).
Reid Wrecking Co., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4089 (iii).
Rock Hill Postmaster, Name, &c. (Ques.) 836 (i).
'Seagull,' Str., Purchase of (remarks) 972 (i).

Bennett, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*
'Seguin,' Str., Payments *re* Construction Work (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4096 (iii).
Stafford, Mr. J. A., Offer to Purchase Island in Georgian Bay (Ques.) 5007 (iii).

SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 2670 (ii).
Canals—Trent (tugs) 5360; Welland (Port Colborne deepening) 5357 (iii).
Indians—General (inspectors) 1228; Man. and N.W.T. (provisions) 932 (i); Ont. (treaty payments) 5988 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies, &c.) 3594 (ii); (compensation *re* gas explosions) 4870 (iii); (lightkeepers' salaries) 3583 (ii); (repairs, &c.) 4118 (iii).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, repairs) 3804 (ii), 4089, 4867 (iii); (maintenance and repairs) 3201 (ii).
Post Office (letter carriers) 527; (mail service) 529, 543 (i).
Public Works—Buildings, B.C. (Cumberland) 6755; (Osoyoos) 6758 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (rents, &c.) 6763 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Generally (armouries) 6758 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 6743; (Winnipeg, postal station, C.P.R.) 6751 ; (Winnipeg, Post Office) 6747; (Winnipeg, stores) 6743 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings, N. B. (Woodstock armoury) 6728 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings, N. S. (Shelburne) 6727 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (London military buildings) 6735; (North Bay) 6736; (Peterborough armoury) 6738; (St. Mary's) 6740; (Simcoe) 6740; (Toronto customs, alterations) 6741; (Toronto, military buildings) 6742 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings, Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 6709; (new buildings) 6724; (Parlt. Buildings, extension) 6712; (royal mint) 6711; (western deptl. block) 6717 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings, Que. (Chicoutimi) 6728; (Magog) 6729; (Montreal military building) 6732; (Sherbrooke drill hall) 6733 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Sask. and Alberta (Edmonton immigration) 6753; (Moosejaw) 6753; (Saskatoon) 6754 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Amherst Point) 6772; Ont. (Collingwood) 6988; (Midland) 6990; Que. (Bic Harbour) 6943 (iv).
Tower, West Block, Collapse, Inspection by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1292, 1298
——— Investigation *re* Collapse (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6717 (iv).
Transportation Commission, Apptmnt. of Commissioners, Copies of Evidence, &c. (M. for ret.*) 203 (i).
——— Rep., Printing and Distributing (Ques.) 427 (i).
———Delay in bringing down (remarks) 770 (i).
Transportation Commission, on Order being called for Notice of Motion (remarks) 1106 (i).

Bennett, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*
Transportation Question, Notice of prop. res., 1679 (i).
——— Rep. Evidence, &c. (prop. res.) 2038 (ii).
Victoria Harbour Postmaster, Complaint *re* Duties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 543 (i).
Whitefish Indian Reserve, Sale of, Name of Purchaser (Ques.) 2454 (ii).
——— Sale of, (Ques.) 2724 (ii).
Wolvin Fleet, Withdrawing from Montreal Port (remarks) 2649 (ii).
Yukon Concessions, Bronson and Ray Claims, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Sup., 1541 (i).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H., *Beauharnois.*
Adulteration Act Amt. (B. 15) 1° m., 213 (i).
——— Discussion *re* (remarks) 2975 (ii).
Agriculture Com., 5th Rep. of, on M. (Mr. Monk) to consider, 4153 (iii).
'Arctic' Expedition, Charges *re* Expenditure, on M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 6388 (iv).
——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden), Pairs on Division (remarks) 3800 (ii).
Aud. Gen's Rep., French Edition (remarks) 5754 (iii).
Bills printed in French (remarks) 3243 (ii).
Brothier, D., Release of from B.C. Penitentiary (remarks) 5328 (iii).
Canada Evidence Act Amt. B. 68 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 1267 (i).
Cape Tourmente and Murray Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6150 (iv).
Castings purchased by Marine Dept. at Sorel, Total Amount paid (Ques.) 5007 (iii).
Court of Appeal, Man. (salaries) Bill (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 5009 (iii).
Criminal Code Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7648 (iv).
Currency Act Amt. B. 196 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 5083; in Com., 5558 (iii).
Dorion, Ry. Mail Clerk, Dismissal and Reinstatement (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 526 (i).
Electric Power and Gas Exportation Regulation B. 145 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 3078 (ii).
Empire Trust Co.'s B. 135 (Mr. Worthington) in Com., 5446 (iii).
Game Preservation Act (unorganized ters.) Amt. B. 154 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. 2825 (ii).
G.T.P. Ry. Branch Lines B. 75 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 5461 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 61 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 4540 (iii).
House of Commons Rules, in Com. on Special Rep., 7480, 7610 (iv).
Immigration Act Amt. B 170 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5568 (iii).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*
Imperial Institute, Explanation of Vote (remarks) on M. for 1° of Supply Bill, 661 (i).
Independence of Parlt.: *See* Criminal B. 4.
Isle Bizard and Ste. Geneviève Bridge, remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6963 (iv).
Lake St. Francis Islands, Number and Owners (Ques.) 7636, 7638 (iv).
La Banque Provinciale du Canada (B. 49) 1°*, 655 (i); in Com., 3236 (ii).
Library of Parlt., Sunday Closing (remarks) 2233 (ii).
Lord's Day B. 12 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5624, 5812 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* electric rys., 7247; in Com. (Jews) 6303; (shooting) 6251, 6271; on Ques. of Order *re* amts. being moved, 7234; on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) to M. for 3°, 7340; on Senate Amts., 7672 (iv).
Lotbinière and Megantic Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6162 (iv).
Members of Parlt. appointed to Office (Ques.) 4798, 5181, 5752, 6085 (iii).
——— (remarks) *re* Answer to former Question, 6543 (iv).
Money-Lenders Act Amt. B. 11 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 354 (i); 6817 (iv).
Montreal Harbour (reorganization) Commissioners B. 124 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 2215
Montreal Harbour Commissioners, B. 222 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 6847 (iv).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Refusal of Mr. Preston to answer Questions, on M. (Mr. Monk) 4478 (iii).
Northwest Lands, Allotment, Denial *re* Statement of Mr. Bole, Ques. of Privilege, 4249 (iii).
Penitentiary Salaries B. 176 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 4080 (iii).
Pierreville, Yamaska Wharf, Cost, Revenue, &c. (Ques.) 1746 (i).
Pilotage Act Amt. B. 219 (Mr. Brodeur) on M. for 1°, 6538 (iv).
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., Removal from Office of Immigration Agent, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com of Sup., 6920 (iv).
Quebec Cliffs, Rep. *re* Dangerous Condition (remarks) 3155 (ii).
Questions answered by Ministers not heard by members (remarks) 320 (i).
Railway Act (General) Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 1°, 748, 759; in Com., 1596 (i); 6098 (iii); 6229, 7065; on Amt. (Mr. Sproule) to M. for 3°, 7115 (iv).
——— (remarks) 4035 (iii).
Ry. Subsidies, Authorization B. 214 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 6150 (iv).
St. John Barracks, Medical Supplies for 1904-5 (Ques.) 4156 (iii).

Bergeron, Mr. J. G. H.—*Con.*
St. John's Barracks, Medical Officer, Name and Qualifications (Ques.) 4704 (iii).
——— Numerical Force (Ques.) 4155 (iii).
St. Lawrence Route, Number of Accidents, Vessels wrecked, &c. (Ques.) 585 (i).
——— Number of Vessels of 100 tons, &c. (Ques.) 768 (i).
——— Number of Sea-going Vessels, &c. (Ques.) 974, 1096 (i).
Senate and House of Commons Act (indemnity) Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7119 (iv).
Senate Reform, on prop. Res. (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 2313 (ii).
Shortis Case, (personal explanation) 5531 (iii).
Southern Central Pacific Ry Co.'s (B. 140) (Mr. McCraney) on Order for 2° (remarks) 2264 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 2669 (ii).
Canals—Beauharnois (weir regulating) 7512 (iv); Quebec (re-marking boundaries, &c.) 5079 (iii); Soulanges (lighting) 7511 (iv).
Customs (I. G. Baker & Co.) 517 (i), 7517 (iv); (outside ports) 503; (statistics) 512 (i).
Dom. Lands (salaries) 5614 (iii).
Interior—Miscellaneous (caves in B. C.) 5860 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies) 3608 (ii).
Militia (annual drill) 5013 (iii).
Post Office (letter carriers) 527; (outside salaries) 525 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Que. (Rivière St. Louis) 6978 (iv).
Supreme Court, Ad Hoc Judges, Apptmnt of (remarks) 3068 (ii).
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act (jurisdiction) Amt. B. 67 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 1262 (i).
Ticket-of-Leave Prisoners, Liberated and returned to Penitentiary (Ques.) 4154 (iii).
Toledo Glass Co.'s Patent Relief B. 110 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3727 (ii).
Usury : *See* 'Money-Lenders.'
Ventilation of House of Commons (remarks) 5618 (iii).
Veterans of Fenian Raids, Claims for Compensation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 639 (i).
Victoria Day, on M. for Adjournment (remarks) 3795 (ii).
Winnipeg Street Car Strike, Settlement, &c. (remarks) 1259 (i).
Winter Communication in P.E.I., Ice-breakers in Northumberland Strait (remarks) 1258 (i).
Wurts, Henry Patent Relief B. 106 (Mr. Belcourt) in Com., 2205 (ii).

Bickerdike, Mr. R., *Montreal, St. Lawrence.*
Canadian Lloyds Certificate, incorp. (B. 114) 1°*, 1576 (i).
G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 5694 (iii).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 170 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5197, 5240, 5569 (iii).
Lord's Day B. 12, in Com. (fourth commandment) 6659; (Jews) 6285, 6296 (iv).
SUPPLY :
Excise (salaries) 1556 (i).

Black, Mr. J. B., *Hants.*
Lord's Day B. 12, in Com., on Amt. (Mr. D. Ross) *re* industrial processes, 7210; (provincial legislatures) 6598 (iv).
Norwegian Shipping Competition, Par. in Sydney 'Record,' 4084 (iii).
Ventilation of Chamber (remarks) 7366 (iv).

Blain, Mr. R., *Peel.*
American Silver, Amount collected (Ques.) 1565 (i).
Baddeck Wharf, N.S., Location, Payments *re* Site, &c. (Ques.) 2457 (ii).
Cannington Postmaster, Dismissal of Mr. Talbot, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Cor., 2489 (ii).
Cigarettes, Prohibition, Legislation *re* Resolution, passed by Hse. (Ques.) 215 (i).
D'Israeli Wharf, Completion, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 2268 (ii).
——— (remarks) in debate on Public Works Expenditures, 3425 (ii).
Fruit Marks Act (apples) Amt. B. 101 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2184, 2551 (ii).
Georgeville Wharf, N.S., Dismissal of Overseer Macpherson (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6777 (iv).
Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. 207 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 5889 (iii).
Immigration Agents, Ont., and Dom. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1347 (i).
Imperial Institute, Explanation of Vote (remarks) on M. for 1°, of Supply Bill, 678 (i).
Indian Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5425 (iii).
I. C. R. Freight Rates, Control of by Ry. Commission, ref. to in Com. on Ry. Bill, 2568 (ii).
Laurier Tower, Investigation *re* Collapse (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6714 (iv).
See 'Tower.'
Lord's Day B. 12, in Com. (Jews) 6304 (iv).
Lotbinière and Megantic Ry. Co.'s Subsidy in Com. on Res., 6162 (iv).
Macleod Court House, Total Cost (Ques.) 2035 (ii).
Milk Cans : *See* 'Weights and Measures.'
Ottawa Post Office, Total Expenditure *re* Repairs (Ques.) 452 (i).

Blain, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Peel County Mail Contracts, Location, Expiration, &c. (M. for ret.*) 773 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 1749 (i).
Port Credit Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6989, 7014 (iv).
Postmasters' Salaries, Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7445 (iv).
Privy Councillors Annuities Repeal B. 22[illegible] (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7633 (iv).
Public Buildings, Erection of, Govt. Policy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6729 (iv).
Public Works Expenditure, Condemnation of (Amt.) to Com. of Sup., 3428; Neg. (Y. 48; N. 100) 3500 (ii).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners B. 174 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 3931 (ii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 1°, 758 (i); in Com., 2567 (ii); 7075 (iv).
Ry. Act (express cos.) Amt B. 9 (Mr. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 806 (i).
Ry. Subsidies Authorization B. 214 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 6162 (iv).
Rideau Canal Reservation, Notice to Tenants *re* Removal of Warehouses, &c. (Ques.) 4703 (iii).
Roberts and Stevens, Marine Engineers, Investigation *re* Certificate (remarks) on conc., 7598 (iv).
Rocky Mountains Park Act Amt. B. 164 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4743 (iii).
St. Alexis Pier, Amount expended, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 3905 (ii).
St. Mary's Post Office Site, Purchase of, Letter read in Com. of Sup., 7051 (iv).
Sorel Wharf, Accident, Cor. with Officials, &c. (M. for copies*) 2951 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c (experimental farms) 7390 (iv).
Canals—Trent (Holland River) 5170 (iii).
Civil Govt.—Post Office (postmaster) 7445; Public Works Dept. (promotions) 7028 (iv).
Customs (outside service) 492 (i).
Electric Light Inspection (salaries) 2609 (ii).
Excise (methylated spirits) 1561; (salaries) 1555 (i).
Immigration (agents, &c.) 1347 (i).
Indians—B.C. (industrial schools) 1093 ; Man. (seeds, &c.) 735; Ont. and Que. (schools) 717 (i).
Interior—Miscellaneous (boundary surveys) 5878 (iii).
Labour Dept. (Gazette, printing) 7444 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 4857 (iii).
Post Office (outside salaries) 527 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (heating, &c.) 6764 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Brantford) 6734; (London military buildings) 6735; (St. Mary's) 6739, 7051; (Toronto, Dom. buildings) 6742 (iv).
Public Works — Buildings — Ottawa (steel fittings) 7038; (western block) 6714 (iv).

Blain, Mr. R.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works — Buildings — Que. (Magog) 6729 (iv).
Public Works—Dredging—Ont. and Que. (generally) 7014 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Fairford river) 6995 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis wharf) 6773; (Georgeville wharf) 6777 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Amherstburg channel) 6985; (Beaverton) 6985; (Cobourg) 6986; (Collingwood) 6987; (repairs, &c.) 6989 (iv.).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (D'Israeli wharf) 6944; (Pointe aux Trembles) 6975; (Sorel wharf) 7047 (iv).
Public Works—Miscellaneous — (surveys, &c.) 7020 (iv).
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys) 5116 (iii).
Railways—I.C.R. (coal handling machinery) 5357 (iii); (expenditure) 7493 (iv).
Steamboat Inspection (inspectors) 3688 (ii).
Weights and Measures (inspections) 2601 (ii).
Taylor, Mr. L. Fennings, Resignation *re* Collapse of Laurier Tower (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7028 (iv).
Thessalon Postmaster, Name (Ques.) 2273 (ii).
Toronto Post Office Pneumatic System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7041 (iv).
Tower of West Block, Collapse, Inspection by Dept. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1283 (i). *See* 'Laurier'.
Weights and Measures Act (milk) Amt. B. 14 (Mr. Campbell) on M. for 2°, 875 (i); in Com., 2068 (ii).
Yukon Gold, Value of Output 1897-1905 (Ques.) 2031 (ii).
Yukon Telegraph System, Total Cost, Earnings, &c. (Ques.) 1865 (i).

Bole, Mr. D. W., *Winnipeg.*
Chamber, Acoustics, Deficiency *re* (remarks) 3154 (ii).
Crown Lands, Administration of by Dept. of Interior, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 4235 (iii).
Inter-Ocean Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 60) 1°*, 744 (i) ; in Com., 3952 (ii).
Lord's Day B. 12, in Com., 6267; (foreign newspapers) 6275 ; (hiring rigs, &c.) 6641; (loading, &c., grain) 6644 (iv).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract, Charges *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Sup., 1994 (i).
Penitentiaries, Salaries B. 175 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 4082 (iii).
San Francisco Disaster, Contribution by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 1748 (i).
Standard Trusts Co.'s (B. 147) 1°*, 2321 ; 2° m., 2720 (ii) ; in Com., 4942 ; 3° m., 5002

Bole, Mr. D. W.—*Con.*
Temple Mutual Life Association incorp. (B. 38) 1°*, 444 (i).

Borden, Hon. Sir Frederick W., K.C.M.G., (Minister of Militia and Defence), *King's, N.S.*
Annual Camp, Drill Instruction for 3rd District, Site, &c. (Ans.) 2034 (ii).
Annual Drill, Claims for Injuries (remarks) 7580 (iv)
Doull, Capt., Apptmnt. to Royal Canadian Regiment (Ans.) 4799 (iii).
Duncan, A. G., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 424 (i).
Esquimalt Defences, Permanent Force, Annual Cost, &c. (Ans.) 184 (i).
Fredericton Cavalry Building, Establishment of, &c. (Ans.) 186 (i).
Halifax Arsenal, Offer by Imp. Authorities (remarks) 1009 (i).
Halifax Drill Shed Property, Disposition of by Govt. (Ans.) 834 (i).
Halifax Garrison, Contract for Supplies (Ans.) 1862 (i).
Imperial Officers and R.M.C., Status *re* (Ans.) 4248 (iii).
Kentville Rifle Range, Payments *re* Purchase (Ans.) 1103 (i).
——— Ref. to Courts, Awards, &c. (Ans.) 195 (i).
Lindsay Rifle Range, Construction of (Ans.) 589 (i).
Lumb, Capt. H. W., Retirement, Charges *re* (Ans.) 1150 (i).
Martello Towers, Repairing, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7172 (iv).
Medical Attendance at Port Canso for Sick Fishermen, Apptnmt., &c. (Ans.) 426 (i).
Military Bands in Street Parades, Regulations *re* Flags (Ans.) 1151 (i).
Military Camp at Simcoe, Option *re* Sites, &c. (Ans.) 5508 (iii).
Military Camp, Removal from Laprairie to Sherbrooke (Ans.) 2726 (ii).
Militia Act Amt. (B. 201) Res. prop., 4157; in Com. on Res., 5190; 1°* of B., 5191; in Com., 5536 (iii).
Militia and Defence, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 1667 (i).
Militia Camps, Illegal Payments, Delayed Transportation, &c. (remarks) 5993 (iii).
——— Service Rolls *re* (remarks) 1001 (i).
——— Service Rolls, Modification of Order (remarks) 2626 (ii).
——— Supplies, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 2033
Militia Pension Act Amt (B. 200) prop. res., 4156; in Com. on Res., 5186; in Com., 5534 (iii).
Militia Schools of Instruction, Commission *re* Inquiry into, &c. (Ans.) 1104 (i).

Borden, Hon. Sir Frederick—*Con.*
Montreal Barracks, Delay in Purchase of Site (Ans.) 334 (i).
Niagara Militia Camp, Tenders *re* Forage Supplies (Ans.) 4800 (iii).
Ottawa Drill Shed, Purchase of Adjoining Property (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7173 (iv).
Ottawa Field Battery, No. 2, Caretaker's Qualifications, &c. (Ans.) 2725 (ii).
Powell, Capt., Apptmnt. to Permanent Force (Ans.) 4798 (iii).
Rifle Ranges in Mar. Provs., Purchase of Sites, &c. (Ans.) 5753 (iii).
Ross Rifles, Charges *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7161 (iv).
Ross Rifle Co., Incorporation, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 1372 (i).
——— Commission *re* Examination, &c. (Ans.) 3408 (ii).
——— Improvements *re* (remarks) 3411 (ii).
——— Inspectorship, Apptmnt. of Imp. Officer (Ans.) 423 (i).
——— Number manufactured, distributed, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 3246 (ii).
Saddlery for Can. Militia, Contracts and Advertisements *re* (Ans.) 577 (i).
St. John's Barracks, Medical Supplies for 1904-5 (Ans.) 4156 (iii).
St. John's Military School, Numerical Force (Ans.) 4155 (iii).
St. John, N.B., Drill Hall, Erection of (Ans.) 427 (i).
Sherbrooke Military Camp, Purchase or Lease of Lands (Ans.) 328 (i).
Smart, Col., Resignation of (remarks) 5364 (iii).
South African Volunteers, Pensions for, on prop. res. (Mr. Broder) 431 (i).
S. A. War, Cost of Outfitting, &c. (Ans.) 1564 (i).
——— Number of Canadians, disabled, killed, pensioned, &c. (Ans.) 1099 (i).
Stony Creek Armoury, Damages by Fire, &c. (Ans.) 328 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt.—Militia (promotions) 7182 (iv); (salaries) 359 (i).
Militia (annual drill) 5012 (iii), 7178; (camp grounds) 7183; (clothing) 7176, 7181; (library) 7182; (permanent corps) 7177; (rifles, &c.) 7161; (R.M.C.) 7182; (Sussex camp) 7183 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (military stores) 7038; Que. (St. John's military buildings) 7036 (iv).
Sussex Rifle Range, Contract Price, Caretaker's Wages, &c. (Ans.) 577 (i).
Sutherland Combination Sight and Ross Rifle, Purchase of (Ans.) 4704 (iii).
Sydney Riots, Payments *re* Militia (Ans.) 1104 (i).

Borden, Hon. Sir Frederick—*Con.*
Thirteenth Scottish Dragoons, Charges *re* Transports (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7178 (iv).
Three Rivers, St. Hyacinthe and Sherbrooke Drill Sheds, Accommodation of Corps, &c. (Ans.) 3252 (ii).
Toronto Old Fort, Application *re* Transfer (Ans.) 1370 (i).
Uniforms for 80th Regiment, Nicolet (Ans.) 7693 (iv).
Veterans of Fenian Raids, Claims for Compensation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 619 (i).
Voyageurs of the Nile, Medals, &c. Recognition for Services (Ans.) 421, 448 (i).
——— (remarks) on Ans., 486 (i).
Winnipeg Militia Dept., Expenditure *re* Coal Supplies (Ans.) 2080 (ii).

Borden, Mr. R. L., *Carleton, Ont.*
Address, The, 34 (i).
Adjournment, Members leaving Chamber before Speaker and Mace. (remarks) 2017 (i).
See 'Decorum,' 'Order,' &c.
Alberta Land Co., Par. in Toronto 'Globe' *re* Signatories (remarks) 2017 (i).
See 'Lands,' 'Ry. Lands,' 'Saskn. Valley,' &c.
Alien Labour Act, Appeal from Judgment of Judge Anglin (remarks) 343 (i).
Apples, Inspection for Export, Quality, &c., Cor., on M. (Mr. E. D. Smith) for Copies, 1387 (i).
Arbitrations and Awards, Payments to Civil Servants *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 377 (i).
'Arctic,' Str., Expedition, Com. of Investigation *re* Expenditures, 3622; (amt.) 3628, Neg. (Y. 45; N. 88) 3669 (ii).
——— Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) to conc. in Rep. of Special Com. and Amt. (Mr. Northrup) 6528 (iv).
——— Expenditure *re* Supplies, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3204, 3350 (ii).
——— Expenditure *re* Supplies, Investigation (remarks) *re* Notice for Committee, 3582
Art Unions: *See* 'Criminal Code B. 209.'
Ashcroft, Barkerville and Fort George Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 89 (Mr. D. Ross) on Senate Amts., 5401 (iii).
Auditor General's Rep., Inquiry for, 7, 15 (i).
——— Presented in Instalments (remarks) 6126 (iv).
Ballot Frauds *re* N. W. Elections (remarks) in Speech on Address, 45 (i).
Bell, Dr., Apptmnt. *re* Director of Geological Survey (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 405 (i).
Bell Telephone Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Bureau) in Com., 3964 (ii), 5998 (iii).
See 'Ry B. 62,' 'Man. Telephones.'

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Blood Reserve Lease to McEwan Cattle Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 957 (i).
British America Assurance Co.'s B. 198 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) on M. for 1°, 5180; in Com. 5501 (iii).
B. C. Shipping Interests, Govt. Aid to, on M. for Sup., 1492, 1508 (i).
Brooks & Co., Govt. Guarantee *re* Banking Arrangements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4842 (iii).
Brothier, Convict, Release of, Par. in B. C. Papers (read) 4992 (iii).
Business of the House (remarks) 742 (i).
Business of the House in *re* Notice of Motion (remarks) 4035 (iii).
See 'Govt. Business,' &c.
By-elections, Issue of Writs (remarks) 7697
Cabinet Changes during Recess, Ref. to in Speech on Address, 36 (i).
——— on Announcement (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4535 (iii).
See 'Ministerial.'
Canada Evidence Act Amt. B. 68 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 1266, 1752 (i).
Cannington Postmaster, Dismissal, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) *re* Irrelevancy of debate in quoting articles, 2468 (ii).
——— Dismissal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 542 (i).
Cement purchased for Lighthouse Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4927 (iii).
Cheese Curing Rooms, Total Expenditure (remarks) *re* Statement, 2243 (ii).
Children's Protection Act, B. C., Cor. *re* Sale and Slavery of Young Girls (M. for copy*) 1741 (i).
See 'Brothier.'
Cinq-Mars, Criticism in La Presse *re* Members, on M. (Mr. Foster) to summon before Bar of Hse, 4715 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. Jackson) to translate article, 4795 (iii).
——— Summoned before Bar of Hse., on Amt. (Mr. Aylesworth) 5278 (iii).
——— on Res. of Censure (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5314 (iii).
Coal purchased for Marine Dept., Prices paid (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2912 (ii).
Colonization or Land Companies, &c., Purchase of Land from Govt. since 1898 (Ques.) 1863 (i).
——— (M.) for Ret., 1869 (i).
See 'Lands.'
Committees, Sel., Power to recommend Expenditure, 'May' quoted (remarks) 7460 (iv).
Conmee and Bowman, Charges by Mr. Bennet *re* Dredging Contract, on Ques. of Order, 1306 (i).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Conmee) 1328

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Criminal Code (payment to members for services) Amt. (B. 4) 1° m., 16, 2° m., 438, M. to ref. to Special Com., 443 (i); in Com., 7648 (iv).
Crifmnal Code (witnesses) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 3099 (ii).
Criminal Code (art unions) Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7663 (iv).
Crooked Lake Indian Reserves, Surrender, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 948 (i).
——— Notice of Motion, 4028 (ii).
Crown Lands, Administration of by Int. Dept. (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 4157; (amt.) 4187, Neg. (Y. 52; N. 99) 4698 (iii).
See 'Lands,' 'Saskn. Valley,' &c.
Customs Dept., Criticism of *re* Irregularities (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4847 (iii).
Decorum in debate, Interruptions and Confusion by Members (remarks) 3072 (ii).
See 'Adjnmt,' 'Order.'
D'Israeli Wharf, Expenditure *re*, 3478 (ii).
See 'Supply.'
Dom. Election Act (by-elections) Amt. (B. 2) 1° m., 15; 2° m., and (M.) to ref. to Sel. Com., 437 (i).
Dom. Controverted Elections Act (corrupt practices) Amt. (B. 5) 1° m., 16; 2° m., and (M.) to ref. to Special Com., 443 (i).
Dominion Lands and Homestead Law, Abuses *re* Notice of Motion, 3064 (ii).
See 'Lands,' &c., 'Homesteads.'
Election of Members, Prevention of Corrupt Practices, &c., on Order being called for Sel. Com. (remarks) 211 (i).
——— M. for Sel. Com., 235 (i).
——— on Order for rsmd. Deb. (remarks) 883 (i).
See 'Dom. Elections Bills.'
Election Committee, Reps. *re* Amendments to Election Laws (remarks 4801 (iii).
——— Rep. of Com. (remarks) 7064 (iv).
Electoral Lists for N.S., Printing by Dom. Govt., Distribution of Copies, &c. (Ques.) 2454 (ii).
Electric Power and Gas Exportation Regulation B. 145 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in com., 3079 (ii).
Empire Trust Co.'s B. 135 (Mr. Worthington) in Com., 5446, 5682 (iii).
Exchequer Court Act (liability) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 3526 (ii).
Express Companies Bill, Discussion *re* (remarks) 2976 (ii).
——— Ref. to Committee (remarks) 4537 (iii).
See 'Ry. B. 62'.
Fenian Raid Medals; *See* 'Veterans'.
Fiscal Year, Change *re* (remarks) 10 (i).
Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Fiscal Year B. 162 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5096 (iii).
Fisher, Hon. Mr., Ref. to Speech *re* Tariff (remarks) in Address, 37 (i).
Fisheries, Sea and Island, Proprietary Rights vested in Govt., &c. (M. for ret.*) 773 (i).
Forest Reserves B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2832, 3324, 3528 (ii), 5541 (iii).
Fort William Terminal Ry. and Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. 120 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com. 5400; on M. for 3°, 5446 (iii).
Geological Survey, Director, Apptmnt. of (remarks) 712 (i).
German Tariffs in Relation to Canada, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 1894 (i).
——— Information regarding (remarks) 1258 (i).
Gobeil, Mr., Dep. Min. of Public Works, acting as Arbitrator (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 377 (i).
Govt. Business, Precedence on Wednesdays (remarks) *re* Motion, 2809 (ii).
——— Correction *re* Votes and Proceedings (remarks) 3063 (ii).
See 'Business', 'Morning Sittings,' &c.
Govt. Legislation, Further, &c. (remarks) 5532 (iii).
Govt. Steamers Expenditure, Aud. Gen.'s Rep. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4115, 4851 (iii).
———Expenditure *re* Str. Minto (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4915 (iii).
Grand River and Western Power Co.'s incorp. B. 216 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 6998, 7261 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 84 (Mr. L. G McCarthy) in Com., 2244, 2702 (ii).
G.T.P. Ry. Act (securities) Amt. B. 215 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6861 (iv).
See 'Natl. Transcl.'
G.T.P. Ry. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 5485, 5685; on Amt. (Mr. Carvell) 6029 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Telegraph Co.'s incorp. B. 61 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 2713 (ii), 4539, 4747; on Amt. (Mr. Sproule) to M. for 3°, 4999 (iii).
G. T. P. Ry., Contracts, Award of (remarks) 655, 973, 1466 (i).
——— reps. *re* (remarks) 1464 (i).
——— Mining Rights in Lands, O.C., Memorandum, &c., Inquiry for, 3713 (ii).
——— Surveys from Quebec to Moncton, on M. (Mr. Crocket) for Ret., 1463, 1738 (i).
G.T.Ry., Arbitration and I.C.R., Inquiry for Report, 224 (i).
See 'I.C.Ry.'

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Grimsby Park, Collection of Fees (remarks) on the Lord's Day Bill, 6672 (iv).
Harbour Commissioners, Montreal, Reorganization of and Exclusion of Press from meetings (remarks) 656 (i).
Haultain, Mr., Ignoring of as Premier of Saskn. (remarks) in Speech on Address, 42 (i).
Hay Trade Regulations, Penalties *re* Violation, in Com. on prop. Res. (Mr. Beauparlant) 4021 (ii).
Homesteads in N.W.T., Blanketing System, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1356 (i).
See 'Dom. Lands,' &c.
House of Commons Act Amt. (B. 3) 1° m., 16; 2° m., and (M.) to ref. to Special Com., 437 (i).
House of Commons Rules, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to consider Rep., 7461; in Com., 7465; in Com. on Rep., 7610 (iv).
Hudson Bay Whale Fisheries B. 223 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 6855 (iv).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 170 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5196; on Amts., 5409 (iii).
Immigration to Canada, False Representations *re* Labour Market, on prop. Res. (Mr. R. Smith) 2969 (ii).
——— (remarks) 7695 (iv).
Imperial Institute, Explanation of Vote (remarks) on M. for 1°° of Supply Bill, 661, 669 (i).
Indemnity to Members and Pensions to Privy Councillors B. 18 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3027 (ii).
See 'Privy Councillors.'.
Indian (J. W. Lewis) Enfranchisement B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2830 (ii).
Indian Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5432 (iii).
Insurance Act, Amts. to, Cor. *re* (M. for copies*) 997 (i).
Insurance Commission, Apptmnt. of Mr. Langmuir (remarks) 836 (i).
——— Commission issued to Commissioners (inquiry for) 8 (i).
——— Completion of Investigation (remarks) 5445 (iii).
——— Conduct of Proceedings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 306 (i).
——— Daily Report submitted (remarks) 317 (i).
——— Expenditure and Remunerations, on M. for 1°, of Supply Bill, 695 (i).
——— Inquiry for Copies of Proceedings, 1940 (i).
——— Instructions to Commissioners, &c. (remarks) in Speech on Address, 47 (i).
——— Report of Evidence Daily, Inquiry for, 655 (i).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Insurance Commission, Special Rep., 9th Nov., 1905, respecting Regulation of Life Insurance in Can. (M. for copy*), 204 (i).
I.C.R., Expenditure *re* Capital Account (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7483 (iv).
——— Freight Rates, Control of by Ry Commission, ref. to in Com. on Ry. B. 62, 2568 (ii).
——— General Statement (remarks) 127 (i).
——— Halifax Property purchased by Govt. (Ques.) 1746 (i).
——— Moncton Land Purchase from Mr. Hewson, on Amt. (Mr. Ames) to Com. of Sup., 5845 (iii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5064 (iii).
——— Mr. Skeffington's Dismissal, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7493 (iv).
——— Passes issued by Conservative Govt. (remarks) *re* Ret., 351 (i).
Interior, Deptl. Rep., Inquiry for, 485, 568 (i).
Internal Economy Committee and House of Commons Salaries (remarks) 7054 (iv).
See 'Coms.,' &c.
Inter-Ocean Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 60 (Mr. Bole) in Com., 3952 (ii).
Interpretation Act Amt. B. 171 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 2°, 5556 (iii).
Iron and Steel Bounties on Canadian Ores, on prop. Res. (Mr. Conmee) 3793 (ii).
Japanese Treaty with Can., &c., Inquiry for, 126, 712 (i).
——— Cor., &c., Inquiry for Copies, 1367 (i), 3349 (ii).
Japanese Treaty and Reduced Tariff Arrangements (remarks) 5754 (iii).
Jews, Persecution of: *See* 'Russian,' &c.
Judges of Provincial Courts (arbitrators, &c.) Amt. B. 13 (Mr. Lennox) on M. for 2°, 871 (i); in Com., 5367 (iii).
Judges of Provincial Courts Act (travelling) Amt. B. 83 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 1769 (i).
Justice, Administration of, Objection *re* Supply, 486 (i).
King's Most Gracious Majesty, Invitation to Visit Canada, on M. (Mr. Belcourt) 1689 (i).
Lafferty, Dr., Payments to *re* Indians (remarks) in Com of Sup., 963 (i).
Land Grants to Rys., Selection by Ry. Cos., Govt. Policy *re*, on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) to Com. of Sup., 1059 (i).
——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1017 (i).
——— Inquiry for Papers referred to in Speech of Min. of Int., 973 (i).
——— Inaccuracy of Votes and Proceedings, *re* adjnd. deb. (remarks) 972 (i).
See 'Rys,' 'Saskn. Valley,' 'Alberta,' 'Militia,' 'Schools,' &c.

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Land Patents for N. W. Provs., on M. for Ret., Preparation of (remarks) 2927 (ii).
Lands purchased by Companies, Associations, &c. from Dom. Govt., Cor. Reps., &c. (M. for copies) 3276 (ii).
Langevin, Sir Hector, Decease of (remarks) 5084 (iii).
Laurier Tower, Collapse : *See* 'Tower.'
Loans, Temporary Govt., Outstanding and Rate of Interest (Ques.) 171 (i).
Long Lake and Qu'Appelle Ret. on Explanation (Mr. Oliver) *re* Cor. 3504 (ii).
Lord's Day B. 12 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5649, 5696, 5757; (coming into force) 6675; (fourth commandment) 6660; (industrial plant) 6628; (Jews) 6337; (maple sugar) 6658; (pleasure grounds) 6664; (provincial legislatures) 6584, 6591-3; (railways) 6368; (shooting) 6252; (Amt.) 6268 (iv); (trains, &c.) 5715 (iii); (24 hours' rest) 6662 (iv).
——— on Amt. (Mr. D. Ross) *re* industrial processes, 7217 (iv).
——— on M. (Mr. Aylesworth) to strike out amt. *re* ball games, 7278 (iv).
——— on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* Amt. (Mr. Porter) 7297 (iv).
——— (amt.) to M. for 3°, 7353; Neg. (Y. 39; N. 77) 7357; on Senate Amts., 7665 (iv).
Magnetawan Lighthouse Supplies, Charges *re*, on Inquiry for Rep. of Investigation, 6800 (iv).
Mail Transportation across Atlantic, Contracts *re* &c. (M. for copies*), 204 (i).
Man. Court of Appeal B. 195 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 5007; in Com., 5556 (iii).
Man. Telephone Lines, Expropriation of, Memorial *re* (remarks) 6248 (iv).
Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy,in Com. on Res., 6140 (iv).
Marine and Fisheries Deptl. Rep., Inquiry for, 1258 (i).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 467; in Com., 469, 844 (i).
Medical Attendance *re* Indians, Payments for (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 962 (i).
Members, Payment for Services : *See* 'Criminal Code B. 4.'
Milan Exhibition, Character of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 304 (i).
Militia (land grants) N. W. Rebellion B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4806; on M. for 3°, 4897 (iii).
Militia Pensions Act Amt. B. 200 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 5188; in Com., 5534 (iii).
Milk Cans : *See* 'Weights and Measures.'
Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Ministerial Changes (remarks) 225 (i).
——— Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 258 (i).
See 'Cabinet.'
Ministers and Deputy Ministers practising in Courts, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 2780; on Amt. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 2805 (ii).
'Minto' Str., Supplies *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4918 (iii).
See 'Govt. Steamers.'
Money-Lenders' Act Amt. B. 11 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 352, 353 (i); 6814 (iv).
——— Legislation *re* (remarks) 6125, 6677 (iv).
Morning Sittings, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) remarks) 5509 (iii).
See 'Govt. Business.'
Murray River Branch, P.E.I. Ry., Settlement of Land Claims, &c. (remarks) 5994 (iii).
Nakusp and Slocan Ry. Co.'s B. 32 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 1297 (i).
Natl. Transcl. Ry. Act Amt. B. 215 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 6244 (iv).
See 'G.T.P.', &c.
Naturalization of Aliens, Uniformity of Laws relating to (M. for ret.) 345 (i).
Naturalization Laws of the Empire, Ret., Copies Available (remarks) 1467 (i).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Adjournment of debate (personal explanation) 2243 (ii).
——— Arrangement *re*, Inquiry for Ret., 3235
——— Contracts, Charges *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Sup., 2391 (ii).
——— on Corrected Resolution (remarks) 2411 (ii).
——— Documents quoted from by Min. of Interior in a former speech, Inquiry for, 1856 (i).
——— Instruction to Mr. W. D. Scott *re* Telegram to Lord Strathcona (remarks) 1158 (i).
——— Refusal of Mr. Preston to answer questions, on M. (Mr. Monk) to appear before Bar of House, 4472 (iii).
——— Responsibility *re* giving Names, Work, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1652 (i).
N. S. Lt. Governorship, Apptmnt. of Mr. Fraser (remarks) 837 (i).
Orangemen and Leader of Opposition, Misrepresentations in 'Le Soleil' (remarks) 4716 (iii).
Ottawa Post Office Building, Condition, Irregularities, &c. (remarks) 1580 (i).
Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co's B. 173 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 6061 (iii); on M. for 3°, 6702 (iv).
Pacific Coast, Aids to Navigation, Pets, Reps., Cor. *re* Necessity of (M. for ret.*) 1741 (i).
——— Loss of Steamships, &c., Reps. *re* Findings, &c. (M. for copies*) 1741 (i).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Parliament, Delay in Opening (remarks) 8 (i).
See 'Fiscal Year Bill.'
Peer, John Albert Relief B. 169 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 5459 (iii).
Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 176 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 4080; in Com., 5387 (iii).
Pensions: *See* 'Indemnity,' 'Senate and House of Commons Bill.'
Pilotage Act Amt. B. 219 (Mr. Brodeur) on M. for 1°, 6538 (iv).
Pilotage Commissioners, Remuneration or Salaries (Ques.) 768 (i).
Pilotage Commission Fund, N. Sydney, Investigation *re*, on Inquiry for Rep., 6804 (iv).
Pilotage Fund, Defalcations of D. McLean, Investigation *re* (remarks) 5437 (ii).
Placer Mining in the Yukon B. 153 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 3412 (ii); 4804 (iii); on Senate Amts., 6828 (iv).
Port Arthur and Fort William, Tenders *re* Dredging (remarks) 1856 (i).
Postmasters' Salaries, Policy of Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 538 (i).
Prefontaine, Hon. R., Decease of, ref. to in Address, 35 (i).
See 'Arctic,' Rep. of Com., 'Privilege.'
Preferential Tariff and Canadian Farmers, Ref. to Mr. Fisher's Speech, 37 (i).
Privilege, Ques. of, Correction in Hansard *re* Reference to Hon. R. Prefontaine, 6608 (iv).
Preston, Griffith and High Commissioner, Cor. between, Inquiry for Ret., 1748 (i).
——— Removal from Office of Immigration Agent, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6905 (iv).
See 'North Atlantic,' &c.
Prince Arthur of Connaught, Welcome upon his arrival in Canada (remarks) on M. to adjn., 742 (i).
Privy Councillors Annuities Repeal B. 220 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7634 (iv).
——— (remarks) 4536 (iii).
Provincial Autonomy, Interference in Elections by Dept. of Interior (remarks) 44 (i).
Provincial Elections in N. W., Frauds, Punishment of (remarks) in Speech on Address, 45 (i).
Public Works, Expenditure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 3478 (ii).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Carvell) in Com., 2704 (ii).
——— Land Grant, Disposal, &c., O. C., Change of, &c., Security held by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 169 (i).
——— (M. for copies*) 203 (i).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake &c. Ry., Indebtedness to Gov., &c. (Ques.) 317 (i).
——— Answer to question, Inaccurate, &c. (remarks) 346 (i).
——— Information *re*, O. C. of Aug., 1902. Inquiry for Ret., 3315 (ii).
——— Land Grant, O. C., Notice to Company by Govt. (Ques.) 425 (i).
'Quadra' Str., Repairs, Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4852 (iii).
Questions answered by Ministers, not heard by members (remarks) 318 (i).
Questions by Members and Discourteous Replies of Minister (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 537 (i).
Ry. Act (crossings) Amt. B. 8 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 855 (ii).
——— (remarks) *re* Discussion, on M. to take in Mondays, 4570 (ii).
Ry. Act (General) Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 1°, 751, 757; in Com., 1594, 1601 (i), 2567 (ii), 4071 (iii), 7067; (express companies) in Com., 6184 (iv); (telephones) 6094 (iii), 6237; on Senate Amts., 7642 (iv).
Ry. Lands Grants, Selection by Ry. Cos., Govt. Policy *re*, on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) to Com. of Sup., 907 (i).
See 'Lands.'
Ry. Subsidies, Authorization B. 214 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 6137; in Com., 6831 (iv).
——— Memorandum *re* (remarks) in Com. on Res., 6181 (iv).
Rainmaking in the Yukon, Payments to by Council, on M. (Mr. Foster) adjn., 564 (i).
Reports, Interior, Inquiry for, 484 (i).
——— Marine and Fisheries, Inquiry for, 1005 (i).
Representation of Provinces, &c., on M. to adjn. deb. (remarks) 1132 (i).
Returns, Inquiry for, 1367, 1940 (i).
Returns, for 1904 and 1905, Delay in bringing down, List (read) 1253 (i).
Returns of previous Session, Memo. from Sec. of State *re* (remarks) 162 (i).
——— Customs Deptl. Rets., Inquiry for, 6802 (iv).
——— Delay in bringing down (remarks) on M. for Sup., 713 (i).
——— Interior Dept., Laid on Table with Explanations (remarks) 3152 (ii).
——— Preparation of, &c. (remarks) 838 (i).
——— Preparation of, Access to Public Fyles of Int. Dept. by members (remarks) 2927 (ii).
——— Preparation of, inefficient System (remarks) 13 (i).
See 'Transportation,' &c.

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Road Allowances for Alberta and Saskatchewan B. 202 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 5363; in Com., 5560 (iii).
Rocky Mountains Park Act Amt. B. 164 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4737; (amt.) 4759 (iii).
Rules of House : *See* 'House of Commons.'
Russian Jews, Massacre of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Macdonell) 230 (i).
San Francisco Disaster, Mess. from His Ex. *re* Suppl. Estimates, 1750 (i).
——— Govt. Aid applied to Canadians (remarks) 2891 (ii).
——— Proposed Aid, (remarks) in Com. on Res., 4352 (iii).
Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Valuation of Lands sold, &c. (Ques.) 425 (i).
——— (M. for ret.*) 428 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 1854 (i), 2234 (i).
——— Omissions in Ret., O.Cs. and Cor., &c. (remarks) 2623, 3076 (ii).
See 'Crown Lands,' 'Speers,' &c.
School Lands Exchange B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5193 (iii).
See 'Lands.'
Senate and House of Commons Act (fees, &c.) Amt. (B. 10) in Com., 7649; on Senate Amts., 7696 (iv).
Senate and House of Commons (indemnity) B. 97 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 2°, 1789 (i); in Com., 7132 (iv).
Senate Reform, on prop. Res. (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 2306 (ii).
Senate Vacancies from N.B. (remarks) *re* Question, 992 (i).
Sessions, Length of : *See* 'Fiscal Year.'
Shanghaiing in B.C., Complaints *re* (remarks) 4994 (iii).
Ships Safety B. 48 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 4026 (ii), 6865 (iv).
S. African Volunteers, Pensions to, on prop. Res. (Mr. Broder) 433 (i).
Speers, C. W., Rep. *re* Lands sold to Col. A. D. Davidson, Inquiry for Ret., 2700, 2890 (ii).
See 'Saskn. Valley,' &c.
Statutes, Revised, Completion of (remarks) 6678 (iv).
Steamer for Coast Agency, B.C. Indian Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1095 (i).
Steel and Iron Ores, Electrical Smelting Process (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5935 (iii).
Supply B. 178 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 4353 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 7374 (iv); (exhibitions) 304 (i); (Patent Record) 7379; (Year-Book) 7383 (iv).
Canals—Trent (staff, repairs, &c.) 7499 (iv).
Charges of Management (salaries) 7451 (iv).
Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Civil Govt.—Depts., Generally (cleaning, &c.) 416 (i); Finance (salaries) 7454 (iv); Geological Survey (salaries) 405; Indian Affairs (salaries) 366; Interior (salaries) 365; Post Office (salaries) 402; Privy Council—(salaries) 359 (i); Public Works—(promotions) 7022 (iv); (salaries) 377 (i).
Customs (I. G. Baker) 519; (miscellaneous) 515; (outside ports) 504; (Yukon Ter.) 516 (i).
Dom. Lands (supt. of mines) 5935 (iii).
Electric Light Inspection (salaries) 2611 (ii).
Govt. of N. W. T. (schools, &c.) 5880 (iii).
Immigration (agents, G. B., &c.) 1342, 1652; (medical inspection, Halifax) 5872; pamphlets) 5875; (printing, &c., in G.B.) 5868; (special service payments) 5871 (iii).
Indians—B. C. (medical attendance) 1084; (steamer, coast agency) 1095; (general expenses) 960; (live stock) 740; (Sioux) 960; (surveys) 948; N. B. (medical attendance) 734; N.S. (medical attendance) 734; Ont. and Que. (schools) 719 (i).
Interior—Miscellaneous (boundary surveys) 5876 (iii).
Justice, Administration of (Exchequer Court) 489; (N. W. Ters.) 487; (Yukon Ter.) 489 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (compensation *re* gas explosions) 4868; (gas buoys) 4888; (maintenance, &c.) 4867 (iii).
Metric System (lectures) 2611 (ii).
Miscellaneous (insurance inspection) 306 (i).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. stmrs.) 3204, 3350 (ii), 4115, 4842, 4915 (iii); (wrecking, Davie & Sons) 4867 (iii).
Post Office (mail service) 532; (Yukon) 558 (i).
Public Works—Buildings — Miscellaneous (arbitrations) 6765; Ottawa (elevators) 6765; (military stores) 7037; (post office fittings) 7039; (Supreme Court Library) 7034; Que. (St. John's military building) 7036 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. Petit Rocher) 7043; N. S. (New Harbour) 7043; (Scotch cove) 7042; Ont. (Echo Bay wharf) 7050; Que. (D'Israeli wharf) 6952, 6956 (iv); ('Galveston' Dredge) 2922; (St. Lawrence channel lighting) 2912 (ii); (Sorel wharf) 7043 (iv).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (Red River Commission) 7053; (surveys, Ottawa river) 6767; (temporary employees) 6768; (waterways commission) 6769 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraph Lines—Mar. Provinces (generally) 7020 (iv).
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, &c.) 5116; I.C.R. (Halifax accommodation) 5071; (iii), 7483 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (commercial agencies) 7540 (iv).
Yukon Ter. (Govtl. expenses) 5927 (iii).
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act (jurisdiction) Amt. B. 67 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 2°, 1260; in Com., 1264 (i).
Supreme Court of Judicature, N.B., B. 224 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7147; on M. for 3°, 7190 (iv).
Tariff Revision, Change of Policy, &c. (remarks) in Address, 37 (i).

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Taylor, Mr. L. Fennings, Resignation from Pub. Works Dept. *re* Collapse of Laurier Tower (letter read) in Com. of Sup., 7025 (iv).
See 'Tower,' &c.
Telephones: *See* 'Ry. B. 62,' 'Bell,' &c.
Toledo Glass Co.'s Patent Relief B. 110 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3729; (M.) that Com. Rise, 3738 (ii).
Tower of West Block, Collapse of, Investigation *re* (remarks) 1154 (i).
——— Further Information *re* (remarks) 1579 (i), 5529 (iii).
——— Inspection, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1268 (i).
——— Rep. of Investigation, Inquiry for, 3712 (ii), 5364 (iii).
Transcontinental Ry. Rep., Printing of (remarks) 126, 212 (i).
——— (M.) to print, 268 (i).
Trans-Niagara Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. 161 (Mr. Calvert) on Senate Amts. 7270 (iv).
Transportation Commission Inquiry for Report, 212, 1004 (i).
See 'Waterways.'
Trust Funds Investment and Securities, Provincial Subsidies, &c. (remarks) *re* Return, 1577 (i).
Twelve Mile Power Co.'s incorp. B. (Mr. Thompson) on M. to receive Pet., 3064 (ii).
United Empire Life Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 90 (Mr. Pardee) on Senate Amts, 7271 (iv).
Usury: *See* 'Money Lenders.'
Ventilation of House of Commons (remarks) 5617 (iii), 7367 (iv).
Veterans of Fenian Raids, Claims for Compensation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 636 (i).
Votes and Proceedings, Correction *re* Adjnd. deb., on Land Grants, &c. (remarks) 972 (i).
See 'Land Grants.'
Wagner, Philip, Charges *re* Political Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. Fowler) to Com. of Sup., 5606 (iii).
Water-powers of Canada, Leases, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Stmnt., 607 (i).
Waterways Commission, Rep. *re* Niagara Water-power, Treaties, &c. (remarks) 567 (i).
——— Printing, &c. (remarks) 1366 (i).
See 'Transportation.'
Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 14 (Mr. Campbell) on M. for 2°, 880 (i); on M. for 3°, 2973 (ii).
West Block Tower, Collapse: *See* 'Tower.'
Western Loan and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 35 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 3238; on M. for 3°, 3241 (ii).
Whale Fishing: *See* 'Hudson Bay B. 223.'

Borden, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
White Fish Island, Classification of Exported Fish, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 1854 (i).
——— Expropriation by Ry. Co. (remarks) in Com. on B. 194, 5432 (iii).
White, Hon. Peter, late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 2546 (ii).
Winnipeg Loan and Trust Co.'s B. 129 (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com., 6054 (iii).
Wrecks on St. Lawrence, 1905, &c., Total Loss, &c. (Ques.) 170 (i).
——— (M. for ret.*) 204 (i).
Windsor, Essex and Lake Shore Rapid Ry. Co.'s B. 150 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 5224 (iii).
Yukon Citizens' Meeting, Res. *re* Hydraulic Concessions, Cancellation, Elective Council, &c. (read) 6546 (iv).
——— Concessions, Bronson and Ray, Cancellation of (remarks) 1856 (i).
——— Council, Govt. Policy *re* Election by the People, Res. from Citizens of Yukon (read) 2886 (ii).
——— Gold Output and Royalties, Comparisons, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5927
——— Gold Royalties, Investigation *re* (remarks) 7638 (iv).
——— Govt., Charges against Judiciary, Cor. of Mr. G. Campbell, &c., on M. (Mr. Sproule) 5925 (iii).
——— Representative Institutions, on M. (Mr. Thompson) for Sup., 5112 (iii).

Bourassa, Mr. H., *Labelle.*
Acetylene Gas Buoys in St. Lawrence Channel (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2921 (ii).
Crown Lands, Administration of by Dept. of Interior, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 4692 (iii).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 2024 (ii).
Hudson Bay Employees Claims, &c., Inquiry for Papers, 7188 (iv).
Indemnity to Members and Pensions to Privy Councillor's B. 18 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3007 (ii).
See 'Senate,' &c.
King's Most Gracious Majesty, Visit to Canada, on M. (Mr. Belcourt) 1692 (i).
Land Grant to Rys., Selection by Ry. Cos., Govt. Policy *re*, on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) to Com. of Sup., 1075 (i).
Lord's Day B. 12 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5627 (iii); (foreign newspapers) 6273; Letter from W. J. Moodey (read) 6273; (amt. *re* Jews) 6280 (iv); (amt.) *re* logs, &c., 5755; (newspapers) 5742 (iii); (railways) 6366; (shooting) 6256 (iv); (trains, &c.) 5734 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. D. Ross) 7207, (iv).
——— on Amt. (Mr. T. Martin) *re* ball games, 7235 (iv).

Bourassa, Mr. H.—*Con.*
Lord's Day B. 12, *re* liquor sold on Sunday excursions, 7257 (iv).
Lord's Day B. 12, on M. for 3°, 7301; (Amt.) Neg. (Y. 15; N. 104) 7349; on Senate Amts., 7688 (iv).
Lord's Day Bill, Montreal Public Meeting (remarks) 6824 (iv).
Money-Lenders' Act Amt. B. 11 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6808 (iv).
Newspaper Reports *re* Members Conduct in House (remarks, &c.) 3069 (ii).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Criticism in 'La Presse' *re* Vote of Mr. A. Lavergne, (personal explanation) 4351 (ii).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 2440 (ii).
——— Mr. Preston's Refusal to answer Questions, on M. (Mr. Monk) 4530 (iii).
Privilege, Ques. of *re* Senator Cox's Indemnity, 3152 (ii).
Privy Councillors Annuities Repeal B. 220 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 3°, 7659 (iv).
Ry. Act (telephones) Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 6231, 7088 (iv).
Russian Jews, Massacre of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Macdonell) 231 (i).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Acetylene Gas Buoys (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2920 (ii).
Senate and House of Commons Act (indemnity) Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7125 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Lighthouse and Coast Service (compensation *re* gas explosions) 4870 (iii).
Tower of West Block, Collapse of, Investigation *re* (remarks) 1156 (i).
Water-powers of Canada, Leases or Alientations, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Statement, 598 (i).

Boyce, Mr. A. C., *West Algoma.*
Allgoma, Pet. *re* Post office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 556 (i).
Copper Cliff, Postal Facilities (remarks) 7693 (iv).
Demers, Jos., Claims *re* Damage to Property (Ques.) 762 (i).
Deptl. Files open to Inspection by Members *re* Rets. (remarks) 2945 (ii).
Duncan, A. G., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 424 (i).
Echo Bay Wharf, Contract Price *re* Construction, Specifications, &c. (Ques.) 2032 (ii).
Fisheries on Great Lakes, Protection, Rep. *re* taking of Spawn by Americans (Ques.) 762 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3710 (ii).
Fish entered for Export Duty at Port Arthur, &c., Classification, &c. from 1890 to 1905, Value, &c. (M. for ret.*) 996 (i).

Boyce, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*
Fish Hatcheries, Establishment of on Great Lakes, &c. (Ques.) 190 (i).
Goodall, Mr. J. A., Compensation *re* Loss of Fishery Right (Ques.) 6088 (iii).
Grand River and Western Power Co.'s incorp. B. 216 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 7000, 7263 (iv).
Great Northern Railway, Application *re* Subsidies, &c. (Ques.) 2078 (ii).
——— (M. for copies*) 2274 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 2700 (ii).
Indian Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5424 (iii).
Indian Lands in East and West Algoma, Agents, Remuneration, &c. (Ques.) 2079 (ii).
Indian Lands Sales, Transactions, Cancellations, &c., Rep. of Agents, &c., from 1896 to 1906 (M. for ret.*) 2273 (ii).
Indian Lands sold or leased in East and West Algoma from 1896 to 1905, Payments, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2273 (ii).
Judges of Provincial Courts Act (travelling) Amt. B. 83 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 1766 (i).
Judges of Provincial Courts (travelling) Amt. B. 83 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 1766 (i).
'Laurier' Tower, Collapse of, Investigation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6720 (iv).
Little Current Postmaster B. H. Turner, Dismissal of, Charges *re* (Ques.) 2727 (ii).
Mackintosh, Eileen Mary Relief B. 185 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 6049 (iii).
Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6140 (iv).
Money Lenders' Act Amt. B. 11 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 354 (i), 6817 (iv).
Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 173 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 6056 (iii); on M. for 3°, 6678; (amt.) 6 m. h., 6323 (iv).
Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co. (Ques.) 833 (i).
Pilotage Commission, N. Sydney, Investigation *re*, Inquiry for Ret., 6803 (iv).
See 'Sydney.'
Pilotage Fund, Defalcation of D. McLean, Sec. Treas., Investigation, &c., Telegrams (read) 5435 (iii).
Port Arthur Dredging, Contract *re* Great Lake Dredging Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3807 (ii).
Post Office Boxes, Regulations *re* Rentals, &c. (Ques.) 423 (i).
Post Offices, System *re* Opening on Sundays (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 554 (i).
Ry. Subsidies, Authorization B. 214 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 6140 (iv).
St. Mary's River Dredging, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 426 (i).
——— Complaints *re* Approaches (Ques.) 450 (i).

Boyce, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*
Sault Ste. Marie Dock, Warehouses, &c., Construction and Repairs (Ques.) 424 (i).
——— Coal stored by Private Cos., &c. (Ques.) 3502 (ii).
——— Post Office, Decision *re* Opening on Sunday (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 555 (i).
——— Riot, Suppression of Militia, Cor. Telegrams, &c. (M. for copies*) 2274 (ii).
——— legal proceedings *re* calling out of Militia (Ques.) 2271 (ii).
——— Value of Farm and Garden Produce entered for Duty, 1905 (Ques.) 2078 (iii).

SUPPLY:
Fisheries (Customs collections from U. S. Vessels) 3710 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies rents) 3593; (lightkeepers) 3588; (Reid Co.) 3588 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. Steamers, repairs) 3807 (ii).
Post Office (mail service) 554 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (royal mint) 6711; (western Deptl. block) 6711 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (Echo Bay wharf) 7049; (Silverwater wharf) 6991 (iv).

Sutherland, Geo. N. and John Lamont, Employment by Govt. (Ques.) 3245 (ii).
——— (remarks) *re* Question, 2701 (ii).
Sutherland, Geo. M., Employment by Govt. (Ques.) 2268 (ii).
Sydney Pilotage Commission and Pilots Retiring Fund, Amounts paid in to, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 997 (i).
See 'Pilotage.'
Thessalon Postmaster, Rentals from P. O. Boxes, &c. (Ques.) 2727 (ii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 557 (i).
Twelve Mile Power Co.'s incorp. B. 183 (Mr. Thompson) on Senate Amts., 7271 (iv).
White Fish Island, Expropriation by Pacific and Atlantic, Ry. Co. (Ques.) 833 (i).
——— (M. for copies*) 996 (i).
——— Plans *re* Expropriation by Ry. Cos. (Ques.) 190.
——— Sale of Timber on Indian Reserves (remarks) in Com. on B. 194, 5429 (iii).

Boyer, Mr. G., *Vaudreuil.*
Canal Lockmasters, Regulations, &c., *re* Salaries (Ques.) 4705 (iii).
Harwood Estate, Building Wharf, &c. (Ques.) 1099 (i).
Hay Trade Regulations, Penalties *re* Violation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beauparlant) 4009 (ii).
Maple Syrup Adulteration (prop. res.) 1397 (i).
Ottawa River, Buoys in Channel (Ques.) 137 (i).
Rigaud Seigniory, Payments to Owners, &c. (Ques.) 993 (i).

Bristol, Mr. E., *Centre Toronto.*
Acoustics in Chamber (remarks) 7361 (iv).
Crown Lands, Administration of by Dept. of Int., on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 4219 (iii).
Gold and Silver Marks Act Amt. B. 211 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7568 (iv).
Lord's Day B. 12, in Com. (Jews) 6298; on Amt. (Mr. T. Martin) *re* games, 7243; on Amt. (Mr. D. Ross) *re* industrial processes, 7221 (iv).
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., Removal from Office of Immigration Agent, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6913 (iv).
Ry. Act (telephones) Amt B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 6093 (iii), 7089 (iv).
Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7139 (iv).
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 67 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 3506 (ii).
Supreme Court References by Gov. in Council (Ques.) 1678 (i).
Ventilation of the Chamber (remarks) 7359 (iv).

Broder, Mr. A., *Dundas.*
Chamberlain, Dr. T. F., Apptmnt. by Govt. (Ques.) 5004 (iii).
I.C.R., on Annual Statement (remarks) 131 (i).
Lord's Day B. 12 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5765 (iii).
N. W. Elections, Frauds, *re* ref. to in deb. on Address, 117 (i).
Ry. Act (express cos.) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 823 (i).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 2592 (ii).
Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7128 (iv).
S. African Volunteers, Disabled, &c., Recognition for Pensions, &c. (prop. res.) 429, Neg. (Y. 59; N. 97) 434 (i).

SUPPLY:
Lighthouse and Coast Service (gas buoys) 4964 (iii).
Tower of West Block, Collapse, Inspection by Dept, (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1269 (i).

Brodeur, Hon. L. P. (Minister of Marine and Fisheries), *Rouville.*
Acetylene Gas Buoys, between Lachine and Kingston, Cost of Maintenance, Installation, &c. (Ans.) 982 (i).
Acetylene Gas Buoys in St. Lawrence Channel, Rep. of Transportation Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2898 (ii).
'Arctic,' Debate, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) Pairs on Division (remarks) 3800 (ii).
'Arctic' Expedition, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) to conc. in Rep. of Special Com., and Amt. (Mr. Northrup) 6516 (iv).

Brodeur, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
'Arctic' Expedition, Ques. of Order, 6411 (iv).
'Arctic,' Str., Amount expended for Supplies and Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 980 (i).
——— Com. of Investigation *re* Expenditure, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3667 (ii).
——— Expenditure *re* Supplies, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3202 (ii).
——— Sale of Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3350 (ii).
Bag-net and Trap-net Licenses, in Queen's County, N.S. (Ans.) 4156 (iii).
Baril, Alfred, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 835 (i).
'Bavarian,' Str., Cause of Wreck (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2899 (ii).
B. C. Shipping Interests, Govt. Aid, &c., on M. for Sup., 1485 (i).
Bronte Lighthouse, Construction of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4790 (iii).
Brooks & Co., Banking Arrangements and Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4840 (iii).
——— Payments to (Ans.) 1103 (i).
Buoys, Foreign-made, purchased by Dom. Govt. for Canada (Ans.) 3407 (ii).
Canadian Fog Signal Co., Amounts paid to (Ans.) 767 (i).
Canadian Lubricant Co., Payments to, Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 987 (i).
Castings, purchased at Sorel by Marine Dept. Total Expenditure (Ans.) 5007 (iii).
Cement purchased from Charles Strubbe (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4923 (iii).
Chateauguay and Beauharnois Channel, Buoying of (Ans.) 2724 (ii).
Chateau Richer, Wharf Dues, Amount collected (Ans.) 4708 (iii).
Coal purchased by Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3598 (ii).
Coal purchased from Allan SS. Co. (Ans.) 4247 (iii).
Conmee & Bowman, Charges *re* Dredging Contracts, on Ques. of Order, 1310 (i).
Coughlin, J. B., Payments to for Supplies (Ans.) 981 (i).
Daly & Hanman, Dredges, Employment and Payments to (Ans.) 761 (i).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 2025 (ii).
Demers, Jos., Claims *re* Damage to Property (Ans.) 762 (i).
Dickenson's Landing Lighthouse, Cost of Installation of Acetylene Gas (Ans.) 982 (i).
Dionne, Louis, Harbour Master, Montmigny, Salary, Revenue, &c. (Ans.) 4707 (iii).
Dredges under Charge of Mr. Cowie (Ans.) 4154 (iii).
Fire Extinguishers for Lighthouses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4959 (iii).

Brodeur, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Fisheries, Jurisdiction over Inshore, Speech of Lt.-Gov. of P.E.I. (Ans.) 768 (i).
Fisheries on Great Lakes, Protection, Reps. *re* Taking of Spawn by Americans (Ans.) 762 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3711 (ii).
Fishery Conditions on Great Lakes, Board of Investigation (Ans.) 575 (i).
Fish Ladder in Cowie's Dam, N.S., Cost of Construction (Ans.) 1868 (i).
Fraser River, B.C., Lightship at Sand-heads, Report from Dept. (read) 4912 (iii).
French River Lighthouse for Ontario Lumber Co., Erection, Contract *re* (Ans.) 1867 (i).
Gallant, W. A., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1105 (i).
'Galveston' Dredge, Purchase by Dom. Govt. (Ans.) 2457 (ii).
Goodall, J. A., Compensation *re* Loss of Fishery Privileges (Ans.) 6088 (iii).
Goose Harbour Buoys. Contract *re* Setting out (Ans.) 3742 (ii).
Govt. Steamers carrying Passengers (remarks) 1009 (i).
Govt. Steamers, Increased Expenditure (explanation) in Com. of Sup., 4786 (iii).
——— Number of Officers, Crews, Emplymt., &c. (Ans.) 994 (i).
G.T.P. Branch Lines B. 75 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 5695 (iii).
Great Lakes Dredging Co., Payments for Tugs *re* Thunder Bay (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3584 (ii).
Hay Trade Regulation, Penalties *re* Violation, in Com. on Res., (Mr. Beauparlant) 4014; (M.) to ref. to Com. on Agriculture, 4023 (ii).
Hudson Bay Whale Fisheries (B. 223) Prop. Res., 6088 (iii); in Com. on Res., 6708; 1°*, of B., 6709, 2°* and in Com., 6854 (iv).
Immigration from Belgium (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1637 (i).
Inland Revenue, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 225 (i).
Insurance Investigation, Delay in Proceedings and Legislation, &c. (remarks) 3802 (ii).
Jack Straw and Red Horse Light, Cost *re* Change to Acetylene Gas (Ans.) 584 (i).
'Kestrel' Str., Tonnage, Officers and Crew, &c. (Ans.) 987 (i).
'King Edward,' Str., Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4791 (iii).
Lake St. Francis Island, Number and Owners (remarks) 7637 (iv).
Lake St. Louis Hydrographic Surveys, Completion of Maps, &c. (Ans.) 330 (i).
Lake of Two Mountains, Completion of Maps, &c. (Ans.) 331 (i).

Brodeur, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Lighthouses, Number constructed, Amount expended, &c. (Ans.) 988 (i).
Lighting System *re* St. Lawrence Route, on Inquiry for Ret., 6545 (iv).
Lights and Fog Alarms, in Ont. Ports, Contract and Supplies (Ans.) 4706 (iii).
Lord's Day B. 12, on M. (Mr. Aylesworth) to strike out Amt. *re* Ball Games, 7277; on on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* Amt. (Mr. Porter) 7297; on Senate Amts., 7691 (iv).
Magnetawan Lighthouse, Charges *re* Member for Parry Sound, and Investigation, on Inquiry for Rep., 6796 (iv).
——— Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4119 (iii).
——— Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 1678 (i).
'Maisonneuve,' Str., Cost of Maintenance, &c. (Ans.) 1566 (i)
Maple Syrup Adulteration, on prop. Res. (Mr. Boyer) 1408 (i).
Marconi Wireless Tel. System, across Atlantic (Ans.) 323 (i).
Marconi Wireless Stations, Amount expended (Ans.) 766 (i).
Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Rep., on Inquiry for, 1005 (i).
——— Deptl. Rep. (presented) 485 (i).
Marine Hospitals at Louisbourg, Completion and Appointments, &c. (Ans.) 1862 (i), 2030 (ii).
Masters and Mates B. 7 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 466; in Com., 468, 842, 998 (i).
'Matilda,' Schr., Rescue of Crew, Reward *re* (Ans.) 2549 (ii).
Merchant Marine of Canada, Decrease ,&c., on M. (Mr. Lewis) 1201 (i).
Merwin, Geo. F., Amounts paid to by Govt. (Ans.) 767 (i), 3411 (ii).
'Minto,' Str., Suplies, Letter from Aud. Gen. (read) *re* Correction of figures, 4915 (iii).
Miscouche Shoals, P.E.I., Erection of a Buoy (Ans.) 582 (i).
Montreal Agency, Rent and Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3592 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Amounts paid in Fees, &c. (Ans.) 1673 (i).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners (B. 222) 2°* and in Com., 6845; in Com. on Res., 6707; 1°* of B., 6708 (iv).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners (power) B. 55, 2°*, and in Com., and 3°*, 2189 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Re-organization and Exclusion of Press from Meetings (remarks) 657 (i).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners (reorganization) B. 124, 1° m., 1668 (i); 2°*, and in Com., 2189, 2205, 2642 (ii).
Brodeur, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Montreal Harbour, Revenue, Expenditure, Bonded Debt, &c. (Ans.) 2730 (ii).
Montreal Marine Agency, Number of Employees (Ans.) 1101 (i).
Naval School of Instruction, Lectures *re* (Ans.) 2726 (ii).
Noble, W.H., Fraser, B.H., and Fraser, J.F., Emplymt. and Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 987 (i).
Norwegian Shipping Competition (remarks) 4086 (iii).
Ottawa Carbide Co., Amounts paid to Dec. 31st, 1905 (Ans.) 1099 (i).
——— Expenditure *re* Purchase (Ans.) 986 (i).
Ottawa River Buoys in Channel (Ans.) 1371 (i).
Palmer's Point Lighthouse, Claims for Damages (Ans.) 6087 (iii).
Paquet, Jos., Reinstatement as Pilot (Ans.) 3970 (ii).
Pickerel Fishing on Lake Huron, Date of Close Season (Ans.) 2034 (ii).
Pilotage Act Amt. (B. 219) 1° m., 6537 (iv).
Pilotage Commissioners, Remuneration or Salaries (Ans.) 768 (i).
Pilotage Commission, N. Sydney, on Inquiry for Rep., 6803 (iv).
Port Arthur Dredging, Contract by Great Lakes Dredging Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3805 (ii).
——— Payments *re* Tugs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4093 (iii).
Pratt, Capt. John, Charges *re* Irregularities (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4784 (iii).
P.E.I. Winter Communication, Total Yearly Expenditure (Ans.) 835 (i).
——— Rumour *re* 'Montcalm' (remarks) 971 (i).
——— Winter Service, Ice-breakers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3938 (ii), 4764, 4817 (iii).
Public Accounts Com., Meetings (remarks) 6802 (iv).
'Quadra,' Str., Repairs, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4852 (iii).
Quebec Bridge, Obstruction to Navigation in St. Lawrence, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to adjn., 223 (i).
Quebec Harbour (deep water)—(B. 174) prop. res., 3503 (ii); in Com. on Res., 3826, 1°*, 2°*, and in Com., 3933 (ii), 4807 (iii).
Ry. Act (liability) Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Lennox) on M. for 2°, 886 (i).
Reid Wrecking Co., Payments to by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4089 (iii).
'Rembrant,' Coal Barge, Investigation *re* Loss (Ans.) 1859 (i).
Returns, on Inquiry for, 1203 (i).

Brodeur, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

Returns, Preparation of, Expenditure *re* (remarks) 2945 (ii).

Roberts and Stevens, Investigation *re* Certificates, (remarks) on conc., 7594 (iv).

Robertson, Andrew C., Appointment as Fishery Inspector, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 4156 (iii).

St. Anicet Wharf, Repairs, Revenue, &c. (Ans.) 1566 (i).

St. Lawrence Lighthouses, Buoys, &c., Cost of Maintenance (Ans.) 1151 (i)

——— Number between Lachine and Bay of Quinté (Ans.) 1571 (i).

——— Number, &c. (remarks) *re* Question, 585 (i).

——— Number of Sea-going Vessels, &c. (Ans.) 1096 (i).

——— remarks *re* Question (Mr. Bergeron) 974 (i).

——— Accidents to Vessels of 100 tons, &c. Remarks *re* Question, 768 (i).

St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Depth of Water at Quebec and Montreal Harbours (Ans.) 4797 (iii).

Sault Ste. Marie Govt. Dock, Coal stored by private cos. (Ans.) 3502 (ii).

'Seagull,' Str., Purchase of (remarks) 972 (i).

'Seguin,' Str., Payments to *re* Construction Work (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4097 (iii).

Shanghaiing in B. C., Complaints *re* (remarks) 4995 (iii).

Shipping List, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 4995 (iii).

Ships Safety B. 48 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 1149 (i); M. to ref. back to Com., 4024 (iii, on M. for 3°, 1205 (i).

Souris Fish Drier, Construction, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1373 (i).

Steamers, Dom., Amount expended for Supplies (Ans.) 981 (i).

Steamer Supplies, Expenditure *re*, Letter from Aud. Gen. *re* correction of figures (read) 4915 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.—Inland Revenue (salaries) 367; Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 370 (i); (private sec's allowance) 4896 (iii); (salaries) 7558 (iv).

Electric Light Inspection (salaries) 2611 (ii).

Excise (methylated spirits) 1561; (salaries) 1550; (tobacco stamps) 1558 (i).

Fisheries (bounty distribution) 3706; (Canadian exhibition) 3706; (customs collections from U.S. vessels) 3711; (dog-fish reduction) 3709; (dog-fish) 3707; (fish curing) 3707; (Georgian Bay Laboratory) 3707; (hatcheries) 3709; (hatcheries) 3700; (inspectors) 3707 (ii); (Lake Winnipeg steamer) 7563; (Lake Winnipeg steamer) conc., 7598 (iv); (overseers) 3692; (protection service) 3703, 3709 (ii).

Immigration (agents, G.B., &c.) 1637 (i).

Brodeur, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 4790, 4912 (iii); 7584 (iv); (agencies, rents, &c.) 3591 (ii); (carbide supplies 4879; (compensation *re* gas explosions) 4868; (gas buoys) 4951 (iii); (lighthouses) 3617; (lightkeepers salaries) 3583 (ii); (maintenance, &c.) 4867 (iii); (Marconi stations) 7561 (iv); (oil supply) 4140; (patrol boats, *re* customs) 4896; (repairs, &c.) 4117; (submarine signals) 4954; (supplies, &c.) 4938 (iii).

Marine Dept. (Lake St. Peter piers) 7560 (iv).

Marine Hospitals (Mar. provs.) 3686; (shipwrecked seamen) 3688 (ii).

Metric System (lectures) 2613 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. strs.) 3350 3803, 3934 (ii); 4089, 4786, 4816; (ice-breakers) 4764 (iii); (ice-breakers, Lower St. Lawrence) 7559 (iv); (maintenance and repairs) 3200; (masters and mates) 3399; (navigation schools) 3399 (ii); (patrol, Hudson's Bay) 4867; (wrecking plant, Davie & Sons) 4867 (iii).

Public Works—Marine (dredge) 7560 (iv); St. Lawrence Ship Channel (dredging) 2894; ('Galveston' Dredge) 2921; (lighting) 2897 (ii).

Scientific Institutions (hydrographic surveys) 3685; (magnetic observatory) 3683; (meteorological service) 3684 (ii).

Steamboat Inspection (fog alarms) 3691; (inspectors) 3688 (ii).

Sutherland, Geo. M., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 2265 (ii).

Sydney Harbour Commissioners (B. 74) 1° m., 969 (i); 3°*, 2189 (ii).

Toronto Observatory (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3683 (ii).

Tyner's Head Fog Alarm, N.B., Total Cost, Employees, &c. (Ans.) 2270 (ii).

Ventilation of Chamber (remarks) 7367 (iv).

Willson, T. L., Amounts paid to for Gas Buoys (Ans.) 767 (i).

Weir Licenses, Charlotte Co., N.B., granted in 1906 (Ans.) 1566 (i).

Winter Communication, P.E.I., and Mainland, Construction of Steamer (Ans.) 323, 336 (i).

——— Str. 'Montcalm' used in Northumberland Straits (remarks) 1257 (i).

Woods Co., Limited, Payments to by all Depts. (remarks) 980 (i).

Wrecks on Pacific Coast, Number, Financial Loss, &c. (Ans.) 338 (i).

Young, Hon. John, Erection of Statue by Harbour Commissioners of Montreal (B. 55) 1° m., 656 (i).

Bruneau, Mr. A. A., *Richelieu.*

La Compagnie d'Assurance Mutuelle B. 88 (Mr. J. A. Ross) in Com., 4942 (iii).

Bureau, Mr. J., *Three Rivers and St. Maurice.*

'Arctic' Str., Expenditure *re* Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3365 (ii).

Bureau, Mr. J.—*Con.*
Bell Telephone Co. of Canada (B. 81) 1°*, 999 (i); M. for Com., 3953 (ii); in Com., 4196, 4388, 5995 (iii); 3° m., 6317 (iv).
Conmee & Bowman, Charges *re* Dredging Contracts, on Ques. of Order, 1310 (i).
Fruit Marks Acts Amt. B. 101 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2557 (ii).
Lord's Day B. 12, in Com. (towing logs) 6655; on Amt. (Mr. D. Ross) 7207; on Amt. (Mr. Aylesworth) to strike out amt. (Mr. T. Martin) *re* ball games, 7292 (iv).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract, Charges *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Sup., 2011 (i).
Northwest Commercial Travellers' Association (B. 212) 1°*, 5992 (iii).
Quebec-Midland Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 23) 1°*, 349 (i).
Ry. Act (telephones) Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 6100, 6111 (iii); 7078 (iv).
Richelieu and Ontario Nav. Co.'s (B. 65) 1°*, 829 (i).
SUPPLY :
Lighthouse and Coast Service (gas buoys) 4872 (iii).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. strs,) 3365 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers. Que. (Three Rivers) 6980 (iv).
Tower, West Block, Collapse of, Investigation by Govt., on M. for Sup., 1332 (i).

Burrows, Mr. T. A., *Dauphin.*
Crown Lands, Administration of by Dept. of Interior, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 4607 (iii).
Forest Reserves B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5541 (iii).
Lord's Day B. 12 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5677 (iii).

Caldwell, Mr. T. B., *North Lanark.*
Iron and Steel Bounties on Canadian Ore, on prop. Res. (Mr. Conmee) 3779 (ii).
Sharbot Lake and Bathurst Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6144 (iv).

Calvert, Mr. W. S., *West Middlesex.*
Allen, James, Relief (B. 192) 1°*, 5081 (iii).
Bulmer, Nettie M., Relief (B. 218) 1°*, 6677 (iv).
Canadian Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 22) 1°*, 349 (i).
Colonial Bank of Canada incorp. (B. 188) 1°*, 4801 (iii).
Farmer's Bank of Canada (B. 127) 1°*, 1743 (i).
Grand Valley Ry. Co.'s (B. 130) 1°*, 1743 (i).
House of Commons Rules, in Com. on Special Rep., 7475, 7611 (iv).
Huron and Erie Loan and Savings Co.'s (B. 21) 1°*, 349 (i).

Calvert, Mr. W. S. —*Con.*
Mexican Light and Power Co.'s (B. 95) 1°*, 1252 (i).
Mexican Tramway and Electric Co.'s (B. 96) 1°*, 1252 (i); in Com., 2666 (ii).
Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s (B. 133) 1°*, 1743 (i).
Private Bills, on M. (Mr. Macpherson) to extend time, 2822 (ii).
——— (M.) to place on Order Paper, 6317 (iv).
Puebla Tramway Light and Power Co.'s (B. 128) 1°*, 1743 (i).
Rio de Janeiro Tramway Light and Power Co.'s (B. 94) 1°*, 1252 (i).
Thorold and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s (B. 126) 1°*, 1743 (i).
Trans-Niagara Bridge Co.'s (B. 161) 1°*, 3065 (ii); on Senate Amts., 7270, 7370 (iv).

Campbell, Mr. A., *Centre York, Ont.*
Agriculture and Colonization, 3rd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 2021 (ii).
Bell Telephone Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Bureau) on M. for Com., 3957 (ii).
Campbell Milling Co., Sale of Flour to Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4135 (iii).
Chartered Bank of London and Canada incorp. (B. 204) 1°*, 5529 (iii).
Coal purchased for Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3615 (ii).
Edmunds, Henry, Patent Relief (B. 69) 1°*, 890 (i).
Fort William Terminal Ry. and Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. 120 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 5400; on M. for 3°, 5446 (iii).
General Accident Assurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 203) 1°*, 5529 (iii).
Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. 207 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5900 (iii).
G.T.P. Ry. Branch Lines incorp. B. 75 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 5695, 5952 (iii).
G.T.P. Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 61 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 4548 (iii).
Grey, Franklin Montgomery, Patent Relief (B. 122) 1°*, 1667 (i); in Com., 4945 (iii).
Hillcrest Coal, Coke and Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 157 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 4398 (iii).
Houk, Henry Luther, Patent Relief (B. 51) 1°*, 655 (i).
House of Commons Rules, in Com. on Special Rep., 7465 (iv).
Iron and Steel Bounties on Canadian Ore, on prop. Res. (Mr. Conmee) 3785 (ii).
James Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 184) 1°*, 4759 (iii).
Mackintosh, Eileen Mary, Relief (B. 185) 1°*, 4759; in Com., 6036 (iii).
Milk Cans : *See* 'Weights,' &c.
Nakusp and Slocan Ry. Co.'s B. 32 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 1297 (i).

Campbell, Mr. A.—*Con.*
Peer, John Albert, Relief (B. 169) 1°*, 3403 (ii); in Com., 4447, 4950, (iii).
Port Arthur Harbour Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3811 (ii).
Preston, Mary Emeline, Relief (B. 168) 1°*, 3403 (ii); in Com., 4950 (iii).
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., Removal from Office of Immigration Agent, on Amt (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6923 (iv).
Ry. Act Telephone Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 6104 (iii); 6221 (iv).
Railway Committee, Sitting concurrently with Sessions of Hse. (M.) 5362 (iii).
Schomburg and Aurora Ry. Co.'s (B. 102) 1°*, 1465 (i).
SUPPLY :
Inspection of Staples (grain inspection) 7541 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (repairs) 4135 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (St. John and Digby) 7550 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 3811 (ii).
Supreme Court of Judicature in N.B., B. 22 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 3°, 7191 (iv).
Underwood Typewriter Co.'s Patent 69140, Relief (B. 123) 1°*, 1667 (i).
Vancouver, Fraser Valley and Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 87 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 3187 (ii).
Vancouver and Lulu Island Ry. Co.'s B. 29 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 1142, 1295 (i).
Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. (B. 14) 1° m., 169 (i); in Com., 2068; 2° m., 874 (i); 3° m., 2971 (ii).

Carney, Mr. M., *Halifax.*
SUPPLY :
Railways—I.C.R. (bridges) 5050 (iii).

Carrier, Mr. L. A., *Lévis.*
Levis Dry Dock, Resolution *re* Enlargement of (Ques.) 4705 (iii).

Carvell, Mr. F. B., *Carleton, N.B.*
'Arctic' Expedition, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) to conc. in Rep. of Special Com., 6440 (iv).
Coal purchased by Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3612 (ii).
Criminal Code (lotteries) Amt. (B. 209) 1°*, 5992 (iii).
G.T.P. Ry. Branch Lines incorp. B. 75 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 5488, 5960; (amt.) 6023 (iii).
G.T.P. Ry., Surveys between Quebec and Moncton, Cor., &c., on M. (Mr. Crocket) for Copies, 1447, 1717 (i).
Lord's Bay B. 12, in Com. (shooting) 6271 (iv); (trains, &c.) 5719 (iii).
Militia Camps, Service Rolls *re* (remarks) 1003 (i).

Carvell, Mr. F. B.—*Con.*
North Atlantic Trading Co., Mr. Preston's Refusal to answer Questions, on M. (Mr. Monk) 4505 (iii).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake & Saskatchewan Railroad and SS. Co. (B. 86) 1°*, 1252 (i); in Com., 2667, 2703 (ii).
Representation of Provinces, Amt. to B.N.A. Act, on M. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 1127 (i).
SUPPLY :
Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies) 3612 (ii).
Toledo Glass Co.'s Patent Relief B. 110 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3676, 3734 (ii).
Tower of West Block, Collapse, Inspection by Dept. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1284 (i).

Cash, Mr. E. L., *Mackenzie.*
G.T.P. Ry. Branch Lines incorp. B. 75 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 5952 (iii).

Chisholm, Mr. T., *East Huron.*
Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (seconded) 27 (i).
Dominion Lands, Administration of by Govt., on Amt. (Mr. Ames) to Com. of Sup., 3184, 3188 (ii).
Duval, Mr. J. E., Resignation from Ry. Commission, &c. (Ques.) 2728 (ii).
German Tariffs in Relation to Canada, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 1891 (i).
G.T.P. Ry., Construction, Mountain Division, Letter from Chas. M. Hays, &c. (Ques.) 3905 (ii).
Homesteads in N.W.T., Blanketing System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1358 (i).
Immigration Agents, Ont. and Dom. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1353 (i).
International Postal Congress, Canadian Representative at, Instructions, &c. (Ques.) 2728 (ii).
King's Most Gracious Majesty, Visit to Canada, on M. (Mr. Belcourt) 1693 (i).
Lighting and Acoustics of Chamber (remarks) 7359 (iv).
Lord's Day B. 12 in Com. (provincial legislatures) 6571 (iv).
Meats Canned and Fluid Beef, &c. Amount exported from U.S. for 1903-4-5 (Ques.) 5005 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Year-book) 2682 (ii).
Immigration (agents, &c.) 1353 (i).
Indians—B.C. (medical attendance) 1082 (i).
Tower of West Block, Collapse, Inspection by Dept. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1274 (i).
Ventilation of the Chamber (remarks) 7359 (iv).

Chisholm, Mr. W., *Antigonish.*
Georgeville Wharf, Dismissal of Overseer Macpherson (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6777 (iv).
Gray, Franklin Montgomery, Patent Relief B. 122 (Mr. Campbell) in Com. 4949 (iii).
Lord's Day B. 12 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com.. (trains, &c.) 5732 (iii).
P.E.I. Winter Service, Ice-breakers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4776 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Georgeville wharf) 6777 (iv).

Clare, Mr. G. A., *South Waterloo.*
SUPPLY:
Lighthouse and Coast Service (carbide supplies) 4965 (iii).

Clarke, Mr. A. H., *South Essex.*
Agricultural Products, American vs. Canadian Duties, on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 4909 (iii).
Alberta Northern Ry. and Coal Co.'s incorp. (B. 93) 1°*, 1252 (i).
Canada Evidence Act Amt. B. 68 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 1268, 1762 (i).
Coasting Trade of Can. Act Amt., Leg. *re* (prop. res.) 590 (i).
Essex Terminal Ry. Co.'s (B. 92) 1°*, 1252 (i).
Lord's Day B. 12, in Com. (railways) 6367; on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) *re* rys., 7251 (iv)
Negro Population in Canada, Positions for, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7505 (iv).
Niagara, Queenston and St. Catharines Ry. Co.'s (B. 25) 1°*, 349 (i).
Toledo Glass Co.'s Patent Relief B. 110 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3723 (ii)
Windsor, Chatham and London Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 146) 1°*, 2321 (ii).
Windsor, Essex and Lake Shore Rapid Ry. Co.'s (B. 150) 1°*, 2321 (ii); in Com., 5223 (iii).

Clements, Mr. H. S., *West Kent.*
Agricultural Imports and Exports between Can. and U.S., Duty, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2038 (ii).
Agricultural Products, American vs. Canadian Duties, on M. for Supply, 4898 (iii).
Chatham, Street Delivery of Mail (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 551 (i).
German Tariffs in Relation to Canada, Cor. with G. B., on M. (Mr. Armstrong) for copies, 1879 (i).
Hog Cholera, Cure for (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2692 (ii).
Hog Plague in Kent County, Protest *re* Quarantine (M. for copies) 647 (i).
——— Quarantine, West and East Kent, &c. (Ques.) 173 (i).

Clements, Mr. H. S.—*Con.*
Leamington Postmaster, and Outside Business (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 533 (i).
——— Post Office, Ownership of (Ques.) 588 (i).
Military Gazette, Expenditure *re* Issue (Ques.) 582 (i).
Money Lenders Act Amt. B. 11 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6815 (iv).
Negro Population in Canada, Positions for, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7503 (iv).
Piping, Butt and Lap Welded, Duty, Quantity imported from U.S., &c. (Ques.) 175 (i).
Postmasters' Salaries, Policy of Govt. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 539 (i).
Privy Councillors Annuities Repeal B. 220 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7620 (iv).
Selkirk, John McR., Salary paid *re* Pelee Island Cable (Ques.) 587 (i).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 7397 (iv).
Post Office (mail service) 533 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Ont. (River Thames) 6991; (Rondeau) 6991 (iv).
Quarantine (animals health) 2692 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R (coloured porters, &c.) 7503 (iv).
Thames River Dredging, Necessity of, &c. (Ques.) 175 (i).
Thames River Flooding, Relief of, Cor. Plans, &c. (M. for copies) 774 (i).
Thames River Survey, Improvements of Channel, &c. (Ques.) 175 (i).
Tobacco, Raw Leaf, Increase of Duty, &c. (Ques.) 176 (i).
Tower of West Block, Collapse, Inspection by Dept., &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1273 (i).
Wire Fencing on Boundary Line, Contracts *re* (Ques.) 1677 (i).
——— Inspection of Importations, &c. (Ques.) 176 (i).

Cochrane, Mr. E., *East Northumberland, Ont.*
Canada Eastern Ry. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5033 (iii).
Cement purchased for Lighthouse Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4926 (iii).
G. T. P. Ry. Branch Lines B. 75 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 5475 (iii).
G.T.Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 84 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 2258 (ii).
House of Commons Rules, in Com. on Special Rep., 7474 (iv).
Judges of Provincial Courts Act (travelling) Amt. B. 83 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 1775 (i).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 7072 (iv).
Senate and House of Commons Act (fees, &c.) Amt. (B. 10) in Com., 7649 (iv).

Cochrane, Mr. E.—*Con.*

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 7395 (iv).

Customs (outside ports) 496 (i).

Penitentiary—Kingston (binder twine 7536 (iv).

Railways—I.C.R. (Halifax accommodation) 7483 (iv).

Cockshutt, Mr. W. F., *Brantford.*

Address, The, 99 (i).

Brantford, Amount of Excise Duty collected for 1900 to 1905 (Ques.) 571 (i).

Brantford Customs Revenue, Duty collected, &c. (Ques.) 339 (i).

Brantford Postal Revenue, Value, Postal Notes, &c. (Ques.) 339 (i).

Brantford Post Office, Total Amount of Wages, Salaries, &c. (Ques.) 340 (i).

Budget, The, 3888 (ii).

Canadian Bible Society's Auxilliary incorp. (B. 20) 1°*, 349 (i).

Customs Tariff Act (steel rails) Amt. B. 175 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5103 (iii).

Dominion Statistician, Superannuation of Mr. Johnson (Ques.) 3971 (ii).

Electric Power and Gas Exportation Regulation B. 145 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 3097 (ii), 4036 (iii).

Imperial Institute, Explanation of Vote (remarks) on M. for 1° of Supply Bill, 681 (i).

Indian (J. W. Lewis) Enfranchisement B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2828 (ii).

I.C.Ry., on Annual Statement (Mr. Emmerson) 303 (i).

Lord's Day B. 12 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5767 (iii).

Lytton School for Indians: in Com. of Sup., 1089 (i).

Magazines, Canadian-American, Advance *re* Postal Rates, &c. (Ques.) 2270 (ii).

Niagara Falls, Preservation of, Memorial. Pets, &c. (Ques.) 1101 (i).

Postal Rates on Magazines, (remarks) *re* Answer to former Question, 2823 (ii).

Preferential Trade with G. B., ref. to deb. in Address. 99 (i).

SUPPLY :

Civil Govt.—Geological Survey (salaries) 411 (i).

Customs (inspectors' salaries) 510; (outside ports) 492; (statistics) 510 (i).

Indians—B.C. (medical attendance) 1084 : (schools) 1089; Ont. and Que. (legal expenses) 728 (i).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (gas buoys) 4878 (iii).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 14 (Mr. Campbell) on M. for 2°, 882 (i).

Conmee, Mr. J., *Thunder Bay and Rainy River.*

Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co's Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6142 (iv)

Conmee, Mr. J.—*Con.*

Canadian-Minnesota Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. 91 (Mr. Dyment) on Order called for Com., 2067 ; in Com., 2499 (ii).

Conmee & Bowman Dredging Contracts, Ques. of Order *re* Charges by Mr. Bennett, 1305 (i).

——— Reply to Charges by Mr. Bennett, 1321 (i).

——— Charges *re* Dredging Contracts (remarks) 1302 (i).

Iron and Steel Ore, Bounties on Can. Ore, (prop. res.) 3748; prop. res., withdrawn, 3787 (ii).

Lord's Day B. 12 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com.. 5654. 5696, 5770, 5810 (iii); (electric rys.) 6643; (loading, &c., grain) 6644; (industrial plant) 6604, 6629; (Jews) 6301; (loading, &c. vessels) 6633 (iv); (trains, &c.) 5702 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. Galliher) 7254; on Amt. (Mr. Guthrie) *re* rys., 7250; on Amt. (Mr. D. Ross) 7207; on Senate Amts., 7669 (iv).

Nipegon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6153 (iv).

Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 173 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 6057 (iii); on M. for 3°, 6679, 6694 (iv).

Port Arthur Harbour, Contract with Great Lakes Dredging Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3815 (ii).

Ry. Act (telephones) Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 6090 (iii); 6202, 6234, 7078 (iv).

Ry. Act (liability) Amt. (B. 152) 1° m., 2451 (ii).

Ry. Subsidies, Authorization B. 214 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 6142 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, &c.) 3815 (ii).

Tower, Collapse of, Inspection by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1302 (i).

Copp, Mr. A. J. S., *Digby.*

SUPPLY :

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 7378 (iv).

Mail Subsidies, &c. (St. John and Digby) 7545, 7580 (iv).

Costigan, Hon. J., *Victoria, N.B.*

G.T.P. Ry., Surveys between Quebec and Moncton, on M. (Mr. Crocket) for Ret., 1711 (i).

Crawford, Mr. J., *Portage la Prairie.*

Crown Lands, Administration of by Dept. of Interior, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 4573 (iii).

Crawford, Mr. J. —*Con.*

Forest Reserves B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 3565 (ii).

Grand River and Western Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 216) M. to place on Order paper for 1°, 6537 (iv).

G.T.P. Ry., Branch Lines incorp. (B. 75) 1° m., 999 (i); in Com., 5460 (iii); 5683, 5950, 6084, 3° m., 6609 (iv).

North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contracts, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Sup., 2084 (ii).

Prince Albert and North Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 221) 1°*, 6677 (iv).

Crocket, Mr. O. S., *York, N.B.*

Fish Dam at Cowie's Dam, N.S., Cost *re* Construction (Ques.) 1867 (i).

——— Cor. Reps., &c. (M. for copies*) 1871 (i).

Fredericton Cavalry Depot, N.B., Establishment of (Ques.) 186 (i).

G.T.P. Ry., Proposed Route from Winnipeg to Moncton, &c. (Ques.) 418 (i).

——— Surveys, Cor. with G. T. Construction Co., &c. (M. for cor.) 203 (i).

——— cor. (M.) for Copies, 1419 (i).

——— Surveys, Between Winnipeg and Moncton, Completion of (Ques.) 766 (i).

I.C.R., Canada Eastern Branch, Removal of Train Despatcher (Ques.) 991 (i).

SUPPLY :

Customs (outside ports) 501 (i).
Indians—N.B. (salaries) 734; Ont. and Que. (legal expenses) 732 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (St. John River) 6942 (iv).
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, &c.) 5115 (iii).

Daniel, Mr. J. W., *St. John City.*

Canada Eastern Ry. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5033 (iii).

Canso Medical Attendance for Sick Fisherman, Apptmnt., &c. (Ques.) 426 (i).

Cape Spencer Fog Signals (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4957 (iii).

Glanders, Quarantine of Animals (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2685 (ii).

G.T.P. Ry., Branch Lines incorp. B. 75 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 5965; on Amt. (Mr. Carvell) 6030 (iii).

G.T.P. Ry., Surveys between Quebec and Moncton, on M. (Mr. Crocket) for Ret., 1720. 1730 (i).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 170 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5244; on Amts., 5409 (iii).

I.C.R., Freight Rates controlled by Ry. Commission, ref. to in Com. on Ry. Bill, 2568 (ii).

——— Pension System, Inauguration of (Ques.) 764 (i).

Daniel, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*

Lord's Day B. 12 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5626 (iii); (Jews) 6346 ; (provincial acts) 6556; (railways) 6367; (trains. &c.) 5714 (iii); on Senate Amts., 7665 (iv).

Marine Hospital at Louisburg, Completion and Appointments, &c. (Ques.) 1861 (i), 2029 (ii).

Masters and Mases Certificates Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 478 (i).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Amount paid in Fees, &c. (Ques.) 1673 (i).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners B. 124 (Mr. Brodeur) on M. for 1°, 1670 (i); in Com., 2654 (ii).

Pratt, Capt. John, Charges *re* Irregularities (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4783 (iii).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 2568 (ii).

St. John, N.B., Drill Hall, Erection of, &c. (Ques.) 427 (i).

St. John, Post Office Facilities (remarks) 7694 (iv).

Ships Safety B. 48 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 1149 (i).

Skeffington, Detective on I.C.R., Dismissal, Charges, &c. (Ques.) 183 (i).

Smart, Col., Resignation of (remarks) 5363 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 361; Inland Revenue (salaries) 368; Interior (salaries) 363; Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 370 (i); Railways and Canals (salaries) 5015 (iii).
Customs (outside service) 491 (i).
Excise (salaries) 1552 (i).
Immigration (agencies) 5512 (iii).
Indians—Mar. Provs. (schools) 718 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (maintenance, &c.) 4868; (submarine signals) 4954; (water system, Partridge Island) 4896 (iii).
Metric System (lectures) 2612 (ii).
Militia (annual drill) 5013 (iii).
Miscellaneous (Jap. famine fund) 315 (i).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 4826 (iii); (master and mates) 3399 (ii).
Quarantine (animals health) 2685; (Str. 'Grosse Isle') 2697 (ii).
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, &c.) 5118 (iii).
Railways—I.C.R. (bridges) 5022; (Halifax accommodation) 5072 ; (increased facilities) 5079; (rolling stock) 5077 (iii).
Weights and Measures (metric system) 2607 (ii).

Veterans of Fenian Raids, Claims for Compensation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 629 (i).

Demers, Mr. L. P., *St. John and Iberville.*

'Arctic' Expedition, Charges *re* Expenditure, Rep. of Special Com., on M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) to conc., 6400 (iv).

Cinq-Mars, Before Bar of Hse., on Amt. (Mr. Aylesworth) 5286 (iii).

Demers, Mr. L. P.—*Con.*
G.T.P. Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 61 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 4753 (iii).
Kootenay and Arrowhead Ry. Co.'s B. 30 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 1145 (i).
Lord's Day B. 12 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5663 (iii); (Jews) 6352; (provincial legislatures) 6585; on M. for 3°, 7312; on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) to M. for 3°, 7339 (iv).
Norwegian Shipping Competition, Par. in Sydney 'Record,' 4088 (iii).
Quebec, Montreal and Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 72) 1°*, 890 (i).
Toledo Glass Co.'s Patent Relief B. 110 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3677, 3721 (ii).
Vancouver and Lulu Island Ry. Co.'s B. 29 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 1141 (i).

Derbyshire, Mr. D., *Brockville.*
Brockville, Westport and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6164 (iv).
Cheese Curing Stations, Payments *re* Boxes (remarks) 2324 (ii).
German Tariffs in relation to Canada, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 1909 (i).
Mackintosh, Eileen Mary, Relief B. 185, on M. (Mr. Northrup) to ref. back to Com., 5443 (iii).
Montreal Harbour (reorganization) Commissioners B. 124 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 2649 (ii).
Ogden, Wm. Edward, Relief (B. 210) 1°*, 5992; 2° m., and M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 6075 (iii).
Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Ry. Co.'s (B. 151) 1°*, 2451 (ii).
P.E.I. Winter Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4820 (iii).
Ry. Subsidies, Authorization B. 214 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 6164 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Lighthouse and Coast Service (gas buoys) 4885 (iii).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers' repairs) 3808 (ii), 4863 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (Cape Tormentine) 6940 (iv).
Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 14 (Mr. Campbell) on M. for 3°, 2974 (ii).

Devlin, Mr. E. B., *Wright.*
Lord's Day B. 12 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5632 (iii); (Jews) 6308; on M. for 3°, 7323 (iv).
South Shore and Quebec Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 118) 1°*, 1667 (i).
Transportation Commission's Rep., on prop. Res. (Mr. Bennett) 3308 (ii).

Dubeau, Mr. J. A., *Joliette.*
Fruit Marks Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2564 (ii).
G.T.P. Ry., Branch Lines Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 5695 (iii).
Northern Ry. of Canada (B. 113) 1°*, 1576 (i).

Dubeau, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (live stock and dairying) 7422 (iv).

Dyment, Mr. A. E., *East Algoma.*
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 125) 1°*, 1743 (i).
Canadian Minnesota Bridge Co.'s incorp (B. 91) 1°*, 1252 (i); on Order for Com., 2067; in Com. 2499 (ii).
Indian Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5426 (iii).
Private Bills (M.) to extend Time, 1575 (i).

Elson, Mr. P., *East Middlesex.*
Binder Twine, Manufacture of at Kingston Penitentiary, Quantity on hand, Price, &c. (Ques.) 2037 (ii).
Dom. Day, Flying of Union Jack (Ques.) 7459 (iv).
——— (remarks) 7184 (iv).
Flags at half-mast, Occasions and Authority for Raising (Ques.) 3906 (ii).
London Armoury, Total Expenditure, &c. 2037 (ii).
London Post Office Improvements, Total Cost (Ques.) 2037 (ii).
O'Gorman, John, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 1099 (i).
Privy Councillors Annuities Repeal B. 220 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 3°, 7654 (iv).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) on Senate Amts., 7640 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 7408 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 4863 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings, Ont. (London post office) 6736 (iv).
Thorndale Post Office, Removal of, Cor., Memorials, &c. (M. for copies*) 998 (i).
——— (Ques.) 989 (i).
Tower of West Block, Collapse, Inspection, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1273 (i).
Wiley, Daniel, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 985 (i).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R. (Minister of Railways and Canals), *Westmoreland.*
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6142 (iv).
Ashcroft, Barkerville and Fort George Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 89 (Mr. D. Ross) on Senate Amts., 5401 (iii).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6150 (iv).
Bell Telephone Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Bureau) in Com., 4196, 6002 (iii).
Belmont Disaster, I.C.R., Investigation and Claims *re* (Ans.) 993 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7507 (iv).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
Brockville, Westport and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6163 (iv).
Canada Eastern Ry. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5033 (iii).
Canadian Minnesota Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. 91 (Mr. Dyment) in Com., 2504 (ii).
Canal Lockmasters, Regulations *re* Salaries (Ans.) 4705 (iii).
Cape Tourmente and Murray Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6148 (iv).
Charlottetown Ry. Station, Contracts *re* Construction (Ans.) 2271 (ii).
Coal Carriage for I.C.R., Survey *re* Channel at River du Loup (Ans.) 455 (i).
Cornwall Canal Electric Power, Contracts *re* (Ans.) 764 (i).
Coughlin, J. B., Payments to for Supplies, &c. (Ans.) 981 (i).
Dams in Ontario, Govt. Control of, Papers laid on Table, 1575 (i).
Davis Contract *re* Cornwall Canal, Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5346 (iii).
Duval, Mr. J. E., Resignation from Ry Commission, &c. (Ans.) 2728 (ii).
Eastern Ry. Supply Co., Contracts with Govt., Value, &c. (Ans.) 173 (i).
——— Ret. *re* (remarks) 840 (i).
Elgin Road Station Piling Ground, Purchase of by Govt. (Ans.) 583 (i).
Farran's Point Acetylene Gas Plant, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 1677 (i).
Fort William Terminal Ry. and Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. 120 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 5400 (iii).
Freight Charges on Steel and Fish Products, I.C.R. (Ans.) 449 (i).
Galops Canal, Original Estimate, Payments *re* (Ans.) 990 (i).
Godin, Dr. A., Payments for Damages *re* Overflowing of Chambly Canal (Ans.) 6087 (iii).
Grand River and Western Power Co.'s incorp. B. 216 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 6999, 7263 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry. Branch Lines B. 75 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 5468, 5683, 5950, 6075; on Amt. (Mr. Carvell) in Com., 6028 (iii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 84 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 2246 (ii).
G.T.P. Ry., Amount of Construction Contract from Quebec Westward (Ans.) 1745 (i).
——— Construction in Mountain Division, Letter from Mr. Chas. M. Hays (Ans.) 3906 (ii).
——— Food Supplies for Exploration Parties, Purchase of (Ans.) 1153 (i).
G. T. P. Ry., Surveys, Cor. with Transcontinental Ry. Commission, on M. (Mr. Crocket) for Cor., 203 (i).
——— Surveys, between Moncton and Quebec, Completion of Work (Ans.) 766 (i).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
G.T.P. Ry., Surveys, between Moncton and Quebec, Cor., &c., on M. (Mr. Crocket) for Copies, 1420 (i).
Great Northern Ry., Application for Subsidies (Ans.) 2078 (ii).
Great Northern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6169 (iv).
Halifax Defences, Permanent Force, Annual Cost, &c. (Ans.) 185 (i).
Harwood Estate, Building Wharf (Ans.) 1099 (i).
Hillcrest Coal, Coke & Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 157 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 4398 (iii).
Hodgson Ret., on Inquiry for (Mr. Lefurgey) 3077 (ii).
House of Commons Rules, in Com. on Special Rep., 7474, 7606 (iv).
Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (remarks) 6177 (iv).
I.C.R., Annual Statement, on M. for Sup., 127 (i).
——— Canada Eastern Branch, Removal of Train Despatcher (Ans.) 991 (i).
——— Canadian Express Co.'s Service, Dissatisfaction *re* (Ans.) 5182 (iii).
——— C.P.R., Comparisons *re* Accounts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5031 (iii).
——— Coal Depots, Establishment *re*, Purchase of Land, &c. (Ans.) 1863 (i).
——— Denning's Siding at Pugwash, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 2077 (ii).
——— Employees, Number, Charges to Different Accounts (Ans.) 976 (i).
——— Employees, Number from 1899 to 1905 (Ans.) 216 (i).
——— Expenditure *re* Capital Account (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7482 (iv).
——— Freight Rates Controlled by Ry. Commission, ref. to in Com. on Ry. Com. B. 62, 2568 (ii).
——— Fundy Coal Co., Quantity of Coal purchased (Ans.) 3244 (ii).
——— Halifax Property, purchased by Govt. (Ans.) 1746 (i).
——— Investigation by Public Accounts *re* Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7489 (iv).
——— Joughin's Patent Car Truck, Patentee, &c. (Ans.) 2729 (ii).
——— Levis Station, Asphalt Pavement (Ans.) 4708 (iii).
——— Location of New Shops at Moncton (Ans.) 1375 (i).
——— Moncton, Land Purchase from Mr. Hewson, on Amt. (Mr. Ames) to Com. of Sup., 5827 (iii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5061 (iii).
——— Pension System, Inauguration of (Ans.) 764 (i).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
I.C.R. Ry., Property, Thefts by Employees, Charges *re* (Ans.) 995 (i).
——— Tanks, Riund Houses, &c., Tenders for (Ans.) 763 (i).
——— Ties purchased from John Mahoney, &c. (remarks) *re* Question, 2270 (ii).
——— Stamps at Moncton, Investigation *re* Loss (Ans.) 1376 (i).
——— Strathcona Coal Co., Quantity of Coal purchased (Ans.) 3245 (ii).
See 'Belmont,' 'Coal,' 'Freight,' 'Langiles,' 'Lozo,' 'Oil,' 'St. Philippe,' 'Skeffington,' 'Supply, I.C.R.,' Ties,' &c.
Kootenay and Arrowhead Ry. Co.'s B. 30 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 1137 (i).
Lachine Canal, Coal Tolls, Charges *re* (remarks) 7063 (iv).
Lake Nominingue and La Lievre Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6143 (iv).
Lake St. John Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., on Res., 6164 (iv).
Langile's Platform on Pugwash Branch, Expenditure *re* Accommodation, &c. (Ans.) 2078 (ii).
Lord's Day B. 12, in Com., Ques. of Order *re* Amts., 6350 (iv).
Lotbinière and Megantic Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6142, 6162 (iv).
Lozo, F. J., Mechanic, I. C. R., Instructions *re* Dismissal of Employees (Ans.) 2547 (ii).
McLaren's Creek, Completion of Roadway (Ans.) 589 (i).
McLaughlin, R. J., and O'Donnell, D., Amount paid *re* Trent Canal Inquiry (Ans.) 590 (i).
Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6140 (iv).
Mugford, J. C., Claim *re* Fire Damages by P. E. I. Ry. (Ans.) 585 (i).
Murray Canal, Construction of Wooden Piers, &c. (Ans.) 6930 (iv).
Murray River Branch, P.E.I. Ry., Expropriation of Land, Settlement of Claims, &c. (remarks) 5994 (iii).
National Transcontinental Ry. Commission. Rep. presented, 125 (i).
N. B. Petroleum Co., Incorporation, Capital Stock, Names of Directors, &c. (Ans.) 1670 (i).
——— Members or Minister of Crown as Officers, &c. (Ans.) 979 (i).
——— Purchase from (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7489 (iv).
——— Retirement of President (Ans.) 1377 (i).
Newmarket and Holland River Canal, Survey, Estimate, &c. (Ans.) 1565 (i).
Nipigon Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6151 (iv).
Official Cars owned by Govt., Cost, Number, &c. (Ans.) 984 (i).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
Oil, Illuminating, for I.C.R., Quantity bought, Tenders for (Ans.) 448 (i).
Oil supplied I.C.R. by N. B. Petroleum Co., Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 172 (i).
Ottawa Carbide Co., Expenditure *re* Purchase (remarks) 986 (i).
Ottawa Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6175 (iv).
Owen Sound and Meaford Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6160 (iv).
Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 173 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 6067 (iii).
Payette, Phileas, Pet. *re* Damage to Health on N. T. Ry. Construction (Ans.) 5321 (iii).
Port Colborne Breakwater, Amount expended (Ans.) 447 (i).
P.E.I. Ry., Cardigan Branch, Completion of (Ans.) 1867 (i).
——— Damages to Expropriated Lands (remarks) re Ret., 2825 (ii).
——— Employees, Wages *re*, Publishing in Aud. Gen.'s Rep. (Ans.) 2549 (i).
——— Hillsborough Bridge, Claims for Damages *re* J. Haney Contract (Ans.) 1563 (i).
——— Land Purchase, Inadequate Compensation *re*, Charges (Ans.) 1865 (i).
——— Newspaper Selling Privileges, &c. (Ans.) 6247 (iv).
——— Shops, Rebuilding, Free Site from Summerside (Ans.) 2728 (i)
——— Stanley Bridge Survey, Ret. *re* (remarks) 3317 (ii).
——— Summerside Branch, Rep. *re* Earnings (Ans.) 1563 (i).
——— Surveys (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5174 (iii).
——— Wages paid Employees, on M. for Stmnt., 2951 (ii).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake, Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Carvell) in Com.. 2704 (ii).
Quebec Bridge, Obstructions to Navigation in St. Lawrence, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to adjn., 220 (i).
Ry. Act Amt. Bill (M.) for Special Com., 890 (i).
Ry. Act (crossings) Amt. B. 8 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 853; M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 859 (i).
Ry. Act (express cos.) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 787 (i).
Ry. Act (General) Amt. (B. 62) 1° m., 744; 2° m., and in Com., 1584 (i); in Com., 2566 (ii); 4068 (M.) to ref. to Sel. Com., 4077, 6089 (iii); 6183, 6205, 7065; 3° m., 7105; on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) Two-cent Tariff, 7107; on Senate Amts., 7639; Sen. Amts. agreed to (Y. 64; N. 24) 7646 (iv).
Railway Accidents, Inspector, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 6088 (iii).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*

Ry. Accidents in Canada, 1904-5, Investigations *re* (Ans.) 446 (i).

Railways and Canals, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 125 (i).

Railways and Canals, Ret. from (remarks) 840 (i).

Railway Cos. and Jurisdiction of Ry. Act, &c. (Ans.) 3969 (ii).

Railways in Dom., Control by Dom. Govt., Par. in Toronto 'Globe,' 3153 (ii).

Railway Statistics, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 2080 (ii).

Railway Subsidies Authorization (B. 214) prop. Res., 6119 (iv); in Com., 6129 (iv); 1° m., 6182; in Com., 6829; on M. for 3°, 6841 (iv).

Ry. Subsidies to Provincial Rys., &c. (Ans.) 2727 (ii).

Returns, on Inquiry for, 1367 (i).

——— on Inquiry for (Mr. Lefurgey) 2327 (ii).

Revillon Bros. Limited B. 76 (Mr. McCool) in Com., 3672 (ii).

Rideau Canal Reservation, Notice to Tenants to remove warehouses, &c. (Ans.) 4703 (iii).

Rideau Canal Water Power, Applications *re* Lease, Names, &c. (Ans.) 3742 (ii).

Roberval and James Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6156 (iv).

Ste. Agathe des Monts Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6171 (iv).

St. John, N.B., Grain Elevator, Cost, Capacity, &c. (Ans.) 2272 (ii).

St. Lawrence Power Co., Amounts paid for Electrical Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5346 (iii).

St. Mary's River Dredging, Amounts paid, Complaints *re* Approaches (Ans.) 450 (i).

St. Philippe Station I.C. Ry., Accommodation *re* Cars, &c. (Ans.) 993 (i).

St. Rose and Orangedale Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6164 (iv).

Scugog River Dams and Locks, Maintenance by Federal Govt. (Ans.) 1859 (i).

Seymour Narrows Survey, Action *re* Rep. of Transportation Commission (Ans.) 5322 (iii).

Sharbot Lake and Bathburst Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6143 (iv).

Shediac and Coast Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6160 (iv).

Skeffington, Detective on I.C.R., Dismissal, Charges, &c. (Ans.) 183 (i).

SUPPLY :

Canals—Beauharnois (weir regulating) 7512 (iv).

Canals—Carillon and Grenville (dams, slides) 5079 (iii).

Canals—Cornwall (Davis contract) 5344* (locks, rip-rap work) 5358 (iii).

Canals—Galops (channel completion) 5158; (leaks, &c.) 5080; (north channel) 5158; (north channel dam) 5357 (iii).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Canals—Lachine (coal tax) 7511 (iv); (lock repairs) 5358 (iii); (medical attendance) 7500 (iv); (slope walls) 5079 (iii); (staff salaries) 7483 (iv).

Canals—Quebec (re-marking boundaries) 5080 (iii).

Canals—Rideau (swing bridges) 5174 (iii).

Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 5165, 5357 (iii).

Canals—Soulanges (construction) 5357 (iii).

Canals (Trent, Balsam Lake) 5343; (construction) 5166; (Holland river) 5167; (improvements) 5172 (iii); (staff, repairs, &c.) 7499 (iv); (tugs) 5360 (iii).

Canals—Welland (electric plant) 5161, (iii); (gratuities) 7500 (iv); (Port Colborne deepening) 5357; (Port Colborne elevators) 5165; (Port Colborne entrance) 5165; (summit level) 5358 (iii).

Canals—Williamsburg (gate-lifter) 5358 (iii).

Civil Govt.—Railways and Canals (salaries) 5014 (iii).

Railways, G.T.P. (surveys, &c.) 5115 (iii).

Railways—I.C.R. (air brakes) 5074 (iii); (bridges) 7481 (iv); (bridge strengthening) 5016 (iii), 7502 (iv); (Campbellton) 5070; (coal handling machinery) 5357; (collection of revenue) 5343; (double tracking) 5356; (Drummondville improvements) 5070; (engine houses, &c.) 5070 (iii); (facilities) 7503 (iv); (increased facilities) 5079; (Halifax accommodation) 5071 (iii), 7483; (Indiantown branch) 7503 (iv); (Levis accommodation) 5355; (Mitchell, diversion) 5070 (iii); (Moncton shops) 7501 (iv); (Newcastle) 5070; (Pictou accommodation) 5075; (Pictou landing) 5073; (rolling stock) 5076 (iii), 7501; (Rothesay) 7501; (St. Moise station) 7483; (side ladders) 7501; (spur lines) 7502 (iv); (Sydney Mines) 5075; (Truro) 5073 (iii); (water service) 7481 (iv).

Railways—Miscellaneous (Gov. Gen.'s cars) 7511 (iv); (litigation) 5179; (surveys) 5174 (iii).

Railways—P.E.I. (Charlottetown) 5149 (iii).

Railways—Ry. Commission (maintenance) 7513 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.B. (Cape Tormentine) 6936 (iv).

Sussex Station, I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5074 (iii).

Tate Dry Dock, Lessee, Rental, &c. (Ans.) 1374 (i).

Ties delivered at Rogersville by Messrs. Buckley, Gallant and Mahoney, Inspection *re* (Ans.) 2724; (remarks) 2270 (ii).

Toronto, Niagara and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 134 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 4390 (iii).

Transportation for Passengers and Freight, Increases in Rates on I.C.R. (Ans.) 583 (i).

Trent Canal, Arrangements *re* Control of Tributary Waters (Ans.) 834 (i).

——— Construction, on Inquiry for Ret., 1581 (i).

——— Eastern Section, Depth of (Ans.) 836 (i).

——— Investigation *re* Route, Damage to Lift Locks, &c. (Ans.) 202 (i).

Emmerson, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
Trent Canal, Inquiry *re* Faulty Construction, Remuneration, &c. (Ans.) 189 (i).
——— Kirkfield Lift Lock, &c., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Cor., 3256 (ii).
——— Precautions *re* Levels, Date of Break, &c. (Ans.) 589 (i).
——— Supt., Instructions to Mr. Pearson (Ans.) 1860 (i).
——— Surveys from Rice Lake, Damages *re* Break in Locks (Ans.) 449 (i)
——— Waters from Balsam Lake, &c., Cost of Opening up (Ans.) 588 (i).
——— Water Power, Control by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 199 (i).
——— Water Power, Lease or Sale of (Ans.) 1379 (i).
Twelve Mile Power Co.'s incorp. B. 183 (Mr. Thompson) on Senate Amts., 7271 (iv).
Vancouver, Fraser Valley and Southern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 87 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 2710, 3187 (ii).
White Fish Island, and Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co. (Ans.) 833 (i).
Williamsburg Canal, Staff and Repairs, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 982 (i).
Windsor, Essex and Lake Shore Rapid Ry. Co.'s B. 150 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 5225 (iii).
Weeks, W. A., Appmnt. by Govt. *re* P. E. I. Ry. Claims (Ans.) 586 (i).
Wellington and Union Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6143 (iv).
Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6159 (iv).
Woods Co., Amounts paid to for Supplies by Transcontinental Ry. Commission Construction (Ans.) 449 (i).
——— Payments to for Supplies, &c. (Ans.) 980 (i).

Ethier, Mr. J. A. C., *Two Mountains.*
Lord's Day B. 12, on M. for 3°, 7331 (iv).
Ry. Subsidies, Authorization B. 214 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 6172 (iv).
Ste. Agathe des Monts Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6172 (iv).
Tobacco Culture in Two Mountains, Requests for Seed, (Ques.) 584 (i).

Fielding, Hon. W. S. (Minister of Finance), *Shelburne and Queen's, N.S.*
'Acadia' SS. Co.'s Subsidy, Govt. Aid to. (Ans.) 3250 (ii).
Annuities to ex-Ministers: *See* 'Privy Councillors.'
'Arctic' Str., Expedition, Com. of Investigation *re* Expenditure, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3641 (ii).
Art Unions: *See* 'Criminal Code B. 209.'
Aud. Gen.'s Rep., Presented in Instalments (remarks) 6127 (iv).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Bell Telephone Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Bureau) in Com., 4388 (iii).
See 'Ry. B. 62.'
Budget, The, (financial statement) 3819 (ii).
——— (remarks) 2018 (i), 3411 (ii).
Business of the House (remarks) 1742 (i).
See 'Govt. Business.'
Cannington Postmaster, Dismissal, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) *re* quoting articles, 2468 (ii).
Cement purchased for Lighthouse Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4927 (iii).
Cinq-Mars, Criticism in 'La Presse,' *re* Members, on M. (Mr. Foster) to summon before Bar of Hse., 4718 (iii).
Coal purchased by Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2913 (ii).
Committees, Sel., Power to recommend Expenditures (remarks) 7460 (iv).
See 'Internal Economy,' &c.
Criminal Code (art unions) Amt. (B. 209) in Com., 7660 (iv).
——— (M.) to place on Govt. Orders, 7599 (iv).
Cullers Office, Quebec, Apptmnt. of Supervisor (Ans.) 3245 (ii).
Currency Act Amt. (B. 196) 1° m., 5082; 2°*, and in Com., 5557 (iii).
Customs Tariff Act (steel rails) Amt. (B. 175) 1° m., 4029; 2°*, and in Com., 5102 (iii).
Electoral Lists for N. S., Printing by Dom. Govt., Distribution of Copies, &c. (Ans.) 2455 (ii).
Empire Trust Co.'s B. 135 (Mr. Worthington) in Com., 5221, 5682 (iii).
Estimates, Suppl. (1906)—(presented) 2016 (i), 5697 (iii).
Fiscal Year (B. 162) 1° m., 3065 (ii); 2°*, and in Com., 5093, 5560 (iii).
Fort William Terminal Ry. and Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. 120 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 5401 (iii).
Fruit Marks Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2561 (ii).
German Tariffs in Relation to Canada, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 1881 (i).
——— Changes, &c., on Inquiry for, 3713 (ii), 7359 (iv).
——— Translation of (remarks) 4994 (iii).
Gold and Silver Marks Act Amt. (B. 211) 1°*, 5992 (iii); 2° m., 6248; in Com., 7565 (iv).
Govt. Business (remarks) 5532 (iii).
See 'Business.'
Govt. Steamers, Expenditure *re* Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4920 (iii).
See 'Arctic,' &c.
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s Act Amt. (B. 215) 2°*, and in Com., 6857 (iv).
G. T. P. Ry., Surveys from Quebec to Moncton, &c., on M. (Mr. Crocket) for Ret., 1737 (i).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
House of Commons Rules, in Com. on Rep., 7608, 7463 (iv).
See 'Committees,' &c.
Immigration Act Amt. B. 170 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5209, 5258; on Amts., 5412 (iii).
Insurance, Life, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) for Special Com., 3978 (ii).
——— Inquiry *re* Assessment Plans (Ans.) 5321 (iii).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 2826 (ii).
——— Legislation and Insurance Commission (remarks) 3236 (ii).
——— Reps. and Documents, &c. (presented) 1840 (i).
——— Retirement of Directors of Manufacturers' Co. (remarks) 2233 (ii).
I.C.R., Halifax to Guysborough Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res. (amt.) 6180 (iv).
——— Moncton Land, Purchase from Mr. Hewson, on Amt. (Mr. Ames) to Com. of Sup., 5841 (iii).
Internal Economy Com., and Salaries of House of Commons Officials (remarks) 7055 (iv).
See 'Committees.'
Inter-Ocean Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 60 (Mr. Bole) in Com., 3953 (ii).
La Banque Provinciale du Canada B. 49 (Mr. Bergeron) in Com., 3236 (ii).
La Compagnie d'Assurance Mutuelle B. No. 88 (Mr. J. A. Ross) in Com., 4942 (iii).
Lands purchased by Companies, &c., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3277 (ii).
Loan Companies B. 40 (Mr. Zimmerman) in Com., 3277 (ii).
——— (M.) to ref. to Govt. Orders, 6856 (iv).
Lord's Day B. 12 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5676 (iii), 6607; (Jews) 6312, 6327; (Amt. *re* Jews) 6359; (towing logs, &c.) 6656 (iv).
——— on M. (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. to strike out amt. (Mr. T. Martin) *re* ball games, 7281 (iv).
——— on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* Amt. (Mr. Porter) 7299 (iv).
——— on Amt. (Mr. D. Ross) *re* industrial processes, 7225 (iv).
Lotteries: *See* 'Criminal Code,' &c.
Maganetawan Lighthouse, Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4129 (iii).
Members appointed to Govt. Positions (remarks) *re* Answer to former Question, 6545 (iv).
Mess. from His Ex. (presented) 5697 (iii).
Ministers and Depy. Ministers practising in Courts, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 2806 (ii).
Ministers-ex, Indemnity: *See* 'Privy Councillors.'
Money Lenders Act Amt. (B. 11) in Com., 6805 (iv).
——— (remarks) 4990 (iii), 6677 (iv).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Montreal Harbour Commissioners B. 222 (Mr. Brodeur) prop. res., 5616 (iii), in Com., 6852 (iv).
N. T. Ry. Act Amt. (B. 215) 1° m., 6244 (iv).
See 'G. T. P.'
Nipigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6152 (iv).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Contracts, O.C., Signatures missing &c. (Ans) 2082 (ii).
——— Contract, ref. to in Debate on 'Arctic,' 3645 (ii).
——— Refusal of Mr. Preston to answer Questions, on M. (Mr. Monk) 4477 (iii).
Norwegian Shipping Competition, Par. in 'Sydney 'Record,' 4087 (iii).
Pacific Cable Deficits, Statement (read) 7692 (iv).
Pictou Voters' Lists, Affidavits *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3950 (ii).
Pilotage Fund, Defalcations of D. McLean, Investigation *re* (remarks) 5437 (iii).
Preston, W. T. R.: *See* 'North Atlantic,' &c., Public Accounts Com.'
Privy Councillors Annuity (pension) Repeal (B. 220) 1° m., 6541; 2° m., 7569; 3° m., 7649, 7658 (iv).
Privy Councillors, Payment of Annuities, Names, &c. (Ans.) 2035 (ii).
Public Accounts Co., Burking of Investigation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4112 (iii).
——— Reps., Printing, &c. (remarks) 7458 (iv).
——— Statement *re* Witnesses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4110 (iii).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners B. 174 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 3927 (ii).
Ry. Act (telephones) Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 6241 (iv).
Ry. Subsidies, Amounts earned, &c. (remarks) 7062 (iv).
Ry. Subsidies, Authorization B. 214 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 6139; in Com., 6832; on M. for 3°, 6842 (iv).
Revillon Brothers, Limited B. 75 (Mr. McCool) on Senate Amts., 6706 (iv).
Rules of the Hse.: *See* 'House of Commons.'
St. John's Military School, Medical Officer, Name and Qualifications (Ans.) 4704 (iii).
San Francisco Disaster, Mess. from His Ex., Suppl. Estimates, 1749 (i).
——— Com. from British Ambassador at Washington (remarks) 2083 (ii).
——— Govt. Aid applied to Relief of Canadians (remarks) 2891 (ii).
——— Proposed Aid (remarks) in Com. on Res., 4352 (iii).
——— Disposal of Relief Fund (remarks) 5530 (iii).
Sessions, Length of: *See* 'Fiscal Year Bill.'
Shanghaiing in B. C. (remarks) 4995 (iii).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Ships Safety B. 48 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 6865 (iv).
——— (M.) to transfer to Govt. Orders, 6856 (iv).
Speaker's Apartments, Expenditure *re*, on Inquiry (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 7358 (iv).
Standard Trust Co.'s B. 147 (Mr. Bole) in Com., 4942; on M. for 3°, 5002 (iii).
Steel Rails Tariff: *See* 'Customs Bill.'
Supply B. 178 (San Francisco Aid) Prop. Res., in Com., 1°*, 2°*, 3°*, 4352-4 (iii).
Supply (B. 225) 1°*, 2°*, in Com. and 3°, 7636, 7649 (iv).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c., (Year-book) 7384 (iv).
Charges of Management (Receiver General) 7451 (iv); (salaries) 7451 (iv).
Civil Government—Aud. Gen's Office (salaries) 7573; (iv), Finance Dept. (dep. min.) 7452; Gov. Gen's Sec. Office (contingencies) 7579; Sec. of State (salaries) 7573; (iv).
Finance—Miscellaneous (tariff commission) 7455 (iv).
Insurance (clerical assistance) 7578; (Royal Commission) 7581 (iv).
Labour Dept. (Gazette) 7445 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subsidies (Newfoundland and Canada) 7557 (iv).
Metric System (lectures) 2613 (ii).
Miscellaneous (Arctic polar expedition) 7579; (Art Gallery) 7576; (British Medical Association) 7577; (Canadian Art International Catalogue of Scientific literature) 7578; (Dom. and Provs. litigated matters) 7577 (legal advice, Aud. Gen.) 7577; (monuments) 7578; (Naturalization Act) 7576; (Pacific cable) 7577; (scientific literature) 7576 (iv).
Pensions (militiamen) 7575 (iv).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (temporary employees) 6768; Harbours ond Rivers—N. S. (Georgeville wharf) 6787 (iv); Que. ('Galveston' dredge) 2922 ; (St. Lawrence Channel, lighting) 2913 (ii); Telegraph Lines (P.E.I. and mainland) 6770 (iv).
Railways— G. T. P. (surveys, &c.) 5134; I.C.R. (rolling stock) 5077 (iii).
Senate (gratuities) 7579; (salaries) 7573 (iv).
Supreme Court of Judicature of N. B., B. 224 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7193 (iv).
Telephones : *See* 'Ry. B. 62,' &c., 'Bell, &c.'
Trust Funds Investment, Securities, Provincial Subsidies, &c. (remarks) 1579 (i).
United Empire Bank of Canada B. 50 (Mr. Belcourt) in Com., 3242 (ii).
United Empire Life Insurance Co's incorp. B. 90 (Mr. Pardee) on Sen. Amts., 7271 7370 iv).
Usury : *See* 'Money Lenders Bill.'
Ventilation of Chamber (remarks) 7367 (iv).
Ways and Means (M.) for Com.—The Budget, 3819 (ii).
Ways and Means in Com., 7636 (iv).

Fielding, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Western Loan and Trust Co's incorp. B. 35 (Mr. Adamson) in Com. 3237 (ii).
Winnipeg Trust and Loan Co.'s B. 129 (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com., 6053 (iii).
Woods, James W., Total Amount paid for Supplies from 1897-1905 (Ans.) 1858 (i).

Finlay, Mr. J., *East Peterborough.*
Railway Act (express companies) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 792 , 815 (i).

Finlayson, Mr. D., *Richmond, N.S.*
Immigration Act Amt. B. 170 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5244 ; on Amts., 5412 (iii).
Ship Safety B. 48 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 6866 (iv).
SUPPLY :
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 4859 (iii).

Fisher, Hon. S. (Minister of Agriculture), *Brome.*
Address, on The, 77 (i).
Agricultural Committee of the H. of C., Translation of Proceedings, (Ans.) 575 (i).
Animals slaughtered, Compensation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2686 (ii).
Apples, Inspection for Export, Quality, &c., Cor., on M. (Mr. E. D. Smith) for Copies, 1382 (i).
See 'Fruit B. 101', &c.
Beef and Cattle Industry, Complaints *re* Condition (Ans.) 4705 (iii).
Bell Telephone Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Bureau) in Com., 6004 (iii).
Brockville Cheese Curing Room, Correction *re* Answer to Mr. Taylor, 969 (i).
——— Further Reference to Question, 1008 (i).
See 'Cheese', &c.
Butter and Cheese, Public Weigher, Apptmnt. of Montreal, (Ans.) 4704 (iii).
Butter manufactured at Experimental Farms, N.S., Quantity, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 5181 (iii),
Cattle Disease in Victoria County, Amounts paid for Losses (Ans.) 421 (i).
Central Experimental Farm, Total Expenditure for 1904-5 (Ans.) 2264 (ii).
Chamberlain, Dr. T. F., Apptmnt. by Govt. (Ans.) 5004 (iii).
Cheese Curing Room at Brockville, Total Cost and Revenue .(Ans.) 585 (i).
——— Total Expenditure and Revenue (Ans.) 587 (i).
See 'Brockville', &c.
Cheese Curing Rooms, Total Expenditure, Explanation *re* Statement furnis'd, 2240 (ii).
——— Statement *re* questions, 2323 (ii).
Criminal Statistics Report (presented) 1667 (i).
D'Arcy Island Lazaretto, B.C., Supervision by Dom. Govt. (remarks) in Com. on Leprosy Bill, 2186 (ii).
D'Israeli Wharf, Expenditure *re*, 3484 (ii).

Fisher, Hon. S.—*Con.*
Erie-Ontario Power Co.'s B. 107 (Mr. German) in Com., 2668 (ii).
Experimental (Central) Farm, Total Expenditure from 1890 to 1905 (Ans.) 761 (i).
Experimental Farm at P.E.I. (Ans.) 575 (i).
Experimental Farms, Number maintained by Govt., Total Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 974 (i).
Experimental Farm Rep. (presented) 1561 (i).
Fish Hatcheries, Establishment of on Great Lakes (Ans.) 190 (i).
Fruit Marks Act Amt. (B. 101) 1° m., 1364 (i); 2°*, and in Com., 2162; in Com., 2550, 2565 (ii).
German Tariffs in Relation to Canada, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 1911 (i).
Glanders, Number of Horses tested with Mallein Test in Man. and N.W.T. (Ans.) 336 (i).
Glanders, Quarantine of Animals (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2683 (ii).
Glanders in Man., Slaughtering Horses, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7443 (iv).
See 'Mallein'.
Govt. Vessels, Number of officers, Crews, &c. (Ans.) 995, 1100 (i).
Grain inspection Amt. (B. 207) 1°*, 2615; 2°, 5886; in Com., 5896 (iii).
G. T. P. Ry., Contracts, Reps. *re* Awarding (remarks) 1464 (i).
G.T.P. Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 61 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 4563 (iii).
Hay Trade Regulations, Violation, Penalties, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beauparlant) 4010 (ii).
Hog Plague, Quarantine, West and East Kent, &c. (Ans.) 174 (i).
——— M. for Copies (Mr. Clements) 652 (i).
House of Commons Rules, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to consider Rep., 7462 (iv).
Imperial Institute, Explanation of Vote, Rep. of Mr. Hutchinson (read) 705 (i).
——— Explanation of Vote (remarks) on M. for 1° of Interim Supply Bill, 658 (i).
Johnson, Mr., Dominion Statistician, Superannuation of (Ans.) 3971 (ii).
Labour Statistics Repeal (B. 109) 1° m., 1562 (i); 2°*, and in Com., 2161 (ii).
Leprosy (B. 115) 1°*, 1576 (i); in Com., 2185 (ii).
Lord's Day B. 12, on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* Amt. (Mr. Porter) 7300; in Com. (Jews) 6343 (iv).
Mallein Tests for Glanders, Number during 1905 (Ans.) 179 (i).
——— from B. C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2691 (ii).
See 'Cattle'.
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. (B. 206) 1° m., 5615; 2°*, and in Com., 5904 (iii); 3° m., 6127 (iv).

Fisher, Hon. S.—*Con.*
Maple Syrup Adulteration, on prop. Res. (Mr. Boyer) 1413 (i).
Mexican Tramways Co.'s B. 96 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 2667 (ii).
Moberley, J. H., Emplymt. by Govt. (remarks) 6793 (iv).
——— Emplymt. as Enumerator (explanation) 6930 (iv).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7436 (iv).
Montreal Harbour (reorganization) Commissioners B. 124 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 2218, 2653 (ii).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contracts, Charges *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Sup., 2412 (ii).
Pictou Cattle Disease (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7440 (iv).
Poultry Stations, Total Expenditure and Revenue (Ans.) 587 (i).
Preferential Tariff, Speech *re* with G. B. (remarks) in deb. on Address, 77 (i).
Public Works, Expenditure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 3484 (ii).
Ry. Act Amt. (telephones) B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 6100, 6105 (iii).
Supply B. 56 (Mr. Paterson) on M. for 1°, 658 (i).

SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 2669 (ii), 7372; (bulletins, printing, &c.) 7411; (census and statistics) 7379; (cold storage) 7412, 7419; (dairying industries) 7419; (exhibition, Charlottetown) 7440; (experimental farms) 7386; (grain inspection) 7428 (iv); (Patent Record) 2676 (ii); 7379; (quinquennial census) 7437 (iv); (Year Book) 2682 (ii); 7382 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Public Works (promotions) 7033 (iv).
Indians—Man. (industrial schools) 5991 (iii).
Quarantine, &c. (animals health) 2683 (ii), 7440 (iv); (Gross Isle Str.) 2697 (ii).
Tobacco Culture in Two Mountains, Requests for Seed (Ans.) 585 (ii).
Toledo Glass Co.'s Patent Relief B. 110 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3680, 3725 (ii).
Ventilation of Chamber, &c. (remarks) 7361 (iv).
Ventilation on SS. carrying Perishable Goods, &c. (Ans.) 569 (i).
Wrecks on St. Lawrence, 1905, Total Loss, &c. (Ans.) 171 (i).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. Charles (Minister of Justice), *Quebec County.*
Alien Labour Act, Appeal *re* Judgment of Judge Anglin (remarks) 343 (i).
Bell Telephone Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Bureau) on M. for Com., 3955; in Com., 3965 (ii).
Binder Twine manufactured at Kingston, Quantity on Hand, Price, &c. (Ans.) 2038 (ii).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. C.—*Con.*
Canada Evidence Act Amt. (B. 68) 1°*, 890; 2° m., and in Com., 1265, 1751 (i).
Cigarettes, Legislation *re* Resolution of House (Ans.) 215 (i).
Cochrane, Fred., Taken Prisoner by Russians (remarks) 841 (i).
County Court Judges, Division of Districts, Population of, &c. (Ans.) 1153 (i).
County Court Judges in Ont., Regulations *re* Number, Amt. of Chap. 54, &c. (remarks) *re* Question, 1747 (i).
County Court Judges MacTavish, O'Meara, &c. Date of Commission, Population of Counties, &c. (Ans.) 2037 (ii).
Criminal Code (witnesses) Amt. (B. 155) 1° m., 2452; in Com., 3099 (ii).
Dominion Police Commissioner's Rep. (presented) 269 (i).
Duryea, Chester B., Patent Relief B. 79 (Mr. Belcourt) in Com., 2196 (ii).
Elections of Members, Corrupt Practices, &c. on M. for Com. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 211; on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Sel. Com., 246; (M.) for Com, 252 (i).
Electric Power and Gas Exportation Regulation (B. 145) 1° m., 2159; 2° m., 3077; in Com., 3078 (ii), 4035 (iii).
Exchequer Court Act (liability) Amt. (M. 156) 2°*, in Com., 3523; 3°*, 3528 (ii).
Flour for Penitentiaries, Tenders *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 940 (i).
See 'Penitentiaries.'
Forest Reserves B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 3546 (ii).
Game Preservation, Unorganized Territories Act Amt. (B. 154) 1°*, 2451 (ii).
G.T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 84 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 2247 (ii).
G.T.Ry. and I.C.R. Arbitration, on Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 225 (i).
Indemnity Bill: *See* 'Senate,' &c.
Indian (J. W. Lewis) Enfranchisement B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2830 (ii).
Insurance Commission, Apptmnt. of Mr. Langmuir (remarks) 836 (i).
——— Conduct of Proceedings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 307 (i).
——— Expenditure and Remuneration, on M. for 1° of Supply Bill, 696 (i).
——— Report submitted (remarks) 316 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) for Special Com., 3988; Memorandum by Mr. Shepley (read) 3990 (ii).
Interpretation Act Amt. (B. 171) 1° m., 3904; Memorandum by Dep. Min. of Justice (read) 3904 (ii)
Judges acting as Directors, &c. in Business, &c. (Ans.) 183 (i).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. C.—*Con.*
Judges and Outside Business, Circular Letter and Replies to, (remarks) 1574 (i).
Judges for Court of Appeal, Man. (M.) to wthdr. Res., 3907 (ii).
Judges of Provincial Courts Act Amt. (B. 83) 1° m., 1095; 2° m., and in Com., 1764; 3° m., 1777 (i).
Judges of Provincial Courts (arbitrators, &c.) Amt. B. 13 (Mr. Lennox) on M. for 2°, 868 (i).
Judges' Salaries, Amount of Work performed, &c., on M. (Mr. Lennox) for Ret. 770 (i).
Justice (Penitentiaries) Deptl. Rep. (presented) 484 (i).
Keech, Hiram, Apptmnt. by Govt. as Sales Agent, &c. (Ans.) 198 (i).
Kentville Rifle Range, Ref. to Courts and Awards, &c. (Ans.) 195 (i).
Labour Statistics Repeal B. 108 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 1562 (i).
Leprosy B. 115 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2188 (ii).
Lord's Day Observance (B. 12) 1° m., 19; 2° m., 1010; Ref. to Special Com. (M.) 1203 (i).
Masters and Mates Certificates B. 7 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 464; in Com., 467 (i).
Members Indemnity: *See* 'Senate and House of Commons,' &c.
Ministers and Deputy Ministers practising in Courts, on Prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 1708 (i); 2788; (amt.) 2789; agreed to (Y. 89; N. 54) 2808 (ii).
——— on Order being called (remarks) 1397 (i).
Money Lenders' Act Amt. (B. 11) 1° m., 19; 2° m., and in Com., 352; (M.) to ref. to Special Com., 1259 (i).
Naturalization of Aliens, Uniformity of Laws relating to, on M. for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 346 (i).
Penitentiaries, Contract *re* Flour supplied (Ans.) 341 (i).
——— List of Names, on M. (Mr. Taylor) for Copy, 774 (i).
See 'Flour,' 'Justice.'
Penitentiary Salaries (B. 176)—(M.) for Com. on Res., 3907; in Com. on Res., 4077; 1°*, 4084 (iii).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake, Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Carvell) in Com., 2704 (ii).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners B. 174 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 3930 (ii).
Ry. Act (arbitrations) Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 458 (i).
Ry. Act (crossings) Amt. B. 8 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 857 (i).

Fitzpatrick, Hon. C.—*Con.*

Ry. Act (express cos.) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 800 (i).

——— on Order being called for resuming adjnd. debate, 1710 (i).

Ry. Act (liability) Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Lennox) on M. for 2°, 886 (i).

Ry. Act (Ry. Commission) Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 1°, 749, 579; in Com., 1587, 1599 (i), 4069 (iii).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary Employees, Increase of Salary, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 2268 (ii).

Sabbath Observance: *See* 'Lord's Day.'

Sault Ste. Marie, Legal Proceedings *re* Calling out Militia (Ans.) 2271 (ii).

Senate and House of Commons Act (corrupt practices) Amt. (B. 10) 1° m., 18; 2° m., and (M.) to ref. to Sel. Com., 351 (i).

Senate and House of Commons Act (sessional indemnity) Amt. (B. 97) 1° m., 1252; 2° m., 1777 (i); in Com., 1793 (i).

SUPPLY :

Civil Govt.—Justice (salaries) 359 (i).

Indians—Ont. and Que. (legal expenses) 731 (i).

Justice, Administration of (B. C. living allowances of Judges) 488; (Dom. Police) 490; (Exchequer Court) 488; (N. W. Ters.) 487; (Supreme Court) 488; (Yukon Ter.) 489 (i).

Miscellaneous (insurance inspection) 307 (i).

Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. (B. 67) 1°, 890; 2° m., 1259; in Com., 1261; on order for Com., 2161 (ii); (M.) for 3° discharged, 1584 (i); in Com., 3506,3519; 3°*, 3523 (ii).

Supreme Court, Ad Hoc Judges, Apptmt., of (remarks) 3068 (ii).

——— Judges, Absence of, Apptmt. of Ad Hoc Judges (Ans.) 1103 (i).

——— References by Gov. Gen. in Council (Ans.) 1678 (i).

Usury Bill : *See* 'Money Lenders.'

West Ontario Pacific Railway Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 1140 (i).

Foster, Hon. Geo. E., *North Toronto.*

Acoustics of Chamber: *See* 'Questions."

Address, on The, 60 (i).

Annuities: *See* 'Privy Councillors.'

Apples : *See* "Fruit".

Arbitrations and Awards, Payments to Civil Servants, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Supply, 371 (i).

'Arctic,' Str., Amounts expended for Supplies, Repairs, &c., (Ques.) 980.

——— Expedition, Com. of Investigation *re* Expenditure, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3631 (ii).

——— on M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) to conc. in Rep. of Special Com., and Amt. (Mr. Northrup) 6519 (iv).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*

Aud. Gen.'s Rep., Delay in presenting (remarks) 14, 484 (i).

Bell Telephone Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Bureau) in Com., 5997 (iii).

See 'Ry. B. 62," &c.

Belmont Disaster, Claims for Damages (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7509.

Brooks, F. L. & Co., Payments to (Ques.) 1103 (i).

Brothier, D., Release of from B. C. Penitentiary (remarks) 5329 (iii), 7526 (iv).

Budget, The, Inquiry for, 2018 (i).

——— (reply) 3839 (ii).

Buoys, Foreign-Made, Purchased by Canadian Govt. for Canada (Ques.) 3407 (ii).

Canadian Economic Lubricant Co., Amounts paid to, Contracts, &c., (Ques.) 987 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry., Land Subsidy, Extension of Area, &c., (Ques.) 1858 (i).

Cement purchased for Lighthouse Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4924 (iii).

Cinq-Mars, Criticism in 'La Presse', Ques. of Privilege, 4030 (iii).

——— (M.) to summon before Bar of the House, 4708-11 (iii).

——— Quotations read *re* Constitutional Practice, 4733 (iii).

Cinq-Mars before the Bar of the House, (M.) that Article be now read from Journals of former meeting of House, 4792; on M. (Mr. Jackson) to translate article, 4795; Questions asked, 4796 (iii).

Cinq-Mars, Constitutionality of Procedure : Ques. of Privilege, Case of Mr. Redmond in British House of Commons, Quoted, &c., 5085 (iii).

Cinq.-Mars, Summoned for further examination, on M. (Mr. Foster) 5268; on Amt. (Mr. Aylesworth) 5269 (iii).

——— Charges *re* Speeches at London, Ont., Denial of, 5438 (iii).

——— Statement *re* Speech at Renfrew (denial) 5301 (iii).

Coal Lands leased, sold, &c., from 1896 to 1905, Areas, Names, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1741

Colonization Lands, Inquiry for Ret., 3952 (iii).

——— O. C., quoted by Mr. D. Ross in Debate, Inqiry for, 2080 (ii).

——— Rep. of Mr. Stevenson, Inquiry for, 4029 (iii).

Coms. : *See* "Printing".

Coughlin, J. B., Payments to for Supplies, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 981 (i).

Court of Appeal, Man. (salaries) Bill (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 5010 (iii).

Crown Lands, Administration of by Dept. of Interior, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 4325 (iii).

See "Lands", &c.

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Currency Act Amt. B. 196 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5557 (iii).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 2022 (ii).
Dom. Lands Commissioner for 1902, 1903, 1904 (Ques.) 2268 (ii).
Duryea, Chester B., Patent Relief B. 79 (Mr. Belcourt) in Com., 2202 (ii).
Emerson Customs House, Irregularities, &c. (remarks) 1582 (i).
——— Re-instatement of Collector (remarks) 5995 (iii).
Express Cos.: *See* "Ry. B. 62", &c.
Fire Extinguishers for Lighthouses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4959 (iii).
Fiscal Year B. 162 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5094 (iii).
Flags on Parlt. Buildings on Dom. Day (remarks) 7186 (iv).
Fog Signals, Amounts paid to Canadian Fog Signal Co. (Ques.) 767 (i).
Forest Reserves B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5538 (iii).
Fruit Marks Act (apples) Amt. B. 101 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2162 (ii).
Gelinas, Mr., Travelling Expenses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 398 (i).
German Tariff, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 1202 (i).
Gobeil, Mr., Dep. Min. of Public Works, Acting as Arbitrator (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 371 (i).
See 'Arbitrations.'
Gold and Silver Marks Act Amt. B. 211 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7567 (iv).
Govt. Vessels, Complement of Officers and Crew, &c. (Ques.) 1100 (i).
——— Expenditure *re* Supplies for Str. 'Minto' (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4919 (iii).
——— Number of Officers, Crews, Emplymt. (Ques.) 994 (i).
See 'Arctic.'
G.T.P. Ry. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 5475, 5684, 5953, 6034 (iii).
G.T.P.Ry. Act (securities) Amt. B. 215 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6861 (iv).
G.T.P.Ry. Co., Mining Rights in Lands, O.C., Memorandum, &c., on Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3715 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Cor., 3909 (ii).
Gray, Franklin Montgomery, Patent Relief B. 122 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 4945 (iii).
Hatfield, Mr., Expenditure *re* rainmaking, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5934 (iii).
See 'Rainmaking.'
House of Commons Rules, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to consider Rep., 7461; in Com., 7463, 7601 (iv).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
House of Commons, Salaries, and Reps. of Committees (remarks) 7054 (iv).
See 'Printing Com.'
Immigration Act Amt. B. 170 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5196 (iii).
Immigration from Belgium (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1636 (i).
Immigration in G. B., Printing Contracts with Arundel Co., &c. (remarks) in Com. of Supply, 5515 (iii).
Imperial Institute, Explanation of Vote (remarks) on M. for 1°, of Interim Supply Bill, 658 (i).
Indemnities: *See* 'Privy Councillors.'
Insurance Commission, Instructions to Commissioner, *re* Methods, &c. (remarks) 5445 (iii).
I.C.R. and C.P.R., Comparisons *re* Accounts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5031 (iii).
I.C.R., Moncton Land Purchase from Mr. Hewson, on Amt. (Mr. Ames) to Com. of Sup., 5835 (iii).
Internal Economy Com.: *See* 'House of Commons,' &c.
Isle Bizard and Ste. Geneviève Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6969 (iv).
Japanese Treaty with G. B. (remarks) in Deb. on Address, 56 (i).
Justice, Administration of, Objections *re* Supply, 486 (i).
'Kestrel' Str., Tonnage, Officers and Crew, &c. (Ques.) 986 (i).
——— Ref. to in debate on 'Arctic' Expenditure, 3635 (ii).
Labour Statistics Repeal B. 109 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2161 (ii).
La Compagnie d'Assurance Mutuelle (Mr. J. A. Ross) in Com., 4942 (ii).
Land Grants to Ry., Selection by Ry. Cos., Govt. Policy on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) to Com. of Sup., 1027 (i).
Lands Sale by Govt., and Ry. Company, to Private Corporations, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 194 (i).
See 'Colonization,' 'Crown,' 'Saskatchewan Valley,' 'Nixon,' 'Wagner.'
Life Insurance: *See* 'Insurance,' &c.
Lighting System, *re* St. Lawrence Route, on Inquiry for Ret., 6545 (iv).
Lighthouses, Construction, Amount expended, &c. (Ques.) 988 (i).
Lord's Day Observance B. 12 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 2°, 1012; on M. to ref. to Special Com., 1203 (i); in Com., 5622, 5696, 5782 (iii), 6606; (Jews) 6341 (iv); (trains, &c.) 5701 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. Aylesworth) to strike out amt. (Mr. T. Martin) *re* ball games, 7285 (iv).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Galliher) 7254 (iv).

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Lord's Day B. 12, on Amt. (Mr. D. Ross) *re* industrial processes, 7227 (iv).
Marconi Wireless Stations, Amount expended (Ques.) 766 (i).
Marine Engineers in Yukon: *See* 'Roberts,' &c.
Merwin, Geo. T., Amounts paid to (Ques.) 767 (i).
Militia Act Amt. B. 201 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 5536 (iii).
Militia Land Grants, N. W. Rebellion B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4806 (iii).
Ministers' Annuities: *See* 'Privy Councillors.'
Money Lenders Act Amt. B. 11 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6805 (iv).
——— (remarks) 4990 (iii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners B. 222 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 6848 (iv).
Newspaper Criticisms: *See* 'Cinq-Mars.'
Nixon, Jos., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 194 (i).
——— Claim of James Daley *re* Payments to (Ques.) 1103 (i).
——— Claims of Mrs. Hodge *re* Payments to (Ques.) 1102 (i).
——— Further Rep. *re* Settlement with Purchasers (Ques.) 452 (i).
——— Land Agent at Macleod, Reps. *re* (M. for copies*) 774 (i).
See 'Lands,' &c.
Noble, W. H., Fraser, B. H., and Fraser, J. F., Employmt. by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 987 (i).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contracts, Charges against (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 1795 (i).
——— Notice of Motion, 1742 (i).
——— O. C., Contracts, &c., Signatures missing (remarks) 2081 (ii).
Ottawa Carbide Co., Amounts paid to Dec. 31st, 1905, (Ques.) 1099 (i).
——— Expenditure *re* Purchase of (Ques.) 986 (i).
See 'Willson.'
Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 176 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5393 (iii).
Pilotage Act Amt. B. 219 (Mr. Brodeur) on M. for 1°, 6538 (iv).
Placer Mining in the Yukon B. 153 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 3416 (ii), 4803 (iii).
Preston, W. T. R.: *See* 'North Atlantic.'
Printing Com., Rep. of Joint Com. on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. to Internal Economy, Com., 7054 (iv).
Private and Official Cars, Ret. ordered by Mr. Talton (remarks) 839 (i).
Privilege (Ques. of) Criticism in 'La Presse,' by Mr. Cinq-Mars, 4030 (iii).
See 'Cinq-Mars.'

Foster, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Privy Councillors Annuity (pension) Repeal B. 220 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 6542; on M. for 2°, 7570; in Com., 7621; on M. for 3°, 7649 (iv)
See 'Senate,' &c.
Provincial Elections in N. W., ref. to in deb. on Address, 68 (i).
Public Accounts Com., Meetings (remarks) 6801 (iv).
Public Works Employees, Payment for Extra Work, Cor. with Aud. Gen. (Ques.) 769 (i).
Quebec Harbour (deep water) Commissioners B. 174 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res. 3927 (ii).
Questions answered by Ministers not heard by members (remarks) 318 (i).
See 'Ventilation.'
Ry. Act (express cos.) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 788 (i).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. 1589 (i); (telephones) 6090 (iii).
Railway Subsidies Authorization B. 214 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 6830 (iv).
Rainmaking in the Yukon, Payment to by Yukon Council (M.) to adjn., 560 (i).
——— Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1209 (i).
——— Inquiry for O. C. *re* (remarks) 839 1008 (i), 2080 (ii).
——— Failure of Mr. Hatfield (remarks) 7187 (iv).
See 'Hatfield.'
Returns, of previous Session, Inquiry for, 12 (i).
Returns, Inquiry for, 456, 839, 1202 (i), 2160 (ii).
Roberts and Stevens, Messrs, Certificate as Engineers, Investigation *re* (remarks) on Conc., 7585 (iv).
Rocky Mountains Park Act Amt. B. 164 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4734 (iii).
Ross Rifles, Examination, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Supply, 7174 (iv).
Rules of the House: *See* 'House of Commons.'
Saskatchewan Public Lands, Transference to Private Corporations (Ques.) 324 (i).
Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Date of Contract, Condition *re* Settlement, &c. (Ques.) 2027 (i).
——— Purchase from Can. Northern Ry. Co., Date of Transfer, &c. (Ques.) 1745 (i).
School Lands Exchange B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 3910 (ii), 5191 (iii).
See 'Lands,' &c.
Senate and House of Commons Act (indemnity, &c.) Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7131 (iv).
See 'Privy Councillors.'
Sessions, Length of: *See* 'Fiscal Year.'

Foster, Hon. Geo. E.—*Con.*
Speaker's Apartments, Expenditure, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 7358 (iv)
Standard Trust Co's B. 147 (Mr. Bole) in Com., 4943 (iii)..
Steamers, Dom., Amounts paid for Supplies, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 981 (i).
SS. Subsidies, Statement *re* Operations, &c., (remarks) 568 (i).
Steel and Iron Ores, Smelting by Electrical Process (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5934
Supply B. 56 (Mr. Paterson) on M. for 1°, 658 (i).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 7372; (Yearbook) 7385 (iv).
Canals—Lachine (slope walls) 5079; Quebec (*re* marking boundaries) 5080 (iii).
Civil Govt.—Agriculture (salaries) 369 (i) ; Aud. Gen.'s Office (salaries) 7574 (iv); Customs (salaries) 360 (i); Geological Survey (director's salary) 5978 (iii); (salaries) 405 (i); Gov. Gen.'s Sec. Office (contingencies) 7579; (salaries) 357; High Commissioner's Office (salaries) 404; Indian Affairs (salaries) 366 (i), 5985 (iii); Inland Revenue (salaries) 367; Interior (salaries) 363, 404 (i), 5509, 5975 (iii); Justice (contingencies) 7529; (promotions) 7538 (iv); (salaries) 359; Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 370 (i), 7558 (iv); Militia (salaries) 359; N.W. Mounted Police (salaries) 360; Post Office (salaries) 401; Privy (salaries) 370 (i), 7558 (iv); Militia (salaries) 371 (i); Sec. of State (salaries) 7573 (iv).
Culling Timber (supervisors) 7542 (iv).
Customs (printing, &c.) 7515; Miscellaneous (refund to I. G. Baker & Co.) 7517 (iv).
Dom. Lands (Banff Park roads, &c.) 5942; (contingencies) 5939; (litigation) 5944 ; (mines branch) 5941; (outside service, salaries) 5936; (supt. of mines) 5934; (tree culture) 5939; (Yoho park roads) 5944 (iii).
Excise (duty collections) 7513 (iv).
Fisheries (Lake Winnipeg steamers) 7563; conc., 7598 (iv).
Gas Inspection (salaries) 7513 (iv).
Geological Survey (coast survey, launch) 5979; (experimental borings) 5982; (gold gravels, Yukon) 5981, 5985; (Nicolas, F., payments to) 5980; (specimens) 5983; (translation of reps.) 5983 (iii).
Immigration (agents, G.B., &c.) 1636 (i), 5509, 5967; (printing, &c.) 5514 (iii).
Indians—B.C. (medical attendance) 1079; (relief) 1079; (salaries) 1078; (seed) 1079 (i).
Indians—Man. and N.W.T. (triennial clothing) 943 (i).
Indians—Ont. and Que. (legal expenses) 728; (Robinson annuities) 723; (schools) 717; (surveys) 723 (i).
Indians—Yukon (medical attendance) 1208 (i).
Inspection of Staples (grain inspection) 7541 (iv).
Interior (assay office, B.C.) 5944; (maps, &c.) 5946; (mining institute) 5949 (iii).
Justice, Administration of (Dom. Police) 490; (Exchequer Court) 488; (N.W.Ters.) 487; (Supreme Court) 488; (Yukon Ter.) 490 (i); (Yukon living allowance) 7518 (iv).

Foster, Hon. Geo. E.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Justice—Miscellaneous (Canadian Law Library) 7528; (Comparative Legislation) 7529; (litigated matters) 7528; (Revised Statutes) 7527 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (gas buoys) 4951; (submarine signals) 4957; (supplies, &c.) 4938 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Annapolis and London) 7555; (Canada-Australia) 7556; (Canada and Newfoundland) 7557; (Canada and S. Africa) 7554; (G.B. and Can.) 7544; (Magdalen Islands) 7553; (Newcastle and Miramichi) 7556; (Pelee Islands) 7557; (Port Simpson and Queen Charlotte Islands) 7555; (St. John and Cumberland Basin) 7555; (St. John and Digby) 7549; (Victoria and San Francisco) 7553 (iv).
Militia (annual drill) 5013 (iii); (clothing) 7176; (library) 7182; (rifles, &c.) 7174 (iv).
Miscellaneous (Academy of Arts) 7576; (Arctic Polar expedition) 7579; (British Medical Association) 7577; (litigated matters, Dom. and Provs.) 7577; (Naturalization Act) 7576 (iv).
N.W. Mounted Police (N.W.T. and Yukon) 4967 (iii).
Ocean and River Service—(ice breaker, Lower St. Lawrence) 7559 (iv).
Penitentiaries—Kingston (binder twine) 7529 (iv).
Pensions (militiamen) 7575 (iv).
Public Works—Dredging, B.C. (new plant) 6996; (Ont. and Quebec new plant) 6995 iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, B.C. (Victoria harbour) 6995 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (Campbellton wharf) 6935; (Cape Tormentine) 6935; (Quaco extension) 6942; (St. John tidal waters) 6942 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Summerside harbour) 6933 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (St. Ane de Chicoutimi) 6980; (D'Israeli wharf) 6944, 6958; (Montmorency Falls) 6975; (Peribonka) 6975; (Three Rivers) 6980 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Sask. (North Saskatchewan survey) 6995 (iv).
Public Works—Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 6996 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (air brakes) 5074; (brige strengthening) 5019 (iii), 7502 (iv); (engine houses, &c.) 5070 (iii); (facilities) 7503; (Indiantown branch) 7503 (iv); (Levis accommodatio) 5355; (Pictou accommodation) 5075; (rolling stock) 5076 (iii); (spur lines) 7502 (iv).
Railways—Miscellaneous (Gov. Gen.'s cars) 7512; Railway Commission (maintenance) 7513 (iv).
Senate (gratuities) 7579; (salaries) 7573 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (commercial agencies) 7540; (Chinese immigration) 7539 (iv).
Yukon Ter. (Govtl. expenses) 5906; (local council, roads, &c.) 5934 (iii).
Supreme Court of Judicature, N.B. B. 224 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 1°, 6790; in Com., 7152; on M. for 3°, 7188 (iv).
Tariff Commission, Evidence, Printing, &c. (remarks) 201 (i).
Telephones: *See* 'Ry. B. 62,' &c.

Foster, Hon. Geo. E.—*Con.*
Timber Berths, Nos. 1158, 1175, &c., Leasing, Cor. &c. (M. for ret.*) 773 (i).
Timber Lands, sold or leased by Govt. (M. for ret.*) 345 (i).
——— Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 212 (i).
Toledo Glass Co.'s Patent Relief B. 110 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3725 (ii).
Usury: *See* 'Ventilation.'
Ventilation of House of Commons (remarks) 5617 (iii), 7362 (iv).
Veterans of Fenian Raids, Claims for Consumption, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 643 (i).
Wagner, Philip, Charges against, (M. for cor.*) 344 (i).
——— Charges *re* Political Interference in Elections, on Amt., (Mr. Fowler) to Com. of Sup., 5594 (iii).
——— (notice of motion) 5185 (iii).
——— Employment by Govt., Previous Imprisonment, &c. (Ques.) 194 (i).
Western Assurance Co.'s B. 199 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 5501 (iii).
Western Block Addition, Amount expended, &c. (Ques.) 194 (i).
Wharfs, Docks, &c., Ret. incomplete, &c. (remarks) 211 (i).
Willson, T. L., Payments to for Gas Buoys (Ques.) 767 (i).
Woods Co., Limited, Payments to from all Departments (Ques.) 979 (i).
——— Amounts paid for Supplies 1905 (Ques.) 1369 (i).
Wurts, Henry Patent Relief B. 106 (Mr. Belcourt) in Com., 2205 (ii).
Yukon Concessions, Bronson & Ray, Claims, Charges *re*, on M. for Sup., 1511 (i).
——— date of grant, conditions, expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 1744 (i).
——— Council, Supervision by Dom. Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1208 (i).
——— Gold Output and Royalties, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5930 (iii)
——— Marine Engineers on Boats: *See* 'Roberts,' &c.
——— Placer Mining: *See* 'Placer.'
——— Martin, Sugrue and Sylvestre, Messrs., Investigation into Irregularities in Yukon (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5932 (iii).
——— Wood Contracts, Papers *re* (remarks) 6801, 7639 (iv).

Fowler, Mr. G. W., *King's and Albert, N.B.*
Arbitrations and Awards, Payments to Civil Servants, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 376 (i).
'Arctic,' Str., Expenditure *re* Supplies, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3206 (ii).
——— Boiler Machinery, Payments *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4103 (iii).
Canada Evidence Act Amt. B. 68 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 1757 (i).

Fowler, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*
Conmee & Bowman, Charges by Mr. Bennett *re* Dredging Contracts, on Ques. of Order, 1306 (i).
Criminal Code (art unions) Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7661 (iv).
Forest Reserves B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2844 (ii).
Game Preservation Act (unorganized ters.) Amt. B. 154 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2826 (ii).
German Tariffs in Relation to Canada, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 1910 (i).
Gobeil, Mr., Dep Min. of Public Works acting as Arbitrator (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 376 (i).
G.T.P. Ry., Surveys between Quebec and Moncton, on M. (Mr. Crocket) for ret., 1727 (i).
G. T. Pacific Telegraph Co.'s incorp. B. 61 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 2716 (ii).
Halifax Drill Shed Property, Spring Garden Road, Disposition by Govt. (Ques.) 833 (i).
——— (M. for ret.*) 774 (i).
Halifax Garrison, Contract for Supplies, &c. (Ques.) 1862 (i).
House of Commons Rules, in Com. on Rep., 7608 (iv).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 170 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5252 (iii).
Imperial Institute, Explanation of Vote (remarks) on M. for 1° of Supply Bill, 683 (i).
Indian (J. W. Lewis) Enfranchisement B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2827 (ii).
Indian Reserves, B.C., Surrender of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 952 (i).
I. C. Ry., on Annual Statement (Mr. Emmerson) 297 (i).
——— Joughins Car Truck, Patentee, &c. (Ques.) 2729 (ii).
——— Location of New Shops at Moncton (Ques.) 1375 (i).
——— Moncton, Land purchased from Mr. Hewson (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 5061
——— Property, Thefts by Employees, Charges *re* (Ques.) 995 (i).
——— Stamps at Moncton, Investigation *re* Loss (Ques.) 1376 (i).
Judges of Provincial Courts (arbitrators) B. 13 (Mr. Lennox) in Com., 5387 (iii).
Judges of Provincial Courts (travelling) Amt. B. 83 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 1765 (i).
Lord's Day B. 12 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. (trains, &c.) 5705 (iii).
Military Council, Par. in Newspaper *re* Lord Aylmer's Statement (read) in Com. of Sup. 7180 (iv).
Money Lenders Act Amt. B. 11 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 352 (i).
Nicolet and Gaspe Representation (Ques.) 1865 (i).

Fowler, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract, Charges *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 2146 (ii).
Oak Point, P.E.I. Mail Service, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 1102 (i).
Oil for Illuminating, I.C.R., Quantity bought, Tenders for, &c. (Ques.) 448 (i).
Palmer's Point Lighthouse, Claims for Damages (Ques.) 6087 (iii).
Peck, L. C., Dismissal as Postmaster from Hopewell Hill, N.B., Investigation *re* (Ques.) 1375 (i).
Peer, John Albert Relief B. 169 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 5458 (iii).
Petroleum Company, N.B., Retirement of President (Ques.) 1377 (i).
Postmasters' Salaries, Policy of Govt. (remarks) 540 (i), 7450 (iv).
——— Pets. *re* Duties and Remuneration (Ques.) 1374 (i).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 4069 (iii)., 7077 (iv).
Richibucto Breakwater, Tenders *re* Contract (Ques.) 2031 (ii).
Robertson, Andrew C., Fishery Inspector, N. S., Appointment and Salary (Ques.) 4155 (iii).
Ross Rifles, Complaints, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7162 (iv).
Saddlery and Harness for Militia, Contracts and Advertisements, &c. (Ques.) 577 (i).
Senate Vacancies from N.B., &c. (Ques.) 992 (i).
SUPPLY :
Adulteration of Food (penalties) 2618 (ii).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 7394 (iv); (Year-book) 2682 (ii).
Canals—Trent (Holland River) 5168; Welland (electric plant) 5162 (iii).
Charges of Management (Receiver General) 7451 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 361 (i); Finance (salaries) 7453 (iv); Interior (salaries) 364 (i); (salaries) 7182 (iv); Public Works (salaries) 376 (i).
Customs (outside ports) 503 (i); Miscellaneous (refund to I. G. Baker & Co.) 7517 (iv).
Electric Light Inspection (salaries) 2610 (ii).
Finance Dept.—Miscellaneous (tariff commission) 7456 (iv).
Govt. of N.W.T. (registry offices) 5528 (iii).
Immigration (printing, &c.) 5517 (iii).
Indians—B.C. (medical attendance) 1082 ; (surveys) 952; Generally (Treaty No. 8) 1251 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (lightships) 4142 (iii); (Marconi stations) 7563 (iv).
Metric System (lectures) 2611 (ii).
Militia (annual drill) 7178; (clothing) 7176, 7181; (properties) 7173; (rifles, &c.) 7162; (Sussex camp) 7183 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 3206 (ii), 4097 (iii).
Post Office (mail service) 533 (i); (postmasters) 7450 (iv).

Fowler, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (D'Israeli wharf) 6945; (Sorel wharf) 7047 (iv).
Quarantine (animals health) 2686 (ii).
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys) 5121 (iii).
Railways—I.C.R. (bridges) 5045; (Halifax accommodation) 5073; (rolling stock) 5077; (Sydney Mines) 5075 (iii).
Supreme Court of Judicature, N.B., B. 224 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7148 (iv).
Sussex Rifle Range, Contract Price, Caretaker's Wages, &c. (Ques.) 577 (i).
Sussex Station, I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5074 (iii).
Thirteenth Scottish Dragoons, Charges *re* Transportation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7178 (iv).
Tower, West Block, Collapse, Inspection by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1288 (i).
Victoria Museum, Specifications *re* Stone, &c. (Ques.) 2031 (ii).
Wagner, Philip, Charges *re* Interference in Elections (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 5576; Neg. (Y. 41, N. 88) 5612 (iii).
Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 14 (Mr. Campbell) on M. for 2°, 879 (i).

Galliher, Mr. W. A., *Kootenay.*
Ashcroft, Barkerville and Fort George Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 89 (Mr. D. Ross) on Senate Amts., 5401 (iii).
B.C. Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 33) 1°*, 350 (i).
Calgary and Fernie Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 71) 1°*, 890 (i).
Cinq-Mars before Bar of House, on Amt. (Mr. Aylesworth) 5288 (iii).
Columbia and Kootenay Ry. Nav. Co.'s (B. 34) 1°*, 350 (i).
Crawford Bay and St. Mary's Ry. Co.'s (B. 53) 1°*, 656 (i).
Duryea, Chester B., Patent Relief B. 79 (Mr. Belcourt) in Com., 2195 (ii).
Fording River Valley Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 197) 1°*, 5180; in Com., 6035 (iii).
G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 5684 (iii).
Hillcrest Ry., Coal and Coke Co.'s incorp., (B. 157) 1°*, 2926 (ii); in Com., 4398 (iii).
Indemnity to Members and Pensions to Privy Councillors B. 18 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°*, 2985 (ii).
See 'Senate,' &c.
Judges of Provincial Courts (arbitrators, &c.) B. 13 (Mr. Lennox) in Com., 5381 (iii).
Judges of Provincial Courts (travelling) Amt. B. 83 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 1764 (i).
Kamloops and Yellowhead Pass Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 27) 1°*, 350 (i).
Kootenay and Arrowhead Ry. Co.'s (B. 30) 1°*, 350; in Com., 1145 (i).

Galliher, Mr. W. A.—*Con.*

Lord's Day, B. 12 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5651, 5699, 5773, 5792, (iii); (industrial plant) 6603, 6623; (Jews) 6348; (amt.) *re* mining industries, 7252 (iv); (newspapers) 5744 (iii); (shooting) 6256 (iv); (trains, &c.) 5718 (iii); on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) *re* Discussion on 3°*, 7194; on amts. being moved, 7234; on M. (Mr. Aylesworth) to strike out amt. (Mr. T. Martin) *re* ball games, 7287 (iv).

Mackintosh, Mary Eileen, Relief B. 185 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 6036 (iii).

Mexican Tramways Co.'s B. 96 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 2667 (ii).

Money Lenders Act Amt. B. 11 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 355 (i).

Nakusp and Slocan Ry. Co.'s (B. 32) 1°*, 350; in Com., 1297 (i).

Ry. Act, (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 6106 (iii), 6193, 6224 (iv).

Ry. Subsidies, Authorization B. 214 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 6179 (iv).

Senate and House of Commons Act (indemnity) Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 1793 (i).

Standard Trust Co.'s B. 147 (Mr. Bole) in Com., 4944 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Interior—Miscellaneous (caves in B. C., Payment to C. H. Duetschman) 5859 (iii).

Wurts, Henry Patent Relief B. 106 (Mr. Belcourt) in Com., 2205 (ii).

Ganong, Mr. G. W., *Charlotte, N.B.*

Cement purchased for Lighthouse Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4923 (iii).

Gallant, W. A., Employment of by Govt. (Ques.) 1104 (i).

Imperial Institute, Explanation of Vote (remarks) on M. for 1° of Supply Bill, 704 (i).

Leonardville, Deer Island Wharf Location, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 3251 (ii).

Lord's Day B. 12, in Com. (Jews) 6329 (iv).

Maple Syrup Adulteration, on prop. Res. (Mr. Boyer) 1418 (i).

Methyl. Alcohol, Import and Excise Duty, Quantity imported, &c. (Ques.) 5507 (iii).

North Head, N.B. Breakwater, Advertisement of Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 1105.

P.E.I. Winter Service, Ice-breakers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4837 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Lighthouse and Coast Service (gas buoys) 4964; (sub-marine signals) 4955 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 4837, 4866 (iii).

Weir Licenses, Charlotte Co., N.B., Granted, 1906 (Ques.) 1567 (i).

Ganong, Mr. G. W.—*Con.*

Wilson's Beach Breakwater, N.B., Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 576 (i).

——— Amount paid to J. M. Johnson (Ques.) 761 (i).

Woodstock Collector of Customs, Apptmnt. of, Complaint, &c. (Ques.) 3251 (ii).

Woodstock, N.B., Apptmnt. of Mr. L. C. Smith as Postmaster (Ques.) 1564 (i).

——— Leave of Absence (Ques.) 1378 (i).

Gauvreau, Mr. C. A., *Temiscouata.*

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 64) 1°*, 829 (i).

Coal Carriage for I.C.R., Surveys *re* Channel at River du Loup (Ques.) 454 (i).

G.T.P. Branch Lines Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 5687 (iii).

I.C.R. and Canadian Express Co.'s Service, Dissatisfaction *re* (Ques.) 5182 (iii).

——— Water Tanks and Round Houses, Tenders for, Names, &c. (Ques.) 763 (i).

Lighthouse Keepers Salaries, Increase of, (Ques.) 455 (i).

Geoffrion, Mr. V., *Chambly and Verchères.*

Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.'s (B. 37) 1°*, 444 (i).

German, Mr. W. M., *Welland.*

Buffalo, Niagara and Toronto Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 42) 1°*, 485 (i).

Canadian Niagara Power Co.'s (B. 36) 1°*, 444 (i).

Central Ry. Co. of Canada (B. 149) 1°*, 2321 (ii).

Cinq-Mars, Before Bar of House, on Amt (Mr. Aylesworth) 5283 (iii).

Electric Power Exportation Regulation B. 145 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 4044 (iii).

Erie Ontario Power Co.'s (B. 107) 1°*, 1465 (i); in Com., 2668 (ii).

Exchequer Court Act (liability) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 3527 (ii).

Fiscal Year B. 162 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5101 (iii).

Grand River and Western Power Co.'s incorp. B. 216 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 7001 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 170 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5231 (iii).

Lord's Day B. 12 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5698, 5813 (iii); (foreign newspapers) 6274 (iv).

Mather Bridge and Power Co.'s (B. 99) 1°*, 1364 (i).

Members and Privy Councillors Indemnity Repeal B. 18 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 2542 (ii).

Ministers and Deputy Ministers practising in Courts, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 1703 (i).

German, Mr. W. M. —*Con.*
Northern Commercial Telegraph Co.'s (B. 139) 1°*, 1743 (i).
Ste. Agathe des Monts Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6174 (iv).
SUPPLY :
Canals—Trent (construction) 5167; Welland (electric plant) 5164; (Port Colborne entrance) 5165 (iii).
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, &c.) 5143 (iii).

Gervais, Mr. H., *Montreal, St. James.*
Debates, Oâcial, 1st Rep. of Com. (presented) 162 (i).
——— 2nd Rep. of Com. (M.) to conc., 2021 (ii).
——— 3rd Rep. (presented) 6244; (M.) to ref. back to Com., 6677 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry. Branch Lines B. 75 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 5696 (iii).
Immigration to Canada, False Representation *re* Labour Market, on prop. Res. (Mr. R. Smith) 2970 (ii).
Lord's Day B. 12, in Com. (coming into force) 6674; (hiring rigs) 6642; (Jews) 6356; (provincial legislatures) 6566; (railways) 6370
Newfoundland's Claim *re* Ungava Bay and Labrador (Ques.) 7459 (iv).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Depth of Harbours at Quebec and Montreal, Article in 'Chronicle,' &c. (Ques.) 4797 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Ocean and River Service (navigation schools) 3402 (ii).
Ungava Bay and Labrador, Claims of Newfoundland, &c. (Ques.) 7459 (iv).

Girard, Mr. J., *Chicoutimi and Saguenay.*
Chicoutimi-Saguenay Dredging, Cor., &c. (M. for copy*) 3997 (ii).
Fruit Marks Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2555 (ii).
Quebec, Saguenay and Gulf of St. Lawrence Ry. Co.'s (B. 141) 1°*, 1743 (i).

Gordon, Mr. D. A., *East Kent.*
Cannington Postmaster, Dismissal of Mr. Talbot, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Cor., 2490 (ii).
Toledo Glass Co.'s Patent Relief B. 110 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3674 (ii).
——— (personal explanation) 3715 (ii).

Grant, Mr. G. D., *North Ontario.*
Cannington Postmaster, Dismissal (personal explanation) on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Cor., 2471 (ii).
——— Dismissal of Mr. Talbot, Charges *re* on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Cor., 2476 (ii).
Private Bills (M.) to extend Time, 828 (i).
Severn River, Obstructions *re* Ry. Construction (Ques.) 581 (i).
Woman's Art Association of Canada incorp. (B. 59) 1°*, 744 (i).

Greenway, Mr. T., *Lisgar.*
Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. 207 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 5889 (iii).
Land Grants to Rys., Selection by Ry. Cos., on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) to Com. of Sup., 1015 (i).

Gunn, Mr. B. B., *South Huron.*
Bayfield Harbour Total Expenditure up to 1896 and Since (Ques.) 578 (i).
Clinton Post Office, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1567 (i).
Lord's Day B. 12, on M. (Mr. Aylesworth) to strike out amt. *re* ball games, 7280 (iv).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract &c. on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Sup., 2103 (ii).
Pickerel Fishing on Lake Huron, Date of Close Season (Ques.) 2034 (ii).
Post Offices open on Sunday, Extra Remuneration (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 555 (i).
St. Joseph Harbour, Amount voted and expended (Ques.) 579 (i).
Seaforth Public Building, Erection of (Ques.) 578 (i).
——— Rentals for (Ques.) 1567 (i).
SUPPLY:
Indians—Mar. Provs. (schools) 720 (i).
Post Office (mail service) 555 (i).
Wingham Public Building, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 1567 (i).

Guthrie, Mr. H., *South Wellington.*
Citizen's Bank of Canada B. (No. 187) 1°*, 4897 (iii).
Crown Lands, Administration of by Dept. of Interior, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 4651 (ii).
Giant's Tomb, Sale of, Mis-statements of Supt. of Indian Affairs (remarks) 5334 (iii).
Grand River and Western Power Co.'s (B. 216) in Com., 6997, 7260 (iv).
Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 58) 1° m., 743 (i).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 170 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5197, 5230; on Amts., 5411 (iii).
Lord's Day B. 12 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5806 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* electric rys., 7248; on Amt. (Mr. D. Ross) *re* industrial processes, 7221; (amt.) provincial rys., 7250 (iv); in Com. (trains, &c.) 5725 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. T. Martin) *re* games, 7243; on M. (Mr. Aylesworth) to strike out Amt. (Mr. T. Martin) *re* ball games, 7280 (iv).
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., Removal from Office of Immigration Agent, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6904 (iv).
South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 19) 1°*, 349 (i).
Toronto, Niagara and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 134) 1°*, 1743 (i); in Com., 4389 (iii).
Windsor, Essex and Lake Shore Rapid Ry. Co.'s B. 150 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 5225

Haggart, Hon. John, *South Lanark.*
Apples, Inspection for Export, Quality, &c., on M. (Mr. E. D. Smith) for Copies, 1385 (i).
Arbitrations and Awards, Payments to Civil Servants *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 375 (i).
'Arctic,' Str., Expedition, Com. of Investigation *re* Expenditure, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3661 (ii).
Brockville, Westport and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6164 (iv).
Cement purchased for Lighthouse Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4931 (iii).
Electric Power and Gas Exportation Regulation B. 145 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 3083 (ii).
Forest Reserves B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2836, 3333 (ii), 5540 (iii).
Fruit Marks Act (apples) Amt. B. 101 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2162 (ii).
Game Preservation Act (unorganized ters.) Amt. B. 154 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2826 (ii).
Gobeil, Mr., Dep. Min. of Public Works, acting as Arbitrator (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 375 (i).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 84 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 2246 (ii).
G. T. Pacific Telegraph Co.'s incorp. B. 61 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 2716 (ii).
House of Commons Rules, in Com. on Special Rep., 7471 (iv).
Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (remarks) 6177 (iv).
Hudson Bay Whale Fisheries B. 123 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6709 (iv).
I. C. R., Expenditure *re* Capital Account (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7482 (iv).
——— Reply to Annual Statement, 157, 269 (i).
——— Supplies, Tenders, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4931 (iii).
Isle Bizard and Ste. Geneviève Bridges (remarks) in Com. of Supply., 6968 (iv).
Lord's Day B. 12, in Com. (industrial plants) 6606 (iv).
Militia (land grants) N. W. Rebellion B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 3°, 4898 (iii).
Nipigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6151 (iv).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Mr. Preston's Refusal to answer Questions, on M. (Mr. Monk) 4522 (iii).
——— Contract, ref. to in debate on 'Arctic,' 3647 (ii).
Ottawa Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6176 (iv).
Private Bills, on M. (Mr. Macpherson) to extend Time, 2823 (ii).
Public Accounts Com., on M. (Mr. Belcourt) to conc., 4247 (iii).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan &c. Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Carvell) in Com., 2707 (ii).

Haggart, Hon. John—*Con.*
Quebec Harbour Commissioners B. 177 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 4809 (iii).
Ry. Act (General) Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 1°, 749 ; in Com., 1588 (i), 4070 (iii), 6185, 7069 (iv).
Ry. Subsidies, Authorization B. 214 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 6146; in Com., 6833 (iv).
Returns to Parlt., Access of Members to Files of Depts. (remarks) 2942 (ii).
School Lands Exchange B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 3914 (ii).
Sharbot Lake and Bathurst Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6146 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Carillon (dams, slides) 5079; ; Galops (leaks, &c.) 5080; (north channel) 5159; (iii); Trent (repairs) 7499 (iv); Welland (electric plant) 5161 (iii); (gratuity) 7500 (iv); (Port Colborne elevators) 5165 (iii).
Civil Government—Agriculture (salaries) 369; Customs (salaries) 361; Indian Affairs (salaries) 366 ; Interior (salaries) 364 ; Public Works (salaries) 375 (i); Railways and Canals (salaries) 5014 (iii).
Customs (I. G. Baker) 519 (i).
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, &c.) 5121 (iii).
Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 5016 (ii), 7481 (iv); (Halifax accommodation) 5071 (iii), 7483; (Indiantown branch) 7503; (Moncton shops) 7501 (iv); (rolling stock) 5076 (iii).
Railways—Miscellaneous (Gov. Gen.'s cars) 7512 (iv).
Toledo Glass Co.'s Patent Relief B. 110 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3726 (ii).
Tower of West Block, Collapse of, Investigation *re* (remarks 1156 (i).
Twelve Mile Power Co.'s incorporation B. (Mr. Thompson) on M. to receive Pet., 3064 (ii).
Vancouver, Fraser Valley and Southern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 87 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 2709 (ii).
Water Powers of Canada, Lease &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for a stmt., 605 (i).

Hall, Mr. R. R., *West Peterborough.*
Anderson Puffed Rice Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 45) 1°*, 485 (i).
General Inspection Act (binder twine) Amt. (B. 165) 1° m., 3234 (ii).
Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s (B. 44) 1°*, 485 (i).
Transportation Commission, Evidence, Rep. &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Bennett) 2053, 3279 (ii).
Trent Canal, Kirkfield Lift Lock, &c., on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Cor., 3268 (ii).

Harty, Mr. Wm., *Kingston.*
Queen's College, Kingston (B. 160) 1°*, 3065 (ii).

Henderson, Mr. D., *Halton.*

Agricultural Products, American vs. Canadian Duties, on M. (Mr. Clements) for Sup., 4908 (iii).

Alberni Industrial School, B.C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1091 (i).

'Arctic' Str., Expenditure *re* Supplies, 3356 (ii).

Bronte Lighthouse (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4788 (iii).

Brothier, Désiré, Release of from B. C. Penitentiary (remarks) 5324 (iii).

Canada Life Insurance Co. and other Cos., Reserve Fund *re* Govt. Standard (Ques.) 985 (i).

Cinq-Mars before Bar of Hse, on M. (Mr. Jackson) translate article, 4795 (iii).

Criminal Code (art unions) B. 209, on M. (Mr. Fielding) to place on Govt. Orders, 7600; in Com., 7663 (iv).

Currency Act Amt. B. 196 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 5083 (iii).

Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 2026 (ii).

Duryea Chester B., Patent Relief B. 79 (Mr. Belcourt) in Com., 2195 (ii).

Empire Trust Co.'s B. 135 (Mr. Worthington) in Com., 5223 (iii).

Forest Reserves B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2861 (ii), 5548 (iii).

Fruit Marks Act (apples) Amt. B. 101 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2164 (ii).

German Tariffs in Relation to Canada, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 1901 (i).

Gold and Silver Marks Act Amt. B. 211 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7569 (iv).

Govt. Steamers Expenditure, Supplies for Str. 'Minto' (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4915 (iii).

Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. 207 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 5887; in Com., 5899 (iii).

G.T.P. Ry., Branch Lines incorp. B. 75 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 5955 (iii); on M. for 3° (amt.) 6614 (iv).

Gray, Franklin Montgomery, Patent Relief B. 122 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 4946 (iii).

Hay Trade Regulations, Penalties *re* Violation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beauparlant) 4016

Hillcrest Coal, Coke & Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 157 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 4398 (iii).

House of Commons Rules, in Com. on Rep., 7602 (iv).

Immigration Act Amt. B. 170 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5210 (iii).

Immigration from Belgium (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1638 (i).

Imperial Institute, Explanation of Vote (remarks) on M. for 1° of Supply Bill, 690 (i).

Indian Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5426 (iii).

Henderson, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Insurance, Life, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) for Special Com., 3996 (ii).

Keewatin Territory, Jurisdiction *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4987 (iii).

Kootenay and Arrowhead Ry. Co.'s B. 30 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 1145 (i).

Lafferty, Dr., Payments to *re* Indians (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 965 (i).

Lord's Day B. 12 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5647, 5663 (iii); (forest fires) 6657; (hiring rigs, &c.) 6642; (industrial plants) 6629; (loading, &c., vessels) 6633; (maple sugar) 6658; (towing logs) 6655 (iv); (trains, &c.) 5732 (iii); on M. (Mr. Aylesworth) to strike out Amt. (Mr. T. Martin) *re* ball games, 7278; on M. for 3°, 7295; on Senate Amts., 7665 (iv).

Lotteries: *See* 'Criminal Code.'

Mackintosh, Eileen Mary, Relief B. 165, on M. (Mr. Northrup) to ref. back to Com., 5443 (iii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 206 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5904 (iii); on M. for 3°, 6127 (iv).

Members, Daily Attendance, Record of, &c., (Ques.) 201 (i).

Militia (land grants) N. W. Rebellion B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4807 (iii).

Pacific Bank of Canada B. 50 (Mr. Belcourt) on M. for 1°, 656 (i).

Penitentiary Act Amt. B. 176 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5402 (iii).

Preston, Mary Emeline, Relief B. 168 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 4950 (iii).

Prorogation, Cause of Delay (remarks) 7697

Ry. Act Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 2594 (ii).

Road Allowances for Alberta and Saskatchewan B. 202 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 5363 (iii).

Royal Bank of Canada B. 131 (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com., 6022 (iii).

Saguenay River Piers and Booms, Cost of Operation, &c. (Ques.) 1379 (i).

Senate Reform, on prop. Res. (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 2298 (ii).

Senate and House of Commons Act (indemnity) Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 2°, 1791 (i); on Sen. Amts., 7571 (iv).

Standard Trust Co.'s B. 147 (Mr. Bole) in Com., 4944 (iii).

Sterling Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. B. 105 (Mr. Lennox) in Com., 5500 (iii).

Supply :

Civil Government—Customs (salaries) 362; Geological Survey (salaries) 413; Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 370 (i).

Customs (I. G. Baker Co.) 516; (outside ports) 498; (Yukon) 516 (i).

Immigration (agents, G.B., &c.) 1638 (i).

Indians—B.C. (schools) 1091; (steamboat coast agency) 1095 (i).

Henderson, Mr. D.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Interior (registry offices, N.W.T.) 5978 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 4788 (iii).
Miscellaneous (Prince Arthur's visit) 314 (i).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. strs.) 3356 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Cumberland) 6755; Man. (Winnipeg post office) 6744; Ont. (Guelph) 6734; (North Bay) 6736; (Owen Sound) 6736; Ottawa (repairs, &c.) 6759; (western deptl. block) 6721; Que. (Sherbrooke drill hall) 6733; Sask. and Alberta (Saskatoon) 6754 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (bridges) 5020; (Halifax accommodation) 5072; (rolling stock) 5076 (iii).

Tariff Commission, Printing of Evidence, &c. (Ques.) 201 (i).

Timber Leases in Man. and N.W.T., Applications for between 1880 and 1896 (Ques.) 5502, 5753 (iii).

Toronto, Niagara and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 124 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 4395 (iii).

Toronto Terminal Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 138 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 4397 (iii).

Vancouver and Lulu Island Ry. Co.'s B. 29 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 1145 (i).

Windsor, Essex and Lake Shore Rapid Ry. Co.'s B. 150 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 5225 (iii).

Yukon Council, Expenditure, Supervision by Dom. Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1211 (i).

Herron, Mr. J., *Alberta.*

Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.'s B. 100 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 3187 (ii).

'Arctic,' Str., Expenditure *re* Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3355 (ii).

Canadian Oil and Mines Co. and Western Oil Co., Names (remarks) 3914 (ii).

Forest Reserves B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2840, 3326 (ii), 5540 (iii).

Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. 207 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5902 (iii).

Homestead Entries, Original Names, Applications *re* Cancellation, &c. (Ques.) 5003 (iii).

Indian Reserves, N.W.T., Surrender of, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 955 (i).

Keewatin Territory, Change of Jurisdiction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4989 (iii).

Lord's Day B. 12 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. (trains, &c.) 5718 (iii).

Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 206 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5906 (iii).

Mormons, Reference to *re* Lord's Day Bill (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7581 (iv).

Pelgan and Blood Indian Agencies, Cattle purchased, Number, Price, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 4702 (iii).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) to M. for 3°, 7110 (iv).

Herron, Mr. J.—*Con.*

Ry. Subsidies, Authorization B. 214 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 6159 (iv).

Rocky Mountains Park Act Amt. B. 164 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4742 (iii).

School Lands Exchange B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 3914 (ii).

South-East Quarter Section 28, Township 7, W. Meridian, Sale of, (Ques.) 584 (i).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice—Yukon (living allowances) 7523 (iv).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 7411; (live stock, &c.) 7430 (iv).
Customs—Miscellaneous (refund to I. G. Baker & Co.) 7516 (iv).
Dom. Lands (surveys, &c.) 5885 (iii).
Fisheries (protection service) 3706 (ii).
Immigration (agents) 1349 (i); (agents, U.S.) 5869 (iii).
Indians—Man., &c. (live stock) 739; (surveys) 955 (i).
Interior—Miscellaneous (payment *re* mining rights) 5862 (iii).
N.W.M. Police—(Northwest) 4989 (iii).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. strs.) 3355 (ii).
Quarantine (animals, health) 2684 (ii); 7443 (iv).

Vancouver Experimental Farm, Statement by Min. of Inland Revenue (Ques.) 575 (i).

Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com., on Res., 6159 (iv).

Hughes, Mr. J. J., *King's, P.E.I.*

Insurance Commission, Inquiry *re* Assessment Plans (Ques.) 5321 (iii).

Orangemen and Party Politics (remarks) 4732 (iii).

P.E.I. Tunnel, Estimate of Cost, &c. (Ques.) 188 (i).

Representation of Provs., Amt. to B.N.A. Act (M.) 1106 (i).

SUPPLY:

Ocean and River Service (ice-breakers) 4773 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (electric elevators) 6764; Telegraph Lines (P.E.I. and mainland) 6770 (iv).
Railways—P.E.I. (Charlottetown) 5151 (iii).

Winter Communication with P.E.I., Contract *re* Steamer (Ques.) 323 (i).

——— Northumberland Straits, Ice-breaker 'Montcalm' (remarks) 1256 (i).

Hughes, Mr. S., *Victoria and Haliburton.*

Acetylene Gas Buoys in St. Lawrence Channel (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2901 (ii).

Annual Camp, Drill Instruction, Selection of Site (Ques.) 2034 (ii).

Aylesworth, Hon. A. B., Resignation, Rumours, &c. (remarks) 5437 (iii).

Belmont Disaster, I.C.R., Claims for Damages (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7507 (iv).

Hughes, Mr. Sam.—*Con.*
Cannington Postmaster, Amount of Salary from 1902-3-4-5 (Ques.) 453 (i).
——— Charges against, Investigation *re* (Ques.) 421 (i).
——— Dismissal of Mr. H. D. Talbot, (M. for copies of cor.) 2459 (ii).
——— Dismissal *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 540 (i).
——— Incomplete Answer to Question (remarks) 225 (i).
——— Removal, Complaints, &c. (Ques.) 190 (i).
——— Rent of Office, Cheques, &c. (remarks) 7584 (iv).
Cattle Disease in Victoria County, Amounts paid for Losses (Ques.) 421 (i).
Conmee & Bowman Dredging Contract (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1325; Ques. of Order (Mr. Conmee) 1326 (i).
——— Charges *re* Dredging Contract, on Ques. of Order, 1307 (i).
Crown Lands, Administration of by Dept. of Interior, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 4673 (iii).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 2025 (ii).
Dorset Wharf, Construction of (Ques.) 419 (i).
Eagle Creek Homestead Rights, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1358 (i).
Esquimalt Defences, Permanent Force, Annual Cost, &c. (Ques.) 184 (i).
Forest Reserves B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2864, 3567 (ii).
Geological Survey, Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5879 (iii).
Giant's Tomb Island, Sale of Timber to P. Ryan, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1236 (i).
Gooderham Post Office, Charges against Postmistress (remarks) 1583 (i).
Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. 207 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 5894 (iii).
G. T. P. Ry., Branch Lines incorp. B. 75 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Carvell) 6030 (iii).
Greenwood, Hamar, Payments to *re* Literature for Immigrants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1646 (i).
Halifax Defences, Permanent Force, Annual Cost, &c. (Ques.) 184 (i).
——— Offer by Imp. Authorities (remarks) 1009 (i).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 170 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5214 (iii).
Immigration Agents, Dom. and Ont. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1351 (i).
Immigrants to Canada, Total Number, Bonus per head, Regulations *re* Payments, &c. (Ques.) 196 (i).

Hughes, Mr. Sam.—*Con.*
Immigrants at Quebec, Letter of Rev. Mr. Williams *re* Treatment of (Ques.) 5504 (iii).
Imperial Officers and R.M.C., Status *re* (Ques.) 4247 (iii).
Indemnity to Members: *See* "Sen. & H. of C. B. 97."
Indian Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5422 (iii).
Kentville Rifle Ranges, Payments *re* Purchase, &c. (Ques.) 1103 (i).
——— Ref. to Courts, Award, &c. (Ques.) 195 (i).
King's Most Gracious Majesty, Invitation to visit Canada, on M. (Mr. Belcourt) 1690 (i).
Laurier Tower, Collapse: *See* 'Taylor,' &c.
Library of Parliament, Sunday Attendance (remarks) 2233 (ii).
Lindsay Rifle Range, Construction of (Ques.) 589 (i).
Lord's Day B. 12 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. (amt.) *re* Penalties, 5755 (iii); (hiring rigs) 6642; (newspapers) 6275; (railways) 6366; (shooting) 6251, 6273; (amt.) 6268 (iv); (trains, &c.) 5727 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. T. Martin) *re* games, 7244; on Amt. (Mr. D. Ross) 7208 (iv).
Lumb, Capt. H. W., Retirement, Charges against (Ques.) 1149 (i).
McLaren's Creek, Completion of Roadway (Ques.) 589 (i).
——— (remarks) *re* Question, 657 (i).
McLaughlin, R. J. and O'Connel, D., Amounts paid *re* Trent Canal Inquiry (Ques.) 590 (i).
Maganetawan Lighthouse Supplies, Charges *re* on Inquiry for Rep. of Investigation, 6799 (iv).
Members appointed to Govt. Positions (remarks) *re* Answer to former Questions, 6544 (iv).
Military Bands in Street Parade, Regulations *re* Flags (Ques.) 1151 (i).
Militia Act Amt. B. 201 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 5537 (iii).
Militia Camps, Illegal Payments, Delayed Transportation, &c., Par. in Toronto Newspapers (read) 5992 (iii).
——— Service Rolls *re* (remarks) 1001 (i).
——— Supplies, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 2033 (ii).
Militia Pension Act Amt. B. 200 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 5187; in Com., 5535 (iii).
Militia Schools of Instruction, Commission *re* Condition, &c. (Ques.) 1104 (i).
Ministerial Changes, on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 264 (i).
National Rifle Association, Use of Wind Gauges, &c. (remarks) 3318 (ii).

Hughes, Mr. Sam.—*Con.*
Negro Population in Canada, Positions for, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7505 (iv).
Nipigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6156 (iv).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 2424 (ii).
——— Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 1648 (i).
——— on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) ref. to Rep. of Com., 2108 (ii).
——— Refusal of Mr. Preston to answer Questions, on M. (Mr. Monk) 4479, 4513 (iii).
See 'Preston.'
Ottawa Drill Hall, Purchase of Additional Property (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7173 (iv).
Ottawa Field Battery, No. 2, Caretaker's Qualifications, &c. (Ques.) 2725 (ii).
Ottawa Military Buildings; Purchasing Collegiate and School Properties (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7013 (iv).
Postmasters' Salaries, Policy of Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 540 (i).
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., Removal from Office of Immigration Agent, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6925 (iv).
See 'North Atlantic.'
Public Accounts Com., Burking of Investigation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4111 (iii).
Public Works, Expenditure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 3489 (ii).
Quebec Bridge, Obstruction to Navigation in St. Lawrence (remarks) 221 (i).
Quebec and Seven Islands Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6156 (iv).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 1611 (i); on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) to M. for 3°, 7109 (iv).
Ry. Subsidies, Authorization B. 214 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 6156 (iv).
Rifle Ranges in Mar. Provs., Purchase of Sites, &c. (Ques.) 5753 (iii).
Ross Rifles, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7174 (iv).
——— Charges *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7164 (iv).
——— Improvements *re* (remarks) 3411 (ii).
Salvation Army Immigration, and S. America, (remarks) 6801 (iv).
Scugog River Dams and Locks, Maintenance by Federal Govt., &c. (Ques.) 1859 (i).
Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7123, 7136 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Carillon and Grenville (slides) 5079; Galops (leaks, &c.) 5080; Trent (Balsam Lake route) 5343; Trent (construction) 5166; (Holland river) 5167; (improvements) 5172; Welland (electric plant) 5163; (Port Colborne elevators) 5165 (iii).

Hughes, Mr. Sam.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Civil Govt.—Board of Civil Service (salaries) 416; Geological Survey (salaries) 415 (i); Indians (salaries) 5985 (iii); (promotions) 7028 (iv).
Customs (outside ports) 512 (i).
Dom. Lands (surveys, &c.) 5883 (iii).
Geological Survey (coast survey, launch) 5979; (experimental borings) 5982; (gold gravels, Yukon) 5981; (Nicolas, F., payments to) 5980; (translation of rep.) 5983 (iii).
Immigration (agents, &c.) 1351, 1646 (i), 5522; (printing, &c. in G. B.) 5866 (iii).
Indians—B. C. (industrial schools) 1089; (medical attendance) 1080; (miscellaneous) 1094; Generally (agencies) 1247 (i); Man. (industrial schools) 5990; Ont. and Quebec (schools) 5985; (treaty payments) 5988; Que. (Seven Islands surveys) 5987 (iii).
Inspection of Staples (grain inspection) 7541 (iv).
Interior—Miscellaneous (boundary surveys) 5878; (caves in B. C.) 5859; (maps, &c.) 5947 (iii).
Justice, Administration of (Dom. Police) 490 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (Marconi stations) 7561 (iv); (repairs, &c.) 4145 (iii).
Militia (ammunition) 7177; (clothing) 7176, 7182; (library) 7182; (permanent corps) 7178; (rifles, &c) 7164 (iv).
Miscellaneous (Academy of Arts) 7576; (monuments) 7578 (iv).
Pensions (militiamen) 7576 (iv).
Post Office (mail service) 550 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (rents, &c.) 7013; Man. (Winnipeg immigration hospital) 7042; Ont. (Toronto post office) 7040; Ottawa (military stores) 7037; Que. (St. Johns military building) 7037 (iv).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (transportation commission) 7021 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Blanche River) 6985; (Collingwood) 6986; (Echo Bay wharf) 7050; (Point Edward) 7049; (Trent) 7014 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (D'Israeli wharf) 6952; (Grande Rivière) 6974; (Peribonka) 6976 (iv); (St. Lawrence Ship Channel, dredging) 2894; (St. Lawrence Channel, lighting) 2897 (ii); (Sorel wharf) 7046 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Sask. (Last Mountain Lake) 7052 (iv).
Public Works—Roads and Bridges, N. W. T. (Battle River) 7020 (iv).
Public Works—Slides and Booms—Que. (Saguenay River) 7016 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraph Lines—Yukon (Ashcroft-Edmonton) 7021 (iv).
Railways—I. C. R. (air brakes) 5074; (bridges) 5018; Miscellaneous (litigation, &c.) 5179 (iii).
Senate (gratuities) 7579 (iv).

Sydney Riots, Payments to Militia, &c. (Ques.) 1104 (i).

Taylor, Mr. L. Fennings, Resignation *re* Collapse of Laurier Tower (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7027 (iv).

Transportation Commission, Reps., Evidence, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Bennett) 2055, 3285 (ii).

Hughes, Mr. Sam.—*Con.*
Trent Canal, Arrangements *re* Control of Tributary Waters (Ques.) 834 (i).
——— Expenditure *re* Construction, (M. for ret.*) 1379 (i).
——— Inquiry for ret., 1581 (i).
——— Kirkfield Lift Lock, Cor. &c. (M. for cor.) 3253 (ii).
——— Official Inquiry *re* Faulty Construction, Remuneration, &c (Ques.) 189 (i).
——— Precautions *re* Levels, Date of Break in Lift Lock (Ques..) 588 (i).
——— Supt., Instructions to Mr. Pearson, &c. (Ques.) 1860 (i).
——— Water Power, Lease or Sale of (Ques.) 1379 (i).
——— Waterways from Balsam Lake, &c.; Cost of Opening, &c. (Ques.) 588 (i).
Tyerman, Dr., Medical Officer for Twatt's Band of Indians (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1245 (i).
Veterans of Fenian Raids, Claims for Compensation, on prop Res. (Mr. Monk) 631 (i).
Voyageurs of the Nile, Medals, Recognition for Services, &c. (Ques.) 420, 448 (i).
——— (remarks) *re* Answer to Ques., 485 (i).
Water Powers for Canada, Lease, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Stmt., 606 (i).
Wicksteed, Pet. *re* Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 556 (i).
Winnipeg River Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7052 (iv).

Hyman, Hon. C. S. (Minister of Public Works), *London.*
Acoustics of Chamber, &c. (remarks) 7364 (iv).
See "Ventilation", "Chamber", &c.
Ahearn & Soper, Amounts paid for Supplies, &c.(Ans.) 4798 (iii).
Anse aux Griffons, Total Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 1151 (i).
Arbitrations and Awards, Payments to Civil Servants *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 372 (i).
Astronomical Observatory, Cost of Electrical Lighting, &c. (Ans.) 1868 (i).
Aylmer, Mr. W., Resignation and re-appointment (Ans.) 5006 (iii).
Baddeck Wharf, N.S., Location, Payments *re* Site, &c. (Ans.) 2457 (ii).
Bayfield Harbour, Total Expenditure up to 1896 and since (Ans.) 578 (i).
Cascumpec Channel near Sand Hills, Amount expended *re* Closing (Ans.) 1562 (i).
Chamber, Acoustics, Complaints *re* (remarks) 3154 (ii).
See "Acoustics, &c."
Chicoutimi, Saguenay River Piers and Booms, Estimated Cost, (Ans.) 993 (i).
See "Saguenay."

Hyman, Hon. C. S.—*Con.*
Clinton Post Office, Total Cost (Ans.) 1567 (i).
Collingwood Dock Co., Amounts paid as Bonus (Ans.) 419 (i).
——— Valuation *re* Bounty (Ans.) 574 (i).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 1367 (i).
Daly & Hanman's Dredges, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 572 (i).
D'Escousse Wharf, Expenditure *re* Construction, &c. (Ans.) 990 (i).
D'Israeli Wharf, Construction and Expenditure (Ans.) 1377 (i), 2268 (ii).
——— Expenditure *re*, 3468 (ii).
See "Supply", &c.
Dom. Coal Co., on Inquiry for Ret., 1581 (i).
Dom. Day, Flying of Union Jack (Ans.) 7459
See "Flags", &c.
Dorset Wharf, Construction of (Ans.) 419 (i).
Dredges under Charge of Mr. Lafleur (Ans.) 4154 (iii).
Dredging in Ont., Amounts paid and unpaid, (Ans.) 417 (i).
——— Tenders *re*, Prices paid, &c., (Ans.) 2721 (ii).
Echo Bay Wharf, Cost of Construction, Specifications, &c. (Ans.) 2032 (ii).
Electric Lighting, Parliament Buildings, Contract *re* (Ans.) 1568 (i).
Electric Power Exportation Regulation B. 145 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 4053 (iii).
"Fielding", Dredge, Estimated and Total Cost of (Ans.) 4700 (iii).
Flags at half-mast, Occasions and Authority for raising (Ans.) 3906 (ii).
Flag on Parlt. Buildings, on Dom. Day (remarks) 7185 (iv).
See "Dom. Day."
Fox River Breakwater, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 1151 (i).
Gélinas, Mr., Travelling Expenses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 400 (i).
Gobeil, Mr., Dep. Min., Public Works, acting as Arbitrator (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 372 (i).
Govt. Property destroyed by Fire, Estimated Loss (Ans.) 582 (i).
Grand River, Dunnville Dredging, Amount expended (Ans.) 580 (i)
Grand River and Western Power Co.'s B. 216 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 6997, 7260 (iv).
Grande Vallée des Monts Wharf, Construction *re* (Ans.) 1150, 1370 (i).
Grosse Isle Quarantine Inspector, Expenditure *re* Yacht 'Montmorency' and Cottage, &c. (Ans.) 2269 (ii).
Halifax Trachoma Hospital, Establishment of Construction, &c., O.C.'s. Reps., &c., on M. (Mr. U. Wilson) for Ret., 1870 (i).
Higgin's Shore, P.E.I., Pet. *re* Wharf (Ans.) 572 (i).

Hyman, Hon. C. S.—*Con.*
Humboldt Telegraph Station (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7012 (iv).
Huntsville, Baysville and Bracebridge Wharfs, Names of Govt. Officials (Ans.) 1869 (i), 2453 (ii).
Isle Bizard and Ste. Geneviève, Bridge, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6962 (iv).
Laprairie Ice Piers, Contract to Messrs. Amiot & Lemay (Ans.) 763 (i).
Laurier Tower : *See* 'Tower.'
Leamington Post Office, Ownership of (Ans.) 588 (i).
Léonardville, Deer, Island, N.B., Wharf Location, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ans.) 3251 (ii).
Levis Quarantine, Amount expended (Ans.) 4707 (iii).
Lighthouse Keepers Salaries, Increase to (Ans.) 455 (i).
London Armoury, Total Expenditure *re* Site, &c. (Ans.) 2037 (ii).
London Post Office Improvements, Total Cost (Ans.) 2037 (ii).
Lord's Day B. 12, in Com., (loading grain) 6650 (iv).
Macleod Court House, Total Cost (Ans.) 2035 (i)).
McLaren's Creek, Victoria County, Work of Municipality (remarks) *re* Question, 658 (i).
Midland Dredging, Number of Contracts (Ans.) 1868 (i).
Miminegash Breakwater, Repairs, &c., Pet. *re* Extension, &c. (Ans.) 201 (i).
North Head Breakwater, N.B., Tenders *re* (Ans.) 576, 1105 (i).
Ottawa, Astronomical Observatory, Electric Wiring (Ans.) 764 (i).
Ottawa Buildings, Leased to Govt., Rentals, Value, &c. (Ans.) 187 (i).
See 'Supply,' &c.
Ottawa Post Office Building, Condition, Irregularities, &c. (remarks) 1581 (i).
——— Total Amount *re* Repairs (Ans.) 452 (i).
Pelee Island Cable: *See* "Selkirk."
Pierreville, Yamaska Wharf, Cost, Revenue, &c. (Ans.) 1746 (i).
Port Arthur and Fort William Dredging, Advertising *re* Tenders (Ans.) 3503 (ii).
——— Dredging Expenditure *re* in 1902-3-4-5 (Ans.) 3243 (ii).
Port Bruce Harbour, Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 3506 (ii).
Port Burwell Harbour Improvements, Advertisements *re* Tenders (Ans.) 982 (i).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 4250, 5343 (iii).
Port Colborne, Breakwater and Elevators, Cor., &c. (presented) 1841 (i).
Port Credit Harbour, Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6989, 7014 (iv).

Hyman, Hon. C. S.—*Con.*
Port Stanley Harbour Improvements, Tenders, Advertisement *re* (Ans.) 984 (i).
——— Payment of Employees (Ans.) 172 (i).
Prendergrast, H. W., Basis of Payment to Dredging at Matchedash Bay (Ans.) 2454 (ii).
Prince County, P.E.I., Expenditure *re* Public Works (Ans.) 2267 (ii).
P.E.I. Tunnel, Estimate of Cost, &c. (Ans.) 188 (i).
Public Buildings, Erection of, Govt. Policy (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6729 (iv).
Public Works, Deptl. Report (presented) 968 (i).
——— Employees, Payments for Extra Work, Cor. with Aud. Gen. (Ans.) 769 (i).
——— Expenditure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 3468 (ii).
——— Expenditure by Provinces (Ans.) 3248 (ii).
Pugwash Wharf, Expenditure *re* Repairs, Inspector's Qualifications (Ans.) 1862 (i).
Quebec Deep Water Wharfs, Construction of (Ans.) 583 (i).
Quebec Harbour Works, Dussault & Lemieux's Contract (Ans.) 1378 (i).
Ry. Act (telephones) Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 6101, 6118, 6200, 6207 (iv).
Ray's Creek Wharf, Location of (Ans.) 2926 (ii).
Returns of previous Session, on Inquiry for, 12 (i).
Returns, Incomplete (remarks) 212 (i).
——— on Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 456 (i).
Richibucto Breakwater, Contract *re*, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 2031 (ii).
Rivière Jesus Wharf, Amount expended, Completion (Ans.) 453 (i).
Royal Bank of Canada B. 131 (Mr. A. K. Maclean) in Com., 6023 (iii).
St. Alexis Pier, Amount expended, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 3905 (ii).
St. Andrew's Locks, Expenditure on (Ans.) 1376 (i).
St. Anicet and St. Barbe Water, Rep. of estimated Cost (Ans.) 7371 (iv).
St. Joseph Harbour, Amount voted and Expended (Ans.) 579 (i).
St. Mary's Post Office Site, Purchase, Price, &c. (Ans.) 4703 (iii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7051 (iv).
St. Mary's River Dredging, Amounts paid by Govt. (Ans.) 427 (i).
St. Maurice Slides and Booms, Total Expenditure, Revenue, &c. (Ans.) 1100 (i).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary, Guards' Salaries (Ans.) 454 (i).
Saguenay River Piers and Booms, Estimated annual Cost (Ans.) 1379 (i).
See 'Chicoutimi'.

Hyman, Hon. C. S.—*Con.*

Sault Ste. Marie Dock, Warehouses, &c., Construction, Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 425 (i).

Savage Harbour, P. E. I., Payments to Certain Persons, Names, &c. (Ans.) 3066 (ii).

Seaforth Public Building, Erection of (Ans.) 578 (i).

Selkirk, John McR, Salary paid *re* Pelee Island Cable (Ans.) 588 (i).

Severn River, Obstruction *re* Ry. Constructions (Ans.) 581 (i).

Shellmouth Bridge, Man., Contract *re* Construction (Ans.) 2270 (ii).

Sorel Wharf, Investigation *re* Accident (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6981 (iv).

Summerside Breakwater, Stipulation in Tender *re* Wages (Ans.) 1375 (i).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice (living allowance) 7525 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Public Works—(promotions) 7022 (iv); (salaries) 372 (i).

Public Works—Buildings, B. C. (Cumberland) 6755; (Fernie) 6757; (Ladysmith) 6757; (New Westminster) 6757; (Osoyoos) 6757; (Vancouver) 6758 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (elevators) 6765; (heating, &c.) 6764; (rents, &c.) 6759, 7013 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Brandon drill hall) 6743; (Neepawa) 6743; (St. Boniface) 6743; (Selkirk) 6743; (Winnipeg, immigration building) 6743; (Winnipeg, immigration hospital) 7042; (Winnipeg, military buidings) 6743; (Winnipeg, postal station 6751; (Winnipeg post office) 6745; (Winnipeg, stores) 6743 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Mar. Provinces (generally) 6728 (iv).

Public Works — Buildings — Miscellaneous (arbitrations) 6765 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—N. B. (Woodstock armoury) 6728 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Antigonish) 6727; (Glace Bay) 6727; (Inverness) 6727; (Shelburne) 6727; (Westville) 6727 (iv).

Public Works—Ont. (Belleville armoury) 6733; (Brantford) 6734; (Guelph armoury) 6734; (Hamilton drill hall) 6735; (Kingston barracks) 6735; (London military buildings) 6735; (London post office) 6736; (North Bay) 6736; (Owen Sound) 6736; (Peterborough armoury) 6738; (St. Mary's) 6739; (Simcoe) 6740; (Toronto customs) 6741; (Toronto Dom. buildings) 6742; (Toronto military buildings) 6742; (Toronto post office) 7040 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Archives) 6711; (astonomical observatory) 6709; (eastern deptl. block) 6713; (military stores) 7037; (new buildings) 6724; (Parlt. Buildings, extension) 6712; (post office fittings) 7038; (refacing buildings) 7038; (repairs) 6859; (royal mint) 6711; (steel fittings) 7038; (steel shelving) 6736; (Supreme Court Library) 7035; (Victoria museum) 6713; (water service) 6755; (western deptl. block) 6714 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Actonvale) 6728; (Chicoutimi) 6728; (Magog) 6729; (Montmagny) 6731; (Montreal military buildings) 6732; (Nicolet) 6732; (Quebec citadel) 6732; (St. Hyacinthe) 6733; (St. John's) 6733; (St. John's military buildings) 7036; (Sherbrooke drill hall) 6733; (Three Rivers drill hall) 6733 (iv)

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. and Alberta (Calgary) 6752; (Edmonton) 6753; (Edmonton, immigration) 7042; (Medicine Hat) 6753; (Moosejaw) 6753; (Prince Albert) 6754; (Regina) 6754; (Saskatoon) 6754 (iv).

Public Works—Dredging—B. C. (new plant) 6996; Ont. and Que. (generally) 7014; (new plant) 6995 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, B.C. (Columbia river) 6995; (Pitt river) 7052; (Victoria) 6995 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Arnes, Lake Winnipeg) 6994; (Fairford river) 6994; (St. Anne's rapids) 7036 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (Campbellton wharf) 6935; (Cape Tormentine) 6935; (Chance Harbour) 6940; (Chockfish Outlet) 6941; (Dalhousie) 6941; (Dipper Harbour) 6941; (Petit Rocher) 7043; (Quaco Harbour) 6941; (St. John Harbour) 6942; (St. John River) 6942 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Amherst Point) 6772; (Annapolis wharf) 6774; (Georgeville wharf) 6778; (Glace Bay) 6774; (Habitant wharf) 6787; (Inverness mines) 6788; (New Harbour) 7043; (Port Hood) 6789; (Scotch cove) 7042 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Amherstburg channel) 6985; (Beaverton) 6985; (Belle river) 6985; (Blanche river) 6985; (Bronte) 6986; (Cobourg) 6986; (Collingwood) 6986; (Echo Bay wharf) 7049; (Goderich) 6989; (Midland) 6990; (Owen Sound) 6990, 7013; (Parry Sound) 6990; (Point Edward) 6990, 7048; (Port Arthur, &c.) 6772; (Port Burwell) 6990; (Port Stanley) 6991; (Rondeau) 6991; (Silverwater) 6991; (Toronto, eastern entrance) 6994; (Trent) 7014; (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P. E. I. (Belle River) 6956; (Point Prim.) 6931; (Rustico Harbour) 6932; (Summerside harbour) 6932; (Wood Island jetty) 6932 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Bic harbour) 6943; (Canton Fabre wharf) 6943; (Châteauguay wharf) 6943; (D'Israeli wharf) 6944; (Grand Rivière) 6974; (Lake Megantic piers) 6974; (Montmorency Falls) 6975; (Peribonka) 6975; (Pointe aux Trembles) 6975; (Quebec harbour) 6771, 7036; Rivière Ouelle piers) 6977; (Rivière St. Louis) 6978; (St. Anne de Chicoutimi) 6980; (Sorel wharf) 7043; (Three Rivers) 6980 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Sask. (Last Mountain Lake) 7052; (North Saskatchewan survey) 6995 (iv).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (Art Gallery) 6767; (clerical assistance) 6767; (deep waterways) 6769; (engineering staff) 6767; (Red River Commission) 7053; (surveys, Ottawa River) 6767; (surveys, inspections, &c.) 7020; (transportation commission) 7021 (iv).

Public Works—Roads and Bridges,—Man. (colonization roads and bridges) 6997; N. W. T. (Battle River bridge) 7020 (iv).

Hyman, Hon. C. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Slides and Booms (St. Maurice) 6996; (Saguenay River) 7016 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines, B. C. (Ashcroft-Dawson) 6771; Mar. Provinces (Cape Breton) 7011; (generally) 7020; (Marconi) 6771; N. W. T., (Edmonton-Athabaska Landing) 7012; (P. E. I. and mainland) 6769; Que. (Descente des Femmes) 7020; (Grosse Isle) 7011; Yukon (Ashcroft-Edmonton) 7021 (iv).

Public Works—Transportation Facilities (Georgian Bay) 6772; (Montreal Harbour) 7036; (Port Colborne) 6772 (iv).

Sutherland, Geo. M., Emplymt. by Govt. (remarks) 2265 (ii).

Taylor, L. Fennings, Resignation *re* Collapse of Laurier Tower (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7025 (iv).

Terrebonne Wharf, Amount expended, Completion, &c. (Ans.) 454 (i).

Thames River Dredging, Necessity of, &c. (Ans.) 176 (i).

Thames River Floods, Relief for, Cor. Plans, &c., on M. (Mr. Clements) for Copies, 777 (i).

Thames River Gunboats, Disposal of (remarks) 2550 (ii).

Thames River Survey, Improvement of Channel, &c. (Ans.) 175 (i).

Three Rivers, St. Hyacinthe, and Sherbrooke drill Sheds, Cost of Construction (Ans.) 3251 (ii).

Toronto, Barracks, Erection of, Purchase of Site on Humber River (Ans.) 5507 (iii).

Toronto Harbour (eastern entrance) Dredging, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 4801 (iii).

Toronto Harbour Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7015 (iv).

Toronto Post Office, Construction of, Purchase of Site, &c. (Ans.) 5506 (iii).

——— Pneumatic System (remarks) in Com. of Supply., 7040 (iv).

Tower of West Block, Collapse of, &c., on Inquiry for Further Information, 1580 (i), 5529.

——— Evidence, on Inquiry for, 5364 (iii).

——— on Inquiry for Rep., 3613 (ii).

——— Inspection *re* Building, on M. for Sup, 1269 (i).

——— Investigation *re* (remarks) 1155 (i).

——— Investigation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6715 (iv).

See 'Taylor,' 'West Block.'

Transportation Commission, on M. for Ret. (Mr. Bennett) 203 (i).

——— on Order being called for Notice of Motion (remarks) 1106 (i).

——— on prop. Res. (Mr. Bennett) 2043 (ii).

——— Rep., Delay in bringing down (remarks) 770 (i).

——— on Inquiry for Report, 213 (i).

Hyman, Hon. C. S.—*Con.*

Transportation Commission's Rep.: Printing and Distribution, &c. (Ans.) 427 (i).

——— Printing of, on Inquiry for, 1005 (i).

See 'Waterways'.

Ventilation of House of Commons (remarks) 5616 (iii).

See 'Acoustics,' &c.

Victoria Memorial Museum, Name of Contractors, Stone required, &c. (Ans.) 1152 (i).

——— Change of Plans (Ans.) 1152 (i).

——— Specifications *re* Stone (Ans.) 2031 (ii).

Washedemoak River, N.B., Deepening of (Ans.) 584 (i).

Water Powers of Canada, Leases, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Statement, 606 (i).

——— Province of Quebec, Sale of, Inquiry *re* (remarks) 4992 (iii).

Waterways Commission, Rep. *re* Niagara Water Power Co., Treaties, &c. (remarks) 567 (i).

——— Rep., Printing, &c. (remarks) 1366 (i).

West Block, Collapse of Tower, Rep. Laid on Table, 4029 (iii).

See 'Tower,' &c.

Western Block Addition, Amount expended, &c. (Ans.) 194 (i).

Wilson's Beach Breakwater, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 576 (i).

——— Total Cost and Amount paid J. M. Johnson (Ans.) 761 (i).

Wingham Post Office, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 1567 (i).

Winnipeg River Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7052 (iv).

Woods, James W. Co., Limited, Payments by Govt. for Rentals (Ans.) 422 (i), 4701 (iii).

——— Amounts paid for Supplies for Georgian Bay Survey (Ans.) 423 (i).

——— Building, Occupied by Militia Dept., Rental, &c. (Ans.) 186 (i).

Yukon Telegraph System, Total Cost, Earnings, &c. (Ans.) 1865 (i).

Ingram, Mr. A. B., *East Elgin.*

Address, on The, 123 (i).

Apples, Inspection for Export, Quality, &c., on M. (Mr. E. D. Smith) for Copies, 1395 (i).

'Arctic,' Str., Expenditure *re* Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3399 (ii).

Aylmer Post Office Site, Pets, &c. *re* (M. for copies *) 205 (i).

Canadian Minnesota Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. 91 (Mr. Dyment) in Com., 2499 (ii).

Cannington Postmaster, Dismissal of Mr. Talbot, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Cor., 2485 (ii).

Coal purchased from Allan SS. Co. (Ques.) 4247 (iii).

Coal purchased for Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3615 (ii).

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
Coasting Trade of Canada Amt., on prop. Res., (Mr. Clarke) 592 (i).
Conmee & Bowman, Charges *re* Dredging Contracts, on Ques. of Order, 1308 (i).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 2023 (ii).
D'Israeli Wharf, Expenditure *re*, 3473 (ii).
Duryea, Chester B., Patent Relief B. 79 (Mr. Belcourt in Com., 2195 (ii).
Elgin County Mail Contracts, Location, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3997 (ii).
Erie-Ontario Power Co.'s B. 107 (Mr. German) in Com., 2668 (ii).
Forest Reserves B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 3577 (ii).
Giant's Tomb Island, Sale of Timber to P. Ryan, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1241 (i).
G. T. P. Telegraph Co.'s incorp. B. 61 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 4539 (iii).
Hay Trade Regulation, Penalties *re* Violation on prop. Res. (Mr. Beauparlant) 4011 (ii).
Head Tax collected by U. S. Officials on Canadians (Ques.) 323 (i).
——— Cor. with Govt. *re* &c. (M. for copies*) 205 (i).
Homestead Entries, Fake Applications, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1361 (i).
——— since 1890, Forms of Application (M. for copies *) 207 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 1854 (i), 2326 (ii).
Immigration Agents, Ont. and Dom. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1345 (i).
Imperial Institute, Explanation of Vote (remarks) on M. for 1° of Supply Bill, 673 (i).
Indemnity to Members and Pensions to Privy Councillors B. 18 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 2544, 3059 (ii)
——— Substitution for objectionable Words against an hon. Member, 3067 (ii).
——— Ques. of Privilege *re* Par. in Toronto 'World,' 2621, 3070 (ii).
Indian Act (intoxicants) Amt. B. 66 (Mr. Monk) on M. for 2°, 2074 (ii).
Insurance Investigation, Copies of all Communications, &c. relating to (M. for ret.) 202 (i).
——— Inquiry for ret., 2068, 2326 (ii).
Iron and Steel Bounties on Canadian Ores, on prop. Res. (Mr. Conmee) 3776 (ii).
Judges of Provincial Courts Act (travelling) Amt. B. 83 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 1768 (i).
Keech, Hiram, Emplymt. by Govt. as Sales Agent, &c. (Ques.) 197 (i).
Labour Statistics Repeal B. 108 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 1°, 1562 (i).
Liddle, David, Apptmt. as Ass't Inspector of Weights and Measures at Windsor (M. for cor.*) 204 (i).

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*con.*
Members' Indemnity—ref. to in deb. on Address, 123 (i).
Members Indemnity Repeal Bill (remarks) *re* Discussion, 2810 (ii).
See 'Indemnity'.
Montreal Harbour (reorganization) Commissioners B. 124 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 2209 (ii).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract, Charges *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Sup., 2417 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) ref. to Rep. of Com., 2107 (ii).
——— Names, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1651 (i).
Port Burwell Harbour, Amounts voted, expended and Payments made to, &c. (M. for ret.*) 206 (i).
——— Inquiry for Rets., 4250 (iii).
Port Bruce Harbour, Amounts voted, expended and Payments to, &c. (M. for ret.*) 205 (i).
——— Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 3505 (ii).
Port Stanley Harbour, Amounts voted, expended and payments to, &c. (M. for ret.*) 205 (i).
Port Stanley, Port Burwell &c., Customs Receipts since 1896, &c. (Ques.) 171 (i).
Port Stanley Harbour Works, Payment of Employees, (Ques.) 172 (i).
Public Accounts Com., Burking of Investigation (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4111 (iii).
Ry. Act (express cos.) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 825 (i).
Ry. Act (General) Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 1°, 757; in Com., 1625 (i), 2578 (ii).
St. Thomas Collector of Customs, Removal of Mr. Darroch (M. for cor.*) 205 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (Patent Record) 2678 (ii).
Civil Govt.—Post Office (salaries) 402 (i).
Fisheries (overseers) 3692; (protection service) 3705, 3709 (ii).
Immigration (agents, G. B., &c.) 1343 (i).
Indians—Man. &c. (live stock) 737 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies) 3607; (agencies, rents, &c.) 3593; (lightkeepers) 3588 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. strs.) 3395 (ii), 4111 (iii).
Quarantine (animals health) 2696 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection (inspectors) 3688 (ii).
Weights and Measures (inspections) 2604 (ii).
Telephone Legislation, Amounts paid *re* Committee (Ques.) 214, 322 (i).
Toledo Glass Co.'s Patent Relief B. 110 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3683, 3726 (ii).
Tower of West Block, Collapse, Inspection by Govt., on M. for Sup., 1314 (i).
Woods Building, Occupied by Militia Dept., Rental, Value, &c. (Ques.) 186 (i).

Ingram, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
Yukon Council Expenditures and Supervision by Dom. Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1224 (i).

Jackson, Mr. S. J., *Selkirk.*
Cinq-Mars before Bar of the Hse. (M.) that Article be read in English, 4794 (iii).
Keewatin Territory, Jurisdiction *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4987 (iii).
Forest Reserves B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 3325 (ii).
Lord's Day B. 12, on Amt. (Mr. Aylesworth) to strike out amt. (Mr. T. Martin) *re* ball games, 7295 (iv).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census and statistics) 7380 (iv.)

Jackson, Mr. W., *West Elgin.*
Campeau, Michel, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 835, 1374 (i).
Deputy Ministers in Civil Service, Salary, Years of Service, Official Dress., &c. (Ques.) 342 (i).
Indian Act (intoxicants) Amt. B. 66 (Mr. Monk) on M. for 2°, 2073 (ii).
Jacks imported for Breeding Purposes, Duty *re* (Ques.) 836 (i).
Lord's Day B. 12 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. (trains, &c.) 5721 (iii).
Port Burwell Harbour, Inquiry for Ret., 5185, 5343 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 7398; (live stock, &c.) 7433 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 4858 (iii).
Tower of West Block, Collapse, Inspection by Dept. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1275 (i).

Johnston, Mr. A., *South Cape Breton.*
'Arctic,' Str., Expenditure *re* Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3231 (ii).
Coal purchased by Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2915 (ii).
German Tariffs in Relation to Canada, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 1928 (i).
Grand River and Western Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 216) 1°*, 6371 (iv).
Iron and Steel Ore, Bounties on Canadian Ore, on prop. Res. (Mr. Conmee) 3767 (ii).
Lord's Day B. 12, in Com., 5680 (iii); (industrial plants) 6605, 6631 (iv).
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., Removal from Office of Immigration Agent, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6914 (iv).
Ry. Act (telephones) Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 6105 (iii), 6210 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Lachine (coal tax) 7511 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies, &c.) 3607 (ii).

Johnston, Mr. A.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Ocean and River Service (maintenance of Strs.) 3231 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Glace Bay) 6775 (iv); Que.—St. Lawrence channel (lighting) 2915 (ii).

Kemp, Mr. A. E., *East Toronto.*
'Arctic' Expedition, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) to conc., in Rep. of Special Com. and Amt. (Mr. Northrup) 6511 (iv).
Bell Telephone Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Bureau) in Com., 5996 (iii).
Belmont Disaster, Claims for Damages (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7511 (iv).
Consular Agents and Trade Commissioners, Apptmnt. of (remarks) 2084 (ii).
Duryea, Chester B., Patent Relief B. 79 (Mr. Belcourt) in Com., 2195 (ii).
Georgian Bay Island Indian Reserves (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 726 (i).
Gold and Silver Marks Act Amt. B. 211 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7567 (iv).
Gun Boats sunk in Thames River, Removal of to U. S. (Ques.) 333 (i).
See 'Thames'.
House of Commons Rules, in Com. on Rep., 7610 (iv).
Hudson Bay Whale Fisheries B. 223 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 6855 (iv).
Imperial Institute, Explanation of Vote (remarks) on M. for 1° of Supply Bill, 677 (i).
Indemnity to Members and Privy Councillors B. 18 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3002 (ii).
See 'Senate', &c.
Insurance Investigation, Delay in Proceedings, &c., Legislation *re* (remarks) 3800 (ii).
I.C.R. Freight Rates, Control of by Ry. Commission, ref. to in Com. on Ry. Bill, 2569 (ii).
Lord's Day B. 12, in Com. (industrial plant) 6626; (loading, &c., vessels) 6634 (iv).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners B. 222 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 6847 (iv).
Montreal Harbour (reorganization) Commissioners B. 124 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 2648 (ii).
Norwegian Shipping Competition, Par. in Sydney 'Record,' 4087 (iii).
Port Arthur Harbour, Contract with Great Lakes Dredging Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3808 (ii).
Privy Councillors Annuities Repeal B. 220 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7629 (iv).
Ry. Accidents in Canada for 1904-5, Passengers and Employees, Investigations, &c. (Ques.) 446 (i).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 1620 (i), 2569 (ii), 7077 (iv).

Kemp, Mr. A. E.—*Con.*
Ry. Subsidies Authorization B. 214 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 3°, 6843 (iv).
Senate and House of Commons Act (indemnity) Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7123 (iv).
Sorel Wharf, Investigation *re* Accident (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6981 (iv).
S. A. War, Number of Canadians, disabled pensioned, &c. (Ques.) 1098 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Trent (Holland river) 5167; (Toronto land (electric plant) 5164 (iii).
Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 362 (i). Public Works—(promotions) 7030 (iv).
Fisheries (overseers) 3695 (ii).
Indians—Ont. and Que. (surveys) 726; (Yukon relief) 1207 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and S. Africa) 7554; (G.B. and Canada) 7544 (iv).
Militia (permanent force) 7177 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers, repairs) 3808 (ii).
Public Works — Buildings — Ont. (Toronto post office) 7039; Ottawa (post office fittings) 7039 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (repairs, &c.) 6974; (St. John military buildings) 7037 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Toronto, eastern entrance) 6994 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (Sorel wharf) 7043; (Three Rivers) 6981 (iv).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (transportation commission) 7021 (iv).
Public Works — Telegraph Lines — Yukon (Ashcroft-Edmonton) 7021 (iv).
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, &c.) 5134 (iii).
Scientific Institutions (magnetic observatory) 3683 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection (fog alarms) 3691; (inspectors) 3688 (ii).
Trade and Commerce (commercial agencies) 7540 (iv).
Thames River, Sunken Gunboats, Disposal of (remarks) 2550 (ii).
See 'Gunboats'.
Toronto Observatory (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 3683 (ii).
——— Removal to Ottawa (remarks) 127 (i).
Toronto Post Office, Pneumatic Tube System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7039 (iv).
Tower of West Block, Specifications *re* Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7030 (iv).
Trade and Commerce Reports, Expenditure *re* Compiling, &c. (Ques.) 581 (i).
Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 14 (Mr. Campbell) on M. for 3°, 2971 (ii).

Kennedy, Mr. J. B., *New Westminster.*
Acoustics of Chamber, &c. (remarks) 7364 (iv).
B.C. Shipping Interests, Govt. Aid, on M for Sup., 1509 (i).
Grimsby Park (remarks) in Com. on B. 12, 6668 (iv).

Kennedy, Mr. J. B.—*Con.*
House of Commons Rules, in Com. on Rep., 7618 (iv).
Lord's Day B. 12 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5674, 5792 (iii); (fishermen) 6653; (industrial plant) 6621; on Amt. (Mr. D. Ross) *re* industrial processes, 7216; (Jews) 6291; (maple sugar) 6659 (iv); (newspapers) 5741 (iii); (towing logs) 6655 (iv).

Knowles, Mr. W. E., *West Assiniboia.*
Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (moved) 20 (i).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 6195 (iv).
Ry. Land Grants, Selection by Ry. Cos., Govt. Policy *re*, on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) to Com. of Sup., 928 (i).

Lachance, Mr. A., *Centre Quebec.*
Quebec and Lake Huron Co.'s (B. 103) 1°*, 1465 (i).

Lake, Mr. R. S., *Qu'Appelle.*
Address, on The, 106 (i).
Arcola and Regina, Mail Service, Pet. *re* Improvements (Ques.) 5006 (iii).
C. P. R. Land Grant, Patents issued *re* &c. (Ques.) 331 (i).
Crooked Lake Indian Reserve, Surrender, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 947 (i).
Crown Lands, Administration of by Dept. of Interior, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 4251 (iii).
Dominion Lands, Administration of by Govt., on Amt. (Mr. Ames) to Com. of Sup., 3163 (ii).
Dom. Lands, Exceeding 160 Acres, Sale of &c. (Ques.) 5502 (iii).
Forest Reserves B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2834, 3337 (ii).
Frauds in N. W. Elections, ref. to in deb. on Address, 106 (i).
'Free Press' Man. and 'Der Nordwester Publishing Co.' Payment to (Ques.) 991 (i).
Grain Inspection Act, Memorials from Man. &c. *re* Changes (Ques.) 976 (i).
Grain Trade, N. W. T. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7425 (iv).
Half-Breed Scrip Claims, Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7372, 7571 (iv).
Hamilton, P. J., Apptmt. as Indian Farm Inspector (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1241 (i).
——— Qualifications as Farm Instructor at Touchwood Hills Indian Reserve (Ques.) 1674 (i).
Heffernan, Inspector N. W. M. Police, Political Interference &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4978 (iii).
Homestead Entries, Authorization Grants from 1901 to 1905, Number issued, Number cancelled, &c. (M. for ret.*) 209 (i).

Lake, Mr. R. S.—*Con.*

Homestead Entries, recorded from 1872 to 1905 in Man., Sask. and Alberta, Percentage of Patents issued, &c. (M. for ret.*) 209 (i).

Homestead Inspections, Applications for, Number, &c. (M. for ret.*) 428 (i).

Homesteads in N. W. T., Blanketing System (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1357 (i).

Hudson Bay Whale Fisheries B. 123 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6708 (iv).

Humboldt Telegraph Station (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7012 (iv).

Indian Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5423 (iii).

Indian Reserves, Portions for Settlement (Ques.) 331 (i).

Keewatin Territory, Jurisdiction *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4988 (iii).

Lord's Day B. 12, in Com. (loading, &c. grain) 6645 (iv).

Moberley, J. H., Apptmt. as Guide *re* Census taking (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7437 (iv).

——— Par. in 'Standard' (read) 6793 (iv).

Muscowequan School Property, Location, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1245 (i).

Nelson, J. and Sutherland, C., Emplymnt. by Govt, (Ques.) 188, 453 (i).

North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contracts, Charges *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Sup., 2357 (ii).

N. W. Elections, and Autonomy Bill, ref. to in deb. on Address, 106 (i).

Pasquah's Indian Band, Surrender of Land, &c. (Ques.) 5503 (iii).

Postmasters' Salaries in N. W. T. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7448 (iv).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 2594 (ii).

Ry. Land Grants, Selection by Ry. Cos., Govt. Policy *re*, on M. (Mr. W. J. Roche) to Sup., 909 (i).

Ry. Subsidies, Authorization B. 214 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 3°, 6843 (iv).

Saskatchewan Land Co., Purchase of Homestead Lands, Selection, &c. (Ques.) 420 (i).

School Lands Exchange B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 3911 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Administration of Justice—Yukon (living allowance) 7526 (iv).

Adulteration of Food (penalties) 2619 (ii).

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (quinquennial census) 7437; (Year-book) 7382 (iv).

Civil Government—Post Office (postmasters) 7448; Public Works (promotions) 7029 (iv).

Customs—(ports of entry) 7514 (iv).

Finance—Miscellaneous (tariff commission) 7457 (iv).

Immigration (agents, &c.) 1362, 1665 (i).

Indians—B. C. (schools) 1087 ; (general agencies) 1241; Man. and N.W.T. (surveys) 947 (i).

Lake, Mr. R. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Inspection of Staples (grain inspection) 7541 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (maintenance, &c.) 4938 (iii).

N. W. Mounted Police (N.W. Ters.) 4978 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings — Alberta, &c. (Edmonton immigration) 7042; (Saskatoon) 6754 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Cumberland) 6755 ; (Fernie) 6757 ; (Ladysmith) 6757 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Selkirk) 6752; (Winnipeg post office) 6749 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings — Ottawa (new buildings) 6726; (western block) 6714 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Chicoutimi) 6728 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (D'Israeli Wharf) 6953; Sask. (North Saskatchewan survey) 6995 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines—N. W. T. (Edmonton-Athabaska Landing) 7012 (iv).

Taylor, L. Fennings, Resignation *re* Collapse of Laurier Tower (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7029 (iv).

Timber or Hay Lands granted for Homestead Entries in Man., Description, Names of Applicants, &c. (M. for ret.*) 427 (i).

Wheat Inspection at Winnipeg, Grading, &c. (Ques.) 5004 (iii).

Lalor, Mr. F. R., *Haldimand.*

Allanburg and Marlatts Crossing Bridge, Welland, Cost of Construction, &c. (Ques.) 580 (i).

Giant's Tomb Island, Sale of Timber to P. Ryan (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1237 (i).

Grand River, Dunnville, Amount spent for Dredging (Ques.) 579 (i).

Grand River and Western Power Co.'s incorp. B. 216 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 7007 (iv).

Imperial Institute, Explanation of Vote (remarks) on M. for 1° of Supply Bill, 702 (i).

Indemnity to Members and Pensions to Privy Councillors B. 18 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3055 (ii).

Insurance Investigation Com., and Fraternal Societies, &c. (Ques.) 189 (i).

Lord's Day B. 12 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5680 (iii).

Money Lenders Act Amt. B. 11 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6807 (iv).

Port Colborne Elevator, Tenders *re* Construction (Ques.) 579 (i).

Preston, Mr. W.T.R., Removal from Office of Immigration Agent, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6915 (iv).

Ry. Act (express companies) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 814 (i).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 7081; on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) to M. for 3°, 7112 (iv).

Lalor, Mr. F. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY :
Customs (outside ports) 506 (i).
Immigration (agents, G.B., &c.) 1665 (i).
Indians—Man. (live stock) 741 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (D'Israeli wharf) 6945 (iv).

Thames River Flooding, Relief of Cor., Plans, &c., on M. (Mr. Clements) for Copies, 779 (i).

Tower of West Block, Collapse, Investigation by Govt., on M. for Sup., 1317 (i).

Welland Canal Bridge and Locks, Amount spent in Repairs (Ques.) 580 (i).

Lancaster, Mr. E. A., *Lincoln & Niagara.*

Arbitrations and Awards, Payments to Civil Servants *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 374 (i).

'Arctic,' Str., Expedition, Com. of Investigation *re* Expenditure, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3660 (ii).

Bell Telephone Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Bureau) on M. for Com., 3954 ; in Com., 3964 (ii), 6090 (iii); on M. for 3°, 6317 (iv).

Canada Evidence Act Amt. B. 68 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 1266 (i).

Cannington Postmaster, Dismissal of Mr. Talbot, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Cor., 2491 (ii).

Cornwall Canal Electric Power, Contract *re* (Ques.) 764 (i).

Dredges under Charge of Mr. Cowie (Ques.) 4154 (iii).

Dredges under Charge of Mr. Lafleur (Ques.) 4154 (iii).

Exchequer Court Act (liability) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 3524 (ii).

'Fielding,' Dredge, Estimated and Total Cost of (Ques.) 4700 (iii).

Fruit Marks Act (apples) Amt. B. 101 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2172 (ii).

Gobeil, Mr., Dep. Min. of Public Works, acting as Arbitrator (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 374 (i).

G.T.P. Ry. Branch Lines incorp. B. 75 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 5460, 6075 (iii); on M. for 3°, (amt.) 6609; on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 6618 (iv).

G.T.P. Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 61 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 4540 (iii).

Grand River and Western Power Co.'s incorp. B. 216 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 7269 (iv).

Grimsby Park, Prohibition of Fees, Cor. (read) in Com., on B. 12, 6664 (iv).

Hillcrest Coal, Coke and Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 157 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 4398 (iii).

Homesteads in N.W.T., Blanketing System, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1358 (i).

House of Commons Rules, in Com. on Special Rep., 7464 (iv).

Lancaster, Mr. E. A.—*Con.*

Indemnity to Members and Pensions to Privy Councillors B. 18 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3042 (ii).

Indian Schools, Complaints *re* Curriculum (remarks) *re* Answer to Question 3250 (ii).

Labour Statistics Repeal B. 109 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2161 (ii).

Land Policy of Govt. *re* Ry. Cos., Notice of M., 889 (i).

Lord's Day B. 12, in Com. (Jews) 6316, 6328; (maple sugar) 6658; (pleasure grounds) 6664; (shooting) 6261; (towing logs, &c.) 6655 (iv).

Mackintosh, Eileen Mary, Relief B. 185, on M. (Mr. Northrup) to ref. back to Com., 5440; in Com., 6040 (iii).

Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. (B. 7) 1° m., 18; 2° m., 458; in Com., 468, 842, 998 (i).

Masters and Mates B. 7, Com., (M.) to add Name, 999 (i).

Niagara Falls Water Power, Representation to Imp. Govt. *re* (Ques.) 334 (i).

Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 173 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 6059 (iii); on M. for 3°, 6699 (iv).

Peer, John Albert, Relief B. 169 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 4950, 5447 (iii).

Preston, Mary Emeline Relief B. 168 (Mr. Campbell) in Com., 4950 (iii).

Ry. Act (arbitrations) Amt. (B. 6) 1° m., 17; 2° m., 456 (i).

Ry. Act (crossings) Amt. (B. 8) 1° m., 18, on M. for 2° (remarks) 349; on Order being called for 2°, 483; 2° m., 844 (i).

Ry. Act (express cos.) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 802 (i).

Ry. Act (General) Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 2574 (ii); 4071, 6094 (iii), 6199, 6215, 7065 (iv); on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) to M. for 3°, 7113 (iv).

Speaker's Apartments, H. of C. Goods supplied, Inventory, Cor. &c. (M. for stmnt.*) 2274 (ii).

——— Inquiry for ret., 5533 (iii).

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. 16 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) on M. for 1°, 250 (i).

SUPPLY :
Civil Govt.—Public Works (salaries) 374 (i).
Customs (I. G. Baker Co.) 523 (i).

Toronto, Niagara and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 134 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 4390 (iii).

Tower, Collapse of, Investigation by Govt., on M. for Sup., 1337 (i).

Vaughan, Wm. Napoleon, Relief B. 180 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 6035 (iii).

Walsh, Patrick, Dismissal from East Roman Valley Post Office, Pet. Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1206 (i).

——— (Ques.) 769 (i).

Lancaster, Mr. E. A.—*Con.*
Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 14 (Mr. Campbell) on M. for 2°, 878 (i).
Western Loan and Trusts Co.'s incorp. B. 35 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 3241 (ii).

Lanctot, Mr. R., *Laprairie-Napierville.*
Military Camp at Sherbrooke, Removal from Laprairie (Ques.) 2726 (ii).

Lapointe, Mr. E., *Kamouraska.*
Lozo, F. J., Instruction *re* Dismissal of Employees on I.C.R. (Ques.) 2547 (ii).
St. Philippe Station, Accommodation *re* Cars, &c. (Ques.) 993 (i).

Laurence, Mr. F. A., *Colchester.*
I. C. R., Belmont Disaster, Investigation, Claims *re* (Ques.) 992 (i).
——— Claims for Damages *re* Accidents to Relatives (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7[illegible] (iv).
Railway Subsidies Authorization B. 214 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 6837 (iv).
'Rembrant' Coal Barge, Investigation *re* Loss (Ques.) 1859 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G. (Prime Minister), *East Quebec.*
Address, on The, 52 (i).
——— (M.) to present, 124 (i).
Adjournment, Confusion on M. for, by Members leaving Chamber (remarks) 2017 (i).
Adulteration Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. Bergeron) on M. for 1°, 214 (i).
——— Discussion *re* (remarks) 2975 (ii).
Agriculture Committee, 5th Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Monk) to consider, 4152 (iii).
——— (M.) to add Name, 4450 (iii).
Alaskan-Yukon Boundary Line (remarks) 5186 (iii).
Alberta Land Co., Par. in Toronto 'Globe' (remarks) 2018 (i).
Alien Labour Act, Appeal *re* Judgment of Judge Anglin (Ans.) 343 (i).
Allanburg and Marlatts Crossing, Cost of Construction (Ans.) 581 (i).
American Silver, Amount collected (Ans.) 1565 (i).
Apples, Inspection for Export, Quality, &c., on M. (Mr. E. D. Smith) for Copies, 1388 (i).
Arbitrations and Awards, Payments *re* to Civil Servants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 381 (i).
'Arctic' Str., Expenditure *re* Investigation into Charges *re*, Remarks as to Committee, 3390 (ii).
——— (remarks) *re* Notice for Com., 3582 (ii).
——— Com. of Investigation *re* Expenditure (M.) 3620; on Amt. (Mr. Borden) 3629; (M.) for Com. (amt.) 3670, agreed to (Y. 132; N. O.) 3671 (ii).
——— (M.) for Special Com., 3903 (ii).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
'Arctic' Expedition, notice of motion (remarks) 3503 (ii).
Atlantic Mail Service, Contracts with Govt., &c. (Ans.) 189, 198, 215 (i).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep., Vol. 1 (presented) 124 (i).
——— Vol. 2 (presented) 169 (i).
——— on Inquiry for, 814 (i)
Aylesworth, Hon. A. B., Acting as Counsel since Apptnmt. as P.M.G. (Ans.) 425 (i).
——— Resignation, &c. (remarks) 5437 (iii).
Bell, Dr., Apptmt. as Director of Geological Survey (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 406 (i).
Bell Telephone Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Bureau) on M. for Com., 3956 (ii); in Com., 4197, 5996 (iii).
Bell Telephone Bill, and Ry. Act (remarks) 4250 (iii).
See 'Ry. B. 62.'
Birthday Honours, Conferring of, Responsibility *re* (remarks) 7460 (iv).
British America Assurance Co.'s B. 198 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 5501 (iii).
Brothier, D., Release of from B. C. Penitentiary (remarks) 5326 (iii).
Business of the House in *re* Motion of Mr. R. L. Borden (remarks) 4035 (iii).
——— (M.) to resume deb. on Minister, &c. practising, 2730 (ii).
See 'Govt. Business.'
By-Elections, Issue of Writs (remarks) 7696 (iv).
Canada Life and Other Insurance Cos., Reserve Fund *re* Standard of Govt. (Ans.) 985 (i).
Canadian Press Association, Annual Payments to, &c. (Ans.) 1370 (i).
Cape Tourmente and Murray Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6149 (iv).
Cinq-Mars, Newspaper Criticisms, on M. (Mr. Foster) to summon before Bar of Hse., 4711, 4714 (iii).
——— Constitutionality of Procedure, on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 5092 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. Jackson) to translate article, 4795 (iii).
——— (M.) to adjn. for one week, 4797 (iii).
——— Summoned for Further Examination, 5266; Res. *re* Censure, 5310 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Aylesworth) 5281 (iii).
Civil Servants and Outside Employments, Dismissal, &c. (Ans.) 455 (i).
Civil Service List (presented) 485 (i).
Coal Strike at Lethbridge, Stmnt. by Col. White *re* (Ans.) 574 (i).
Coasting Trade of Canada Amendments, on prop. res. (Mr. Clarke) 592 (i).
Colonization or Land Companies, Purchase of Land from Govt., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Ret. (Amt.) 1869 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Colonization Cos., Rep. of Mr. Stevenson, on Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 4029 (iii).
Committees, Sel. Standing (M.) 7, 11 (i).
——— Lists presented, 163 (i).
——— (M.) to add Names, 1668 (i), 4246, 4450, 5082 (iii).
Consular Agents, &c., Apptmnt. of by Imp. Govt. (remarks) 2084 (ii).
Co-operative and Industrial B. 144 (Mr. Bergeron), Discussion *re* (remarks) 2975 (ii).
Court of Appeal, Man. (salaries) Bill (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 5010 (iii).
Crown Lands, Administration of by Dept. of Interior, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 4679 (iii).
Debates, Official (M.) for Com., 126 (i).
——— 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 2022 (ii).
See 'Internal Economy'.
Deptl. Files, Access to by Members (remarks) 2934 (ii).
Deputy Ministers, Years of Service, Salary, Official Dress, &c. (Ans.) 342 (i).
Dom. Day Adjournment (M.) to Sit on Saturday, 6537 (iv).
Duryea, Chester B., Patent Relief B. 79 (Mr. Belcourt) in Com., 2198 (ii).
Elections of Members, Special Com. (Mr. R. L. Borden) on Order being called (remarks) 211 (i).
Embargo on Canadian Cattle, Repeal of, Representation *re* (Ans.) 183 (i).
Empire Trust Co.'s B. 135 (Mr. Worthington) in Com., 5446 (iii).
Estimates for 1906 7 (presented) 125 (i).
Express Companies (M.) to refer Bill to Sel. Com. on Rys., 4537, 4734 (iii).
See 'Ry. B. 62.'
Fiscal Year, Change *re* (remarks) 10 (i).
Forest Reserves B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2839, 3331, 3543 (ii).
Georgian Bay Survey, Amount expended (Ans.) 335 (i).
Gobeil, Mr., Dep. Min. of Public Works, acting as Arbitrator (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 381 (i).
Govt. Business, Procedure, &c. (M.) 7184 (iv).
——— Precedence on Mondays (M.) 4568 (iii).
——— Precedence on Wednesdays (M.) 2811 (ii).
——— Precedence on Wednesdays (remarks) *re* Motion, 2809 (ii).
——— Precedence on Thursday (M.) 1253 (i).
——— (remarks) 5532 (iii).
See 'Business,' 'Morning Sittings,' &c.
Grand River and Western Power Co.'s incorp. B. 216 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 7001 (iv).
G. T. P. Ry. Co.'s B. 58 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) on M. for 1°, 1147 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
G. T. P. Ry., Branch Lines B. 75 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 2263, 2702 (ii).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 84 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 2263, 2702 (ii).
G. T. Pacific Telegraph Co.'s incorp. B. 61 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 2713 (ii), 4539 (iii).
G. T. P. Ry., Award of Tenders (remarks) 655, 974 (i).
——— Construction, Emplymt. of Chinese Labour (remarks) 1000 (i).
——— Contracts, Tenders, &c. (remarks) 1466 (i).
——— Proposed Route from Winnipeg to Moncton, &c. (Ans.) 418 (i).
——— Tenders in Detail *re* Two Sections of N. T. Ry. (remarks) 4034 (iii).
Grand Vallee Wharf, Total Cost, Revenue, &c. (Ans.) 341 (i).
Gun Boats sunk in Thames River, Removal of, &c. (Ans.) 333 (i).
Head Tax collected by U. S. Officials from Canadians (Ans.) 323 (i).
Heffernan, N.W.M.P. Inspector and Political Interference (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4979 (iii).
Hope Island Timber Reserve, Amount (removed and paid for by Mr. M. Chew (Ans.) 419 (i).
House of Commons Rules, Revision, Report of Special Com. (presented) 7054 (iv).
——— M. for Com. on Rep. of Special Com., 7460; in Com. 7463, 7600 (iv).
Hudson Bay Co.'s Employees, Policy *re* Retirement Claims (Ans.) 1568 (i).
——— Land Claims, &c., on M. (Mr. McCraney) for Copies, 3746 (ii).
Immigration from G. B., False Representations *re* (remarks) 7694 (iv).
——— Whips' conduct *re* Vote, Rep. in Toronto 'World' (remarks) 3071 (ii).
Indemnity to Members and Pensions to Privy Councillors B. 18 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3020 (ii).
See 'Sen. and H. of C.', &c.
Indian Act (intoxicants) Amt. B. 66 (Mr. Monk) on M. for 2°, 2075 (ii).
Indian (J. W. Lewis) Enfranchisement B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2829 (ii).
Insurance Commission, Emplymt. of Counsel (remarks) 10 (i).
——— Conduct of Proceedings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 306 (i).
——— Fraternal Societies, &c. (Ans.) 189 (i).
——— Inquiry for Copies of Proceedings, 1940 (i).
——— O. C. laid on table, 12 (i).
Interior, Deptl. Rep., on Inquiry for, 485 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
I. C. R., General Statement (remarks) on M. for Sup., 127 (i).
Internal Economy Com.; Mes from His Ex., 125 (i).
Internal Economy Com., and Salaries of Hse. of Commons Officials (remarks) 7057 (iv). *See* 'Printing'.
Japanese Treaty, and Reduced Tariff Arrangements (remarks) 5754 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Documents, 126, 1367 (i), 3349 (ii).
——— Papers laid on Table, 1940 (i).
——— ref. to in deb. on Address, 56 (i).
Judges of Provincial Courts (arbitrators, &c.) B. 13 (Mr. Lennox) in Com., 5382 (iii).
——— (travelling) Amt. B. 83 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 1769 (i).
——— Legislation *re* outside work, 4538 (iii).
——— (remarks) 5532 (iii).
Justice, Administration of, Objection *re* Supply., 486 (i).
Keewatin Territory, Jurisdiction by N. W. Police (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4982 (iii).
King's Most Gracious Majesty, Invitation to visit Canada, on M. (Mr. Belcourt) 1687 (i).
———Mess. to the Senate (M.) 2321 (ii).
Lac Bouchette to St. André Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res. (Amt.) 6182 (iv).
Lands Grants to Ry., Inaccuracy of Votes and Proceedings *re* adjnd. deb. (remarks) 973 (i).
——— on Inquiry for Papers referred to in Speech of Min. of Int., 973 (i).
——— Selection by Ry. Cos., Govt. Policy *re*, on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) to Com. of Sup., 1051 (i).
Lands purchased by Companies, &c., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3277 (ii).
Langevin, Sir Hector, Decease of (remarks) 5084 (iii).
Levis Dry Dock, Resolution *re* Enlargement (Ans.) 4706 (iii).
Library of Parlt., Com. List (presented) 169 (i).
——— Sunday Closing (remarks) 2233 (ii).
L'Ile aux Grues, Channel-Deepening, &c. (Ans.) 200 (i).
Loans, Temporary Govt., Oustanding, Rate of Interest, &c. (Ans.) 171 (i).
Lord's Day B. 12 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5637, 5766 (iii); (Jews) 6310; (maple sugar) 6658; (provincial legislatures) 6600; (shooting) 6254; on M. for 3°, Ques. of Order *re* Amt. (Mr. Porter) 7297; on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) *re* Discussion on 3°, 7196; on Senate Amts., 7687 (iv).
——— Further Consideration of (remarks) 7061 (iv).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Lotbinière and Megantic Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6162 (iv).
McDonald Iron Co., &c., Yukon Ter., Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 7059 (iv).
Maganetawan Lighthouse, Construction of, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 422 (i).
Magog Post Office, Purchase of Site, &c. (Ans.) 341 (i).
Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Conference with Ont. &c. (Ans.) 199 (i). *See* 'Court'.
Man. Telephone Lines, Expropriation of, Memorial *re* (remarks) 6247 (iv).
Medicines, Deleterious, (M.) to add Mr. Bergeron's Name to Com., 3150 (ii).
Members appointed to Offices &c. (Ans.) 214 (i), 4798 (iii).
Members appointed to Govt. Offices since 1867 (Ans.) 6086 (iii).
——— (remarks) *re* Answer to former Questions, 6544 (iv).
——— (remarks) 5752 (iii).
Members and Privy Councillors Indemnity (Mr. W. F. Maclean)—(M.) that 2° be considered, 2511 (ii).
——— Discussion *re* (remarks) 2067 (ii).
Members, Daily Attendance, Record, of (Ans.) 202 (i).
Mess. from His Ex. Estimates 1906-7 (presented) 125 (i).
——— Internal Economy (presented) 125 (i).
——— Reply to Adress (presented) 1940 (i).
Milan Exhibition, Exhibit *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 304 (i).
Military Gazette, Expenditure *re* Issue (Ans.) 583 (i).
Militia Camps, Service Rolls, Modification of (remarks) 2625 (ii).
Ministerial Changes (remarks) 226; (explanation) 252 (i).
Ministerial Changes, Announcement *re*, Justice, Post Office and Supreme Court Vacancies, 4535 (iii).
Ministers and Deputy Ministers practising in Courts, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 1708 (i), 2800 (ii).
Money Lenders Act Amt. B. 11 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6810 (iv).
——— Legislation *re* (remarks) 6126 (iv).
Montreal Harbour (reorganization) Commissioners B. 124 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 2649 (ii).
Morning Sittings, (M.) 5508 (iii).
Mutual Reserve Life Ins. Co., Charges for Grand Larceny (Ans.). 420 (i).
Naturalization Laws of the Empire, Available Copies (remarks) 1467 (i).
Naturalization Laws for U.S. Citizens, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 418 (i). *See* "U. S."

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Newfoundland's Claim to Ungava Bay and Labrador (Ans.) 7459 (iv).
Newfoundland and W. Indies, Steps *re* Confederation (Ans.) 333 (i).
Niagara Falls, Preservation of, Pets., &c. (Ans.) 1101 (1).
Niagara Falls Water Power, Representations to Imp. Govt. *re* (Ans.) 334 (i).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract, Charges *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Sup., 2372 (ii).
——— Contracts, Signatures missing (remarks) 2081 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Foster), Misquoting Res. (personal explanation) 2410 (ii).
——— Irregularity of Debate (remarks) 1160 (i).
——— Ques. of Order, Ref. to Committee's Rep., 2106 (ii).
——— Refusal of Mr. Preston to answer Questions, on M. (Mr. Monk) to appear before Bar of Hse., 4461; (amt.) 4472; agreed to (Y. 95; N. 47) 4533 (iii).
N. W. Mounted Police in Alberta and Sask.: Rep. of Council (read) 4975 (iii).
Oaths of Office (B. 1) 1°*, pro forma, 4 (i).
O'Gorman, John, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1099 (i).
Ottawa Carbide Co., Payments *re* Purchase (remarks) *re* Question, 986 (i).
Parliament, Delay in Opening (remarks) 8 (i).
Patent Medicines, Legislation *re* Sale of (Ans.) 183 (i).
Pilotage Fund, Defalcations of D. McLean, &c., (remarks) 5436 (iii).
Pinette Harbour Dredging, P.E.I., Pet. *re* (Ans.) 333 (i).
Placer Mining in Yukon B. 153 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 3422 ((ii).
Port Colborne Elevator, Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 579 (i).
Postal Act, Legislation *re* (remarks) 3583 (ii).
Post Office Savings Banks, N.B. and N.S., Number transferred (Ans.) 1101 (i).
Prince Arthur of Connaught, Reception in Senate (remarks) 1749 (i).
P.E.I., Dredging Crapaud Harbour, Apptnt. of Supt. (Ans.) 329 (i).
——— and Magdalen Islands SS. Service (Ans.) 445 (i).
——— New Dredge, Completion of (Ans.) 332 (i).
——— Ry. Facilities, Pets. *re* Extension (Ans.) 444 (i).
——— Representation in the House (remarks) on M. to take in Mondays, 4571 (iii).
Printing Bureau Employees, Names, receiving less than $12 per week (Ans.) 7060 (iv).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Printing Committee, Joint Rep. (M.) to ref. to Internal Economy Com. 7054 (iv).
——— List (presented) 169 (i).
Printers' Complaint *re* Winnipeg Printer's Board of Trade, Cor. with Imp. Govt. (Ans.) 572 (i).
Private Bills, on M. (Mr. Macpherson) to extend time, 2822 (ii).
Privy Councillors Annuities Repeal B. 220 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7627 (iv).
——— (remarks) *re*, 4537 (iii).
——— (remarks) on M. to take in Mondays, 4569 (iii).
Prorogation, (announcement) 7600 (iv).
——— Cause of Delay (remarks) 7697 (iv).
Provincial Elections in N.W., Interference by Dom. Govt. (remarks) on Address, 52 (i).
Provincial Subsidies Conference *re* readjustment,, &c. (Ans) 195 (i).
Public Accounts Com. (presented) 126 (i).
——— (M.) to add Name, 417 (i).
——— Rep., on M. (Mr. Northrup) to ref. back to Com., 3904 (ii).
Quebec Bridge Co., Board of Directors, Govt. Representatives, &c. (Ans.) 339 (i).
——— Co.'s Books, Inspection of (Ans.) 445 (i).
——— Subsidies, Payment of, Bonds, &c. (Ans.) 445 (i).
——— Total Amount paid, Bonds guaranteed. &c. (Ans.) 338 (i).
Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6157 (iv).
Quebec Cliffs, Dangerous Condition, Rep. *re*, Protection to City (Ans.) 3066 (ii).
——— (remarks) 3155 (ii).
Quebec and Seven Islands Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6156 (iv).
Ry. Act (crossings) Amt. B. 8 (Mr. Lancaster) on Order being called for 2°, 484 (i).
——— Discussions *re* (remarks) 4570 (iii).
Ry. Act (telephones, &c.) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on Order being called for 2°, 443 (i).
Ry. Act Amt. B. No. 17, Consideration of (remarks) on M. to take in Mondays, 4571 (iii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 1607 (i); on Senate Amts., 7570 (iv).
Ry. Act Amt. Bill (remarks) *re* Legislation, 4539 (iii).
Ry. Subsidies, Authorization B. 214 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 6149 (iv).
Rainmaking in the Yukon, Payments to by Council (remarks) on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 563 (i).
——— Supervision of Expenditure by Dom. Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1220 (i).
Renfrew, N., Vacancy in Electoral District (remarks) 6125 (iv).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Representation of Provinces, &c., on M. to adjn. deb. (remarks) 1132 (i).
Returns for 1904-5, Delay in bringing down (remarks) 1255 (i).
Returns, Preparation of, Inefficient System (remarks) 13 (i).
Rigaud Seigniory, Payments to Owners, (Ans.) 993 (i).
Roberval and Quebec Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6157 (iv).
Rules and Procedure of the House, Revision of (M.) for Special Com., 252 (i).
See 'House of Commons.'
Russian Jews, Massacre of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Macdonell) 228 (i).
San Francisco Disaster, Contribution by Dom. Govt. (remarks) 1748 (i).
Senate and House of Commons Act (indemnity) Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Fitzpatrick); on M. for 2°, 1790 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 1869 (i).
Senate Reform, on prop. Res. (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 2298 (ii).
Senate Vacancies in N.B., &c. (Ans.) 992 (i).
Silver Coins, &c., Redemption of old Coins (Ans.) 333 (i).
See 'American Silver.'
Speaker's Apartments, on Inquiry for Ret., 5533 (iii).
Speech from Throne, (M.) for consdn., 7 (i).
Standard Trust Co.'s B. 147 (Mr. Bole) on M. for 2°, 2720 (ii).
Sterling Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. B. 105 (Mr. Lennox) in Com., 5500 (iii).
Supply (M.) for Com., 125 (i).

SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics (exhibitions) 304; (imperial institute, Canadian exhibit) 315 (i).
Civil Govt.—Agriculture (salaries) 369; Board of Civil Service Examiners (salaries) 416; Depts. Generally (cleaning, &c.) 416; Finance (salaries) 366; Geological Survey (salaries) 406; Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office (salaries) 357, 416; High Commissioner's Office (salaries) 404; Interior (salaries) 363; N.W. Mounted Police (salaries) 360; Privy Council (salaries) 358; Public Works (salaries) 381; Railways and Canals (consulting engineer) 416; Trade and Commerce (salaries) 403 (i).
Culling Timber (supervisors) 7542 (iv).
Inspection of Staples (grain inspection) 7541 (iv).
Justice—Miscellaneous (Comparative Legislation) 7529 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Annapolis and London) 7555; (Canada-Australia) 7556; (Canada and Havana) 7556; (Canada and Mexico) 7554; (Canada and S. Africa) 7553; (G. B. and Canada) 7543; (Halifax and W. Indies) 7551; (Newcastle and Miramichi) 7556; (Pelee Island) 7557; (Port Simpson and Queen Charlotte Islands) 7555; (Quebec and Orleans) 7557; (St. Catharines and Tadousac) 7554; (St. John and Cumberland) 7555; (St. John and Digby) 7551; (Victoria and San Francisco) 7553 (iv).
Miscellaneous (insurance inspection) 306; (Japanese famine fund) 315; (Prince Arthur's visit) 314 (i).
N. W. Mounted Police (N. W. and Yukon) 4967 (iii).
Trade and Commerce (Chinese Immigration) 7539; (commercial agencies) 7539 (iv)

Supreme Court of Judicature in N. B., B. 224 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 3°, 7190 (iv).
Supreme Court, Postponement of Quebec Cases (remarks) 3076 (ii).
——— Vacancy, &c. (remarks) 3910 (ii).
——— (remarks) *re* Question, 2702 (ii).
Sutherland, Geo. M., Emplymt. by Govt. (remarks) 2266 (ii).
——— and John Lamont, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 3246 (ii).
Tariff Commission, Announcement *re* Legislation, 9 (i).
Taschereau, Sir Henri, Resignation from Supreme Court (remarks) 2243 (ii).
Telephone Committee, of 1905, Conclusions, &c. (Ans.) 979 (i).
——— Amount paid *re* Committees (Ans.) 322 (i).
——— Expenses of Special Com. (remarks) 214 (i).
——— Sittings, &c. (remarks) 126 (i).
Telephone Legislation, Govtl. Intention (remarks) 348 (i).
Telephone Lines in Man., Memorial *re* Expropriation by Govt. (Ans.) 3250 (ii).
Toledo Glass Co.'s Patent Relief, B. 110 (Mr. Stewart) on Order for Com. (remarks) 3952; in Com., 3737 (ii).
Toronto Observatory, Removal from Toronto (remarks) 127 (i).
Toronto Street Ry. Co., Litigation *re*, Retainer of Hon. Mr. Aylesworth, (remarks) *re* (Ques.) 3252 (ii).
Trade and Commerce Rep., Expenditure *re* Compiling (Ans.) 581 (i).
Transcontinental Ry. Commissioners, Expropriation of Land in Prov. of Quebec (Ans.) 416 (i).
Transcontinental Ry. Report, Printing, &c. (remarks) 126 (i).
——— on Inquiry for Report, 213 (i).
See 'G.T.P. Ry.'
U.S. Citizens and Naturalization *re* N.W.Ter. Settlers (Ans.) 344 (i).
See 'Naturalization.'
Veterans of Fenian Raids, Claims for Compensation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 633 (i).

Laurier, Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid, G.C.M.G.—*Con.*
Victoria Day (remarks) *re* adjournment, 3672 (ii).
——— (M.) for Adjournment, 3795 (ii).
Votes and Proceedings, Correction *re* adjnd. deb. on Land Grants, &c. (remarks) 973 (i).
Wagner, Philip, Charges *re* Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. Fowler) to Com. of Sup., 5603 (iii).
Water Powers in Canada, Leases, Alienations, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Stmnt., 603 (i).
Waterways Commission, Rep. *re* Niagara Water Power Treaties &c. (remarks) 568 (i).
Ways and Means (M.) for Com., 125 (i).
Welland Canal Bridge and Locks, Amount spent in Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 580 (i).
West Cape Branch P.E.I. Ry., Survey *re* (Ans.) 582 (i).
Wheat Inspection at Winnipeg (remarks) *re* Question, 5004 (iii).
White, Hon. Peter, late M.P., Decease of (remarks) 2545 (ii).
Winnipeg 'Free Press,' Amounts paid for all Purposes (remarks) 5752 (iii).
Woods Co., Payments to for Supplies 1905 (Ans.) 1369 (i).
Wood Island Breakwater, P.E.I., Repairs to (Ans.) 332 (i).
Yukon Concessions, Bronson & Ray Claims, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 1538 (i).
Yukon Expenditure by Council and Supervision by Dom. Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1220 (i).
Yukon Govt., Charges against Judiciary, Cor. of Mr. G. Campbell, &c., on M. (Mr. Sproule) 5924 (iii).
See 'Alaska,' &c.

Lavergne, Mr. A., *Montmagny.*
Cinq-Mars, Summoned for further examination, on M. to read Article, 5267 (iii)
Customs Duties collected on Books in English and French (Ans.) 4248 (iii).
Lord's Day B. 12 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5645, 5786, 5807 (iii), 6275; (Jews) 6287 (iv); (newspapers) 5742 (iii); (provincial acts) 6556; (provincial legislatures) 6559; (shooting) 6251 (iv); (trains, &c.) 5703, 5726 (iii).
Lord's Day B. 12, in Com., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) *re* Amts., 7206; on M. (Mr. Aylesworth) to strike out amt. (Mr. T. Martin) *re* ball games, 7279, 7289; on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) to M. for 3°, 7339 (iv).
Lord's Day Bill, Montreal Public Meeting (remarks) 6825 (iv).
——— Personal Explanation (Mr. Macdonald) 7637 (iv).

Lavergne, Mr. A.—*Con.*
North Atlantic Trading Co. (personal explanation) *re* Vote, 2622 (ii).
Orangemen and Conservative Party, Misrepresentations in Press (remarks) 4721 (iii).
Quebec Cliffs, Dangerous Condition of, Works *re* Protection of City (Ques.) 3066 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Railways—I.C.R. (double tracking) 5356 ; (Lévis accommodation) 5355 (iii).

Lavergne, Mr. Louis, *Drummond and Arthabaska.*
Lord's Day B. 12 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5758 (iii).
North Atlantic Trading Co. (remarks) *re* Par. in 'La Presse' on Pairs, 2622 (ii).
Uniforms for 80th Regiment, Nicolet, (Ques.) 7693 (iv).

Law, Mr. B. B., *Yarmouth, N.S.*,
Cement purchased for Lighthouse Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4925 (iii).
Fruit Marks Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2562 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 4861 (iii).

Lefurgey, Mr. A. A., *East Prince, P.E.I.*
Alberta and Athabaska Lands, O.C. *re* Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 1741 (i).
——— (Ques.) 1374 (i).
Bag-net and Trap-net Licenses, Queen's Co., N.S. (Ques.) 4156 (iii).
Butter manufactured at N.S. Experimental Farms, Quantity, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 5781 (iii).
Cascumpec Sand Hills Channel, Closing of Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 1562 (i).
Fisheries, Jurisdiction over In-Shore, Speech of Lt. Gov. of P.E.I. (Ques.) 767 (i).
Goose Harbour Buoys, Contract *re* Setting out (Ques.) 3742 (ii).
Government Property destroyed by Fire, Estimated Cost (Ques.) 581 (i).
Higgin's Shore, P.E.I., Pet. *re* Wharf (Ques.) 572 (i).
Hillcrest Coal, Coke and Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 157 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 4398 (iii).
'Matilda' Schr., Rescue of Crew, Reward *re* (Ques.) 2549 (ii).
Miminegash Breakwater Repairs, Pet. *re* Extension (Ques.) 201 (i).
——— Vouchers *re* Expenditure (M. for copies*) 2273 (ii).
Miscouche Shoals, P.E.I., Erection of a Buoy (Ques.) 582 (i).
Prince County, P.E.I., Expenditure *re* Public Works (Ques.) 2266 (ii).
P.E.I., Coal Boring, Rep. of Mr. Ellis, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5983 (iii).

Lefurgey, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*
P.E.I., Contract *re* Mail Service on Ry. (Ques.) 2267 (ii).
——— Employees on Ry., Wages *re*, Publishing in Aud. Gen.'s Rep., 2549 (ii).
——— Fisheries, Cor. *re* Control by Govt. (M. for copies*) 997 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 3076 (ii).
P.E.I. Ry., Freight Rates, 1905, Tariff in 1906, Stmt. of Through Freight Rates, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2950 (ii).
——— Haney, Mr J., Contractor for Hillsborough Bridge, Claims for Damages (Ques.) 1563 (i).
——— Hodgson Property, Acquiring of, Cor. &c. (M. for copy*) 1380 (i).
P. E. I., Ice-breaker for Northumberland Straits, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3938 (ii).
P.E.I. Ry., News Agency, Contract *re* (Ques.) 2266 (ii), 6247 (iv).
——— Shops, Rebuilding, Free Site at Summerside, &c. (Ques.) 2728 (ii).
——— Summerside Branch, Rep. *re* Earnings, &c. (Ques.) 1563 (i).
——— Surveys, Cape Traverse Branch, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5174 (iii).
——— Wages paid, with reference to I.C.R. (M. for statement) 2951 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 5533 (iii.).
P.E.I., Winter Service, Ice-breakers, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4767, 4817 (iii).
Provincial Representaions in Parlt. (remarks) *re* Consideration, on M. to take in Mondays, 4571 (iii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 2595 (ii).
Representations of Provinces, Amt. to B.N.A. Act, on M. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 1130 (i).
Returns, Inquiry for, 2327, 3076 (ii).
Summerside Breakwater, Stipulation in Tender *re* Wages (Ques.) 1375 (i).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Trent (Holland river) 5170 (iii).
Geological Survey (borings) 5983 (iii).
Immigration (agencies, &c.) 5527; (printing &c. in G.B.) 5864 (iii).
Orean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 3938, 4816 (ii) ; (ice-breakers) 4767 (iii).
Railways—I.C.R. (Halifax accommodation) 5072; (Pictou accommodation) 5075; Miscellaneous (surveys), 5174 (iii).
West Cape Branch of P.E.I. Ry., Surveys &c. (Ques.) 582 (i).
Winnipeg Trust & Loan Co.'s incorp. (B. 129) 1°*, 1743 (i) ; in Com., 6053 (iii).

Lemieux, Hon. R. (Postmaster General), *Gaspé, Nicolet.*
Appeal Court, Man, Judges Salaries (prop res.) 4157 (iii). ,
'Appeal to Reason,' Removal of Ban of P.O. Dept., &c. (Ans.) 5616 (iii).

Lemieux, Hon. R.—*Con.*
Arcola and Regina Mail Service, Pet. *re* Improvement (Ans.) 5006 (iii).
Birnie, Postal Facilities, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 5006 (iii).
Copper Cliff, Postal Facilities (remarks) 7694 (iv).
D'Israeli Wharf, Expenditure *re* &c., 3458 (ii).
Grande Vallée Wharf, Par. in 'Le Canada,' on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Monk) 3798 (ii).
Immigration from Belgium (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1639 (i).
Lamont, J.H., Payments to as Crown Prosecutor, 1905 (Ans.) 979 (i)
Lord's Day B. 12, in Com. (Jews) 6334 (iv) on Amt. (Mr. D. Ross) *re* industrial processes, 7230; on M. for 3°, 7311 (iv).
McRae, Mr. E., Claims *re* Loss of Letter posted to Bank of N.B., enclosing Money (Ans.) 6930 (iv).
Montreal Harbour (reorganization) Commissioners' B. 124 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 2649 (ii).
Nicolet and Gaspé Representation (Ans.) 1865 (i).
Ottawa Post Office Employees, Wages paid, &c. (Ans.) 6245 (iv).
Penitentiaries, Flour supplied, Advertisements *re* (Ans.) 451 (i).
Postal Regulations *re* U. S. Publications, 'Ladies Home Journal,' &c., Statement (read) 5620 (iii).
Postmasters Salaries, Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7445 (iv).
Public Works Expenditure, Condemnation of, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 3458 (ii).
St. John Postal Difficulties (remarks) 7694 (iv.)
Saskatchewan Protested Elections, Law *re* Trial of (Ans.) 3741 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 7375 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Labour Dept. (salaries, &c.) 7444; Post Office (postmaster) 7445; (salaries) 7445 (iv).
Immigration (agents, G.B., &c.) 1637 (i).
Interior—Miscellaneous (Labrador boundary) 5861 (iii).
Labour Dept.—(printing 'Labour Gazette') 7444 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Magdalen Islands) 7553 ; (Quebec and Gaspé) 7553 (iv).
Metric System (lectures) 2614 (ii).
Ticket of Leave Men liberated and re-arrested (Ans.) 4154 (iii).
Toledo Glass Co.'s Patent Relief B. 110 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3679, 3719 (ii).

Lennox, Mr. H., *South Simcoe.*
Address, The, 97 (i).
Arbitrations and Awards, Payments to Civil Servants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 372 (i).

Lennox, Mr. H.—*Con.*
Bell Telephone Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Bureau) on M. for Com., 3956; (M.) to ref. back to Special Com., 3957; in Com., 3966 (ii).
Bell Telephone Bill. Ry. Act, Clauses *re* (remarks) 4250 (iii).
See 'Ry. B. 62,' &c.
Blood Indian Reserve, Inquiry for Ret., 3713 (ii).
Canadian Minnesota Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. 91 (Mr. Dyment) in Com., 2505 (ii).
Cement purchased for Lighthouse Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4929 (iii).
Cinq-Mars, Before Ear of Hse., on Amt. (Mr. Aylesworth) 5183 (iii).
County Court Judges, Division of Districts, Population of, &c. (Ques.) 1153 (i).
County Court Judges, MacTavish, O'Meara, Colter, Deroche and Dowlin, Date of Commission, Population of Counties, &c. (Ques.) 2036 (ii).
——— Ont., Regulations *re* Number, c. 54, ss. 5 and 6, Amts., &c. (Ques.) 1747 (i).
Criminal Code (witnesses) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 3099 (ii).
Customs Tariff Act (steel rails) Amt. B. 175 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5102 (iii).
D'Israeli Wharf, Expenditure *re*, 3453 (ii).
Duryea, Chester B., Patent Relief B. 79 (Mr. Belcourt) in Com., 2201 (ii).
Electric Power and Gas Exportation B. 145 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 3089 (ii).
Files of Dept., Open to Inspection by Members (remarks) 2947 (ii).
Fiscal Year B. 162 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5095 (iii).
German Tariffs in Relation to Canada, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 1935 (i).
Gobeil, Mr., Dep. Min., Public Works, acting as Arbitrator (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 372 (i).
G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 84 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 2262 (ii).
G. T. P. Telegraph Co.'s B. 61 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 4541, 4755 (iii).
G. T. P. Ry., Surveys between Quebec and Moncton, Cor., &c., on M. (Mr. Crocket) for Copies, 1463 (i).
Hay Trade Regulations, Penalties *re* Violation, in Com. on Res. (Mr. Beauparlant) 4016 (ii).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 170 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5199, 5227 (iii).
Imperial Institute, Explanation of Vote (remarks) on M. for 1° of Supply Bill, 666 (i).
Indian Reserves, Right *re* Timber &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1249 (i).
Insurance Investigation Com., Conduct of Proceedings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 309 (i).

Lennox, Mr. H.—*Con.*
Insurance Legislation and Investigation Committee (remarks) 3235 (ii).
Judges of Provincial Courts, Amounts paid to, &c., since July 1905 (M. for ret.*) 207 (i).
——— Legislation *re* Outside Work (remarks) 4538 (iii).
——— (arbitrators) Act Amt. (B. 13) 1° m., 20; 2° m., 859 (i); in Com., 5364 (iii).
——— Discussion *re* (remarks) 5083, 5185 (iii).
——— (remarks) *re* Action of Govt., 5531 (iii).
Judges' Salaries, Amount of Work performed, &c. (M.) for Ret., 770 (i).
Keewatin Territory, Jurisdiction *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4986 (iii).
Kootenay and Arrowhead Ry. Co.'s B. 30 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 1146 (i).
MacTavish, Judge, &c., Date of Commissions, Population of County, &c. (Ques.) 2036 (ii).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 479, 481 (i).
Members Indemnity, ref. to in deb. on Address, 97 (i).
Military Camp at Simcoe County, Option *re* Site, &c. (Ques.) 5508 (iii).
Ministers and Deputy Ministers, Practising in Courts (prop. res.) 1694 (i); 2731; Neg. (N. 89; Y. 54) 2808; on Amt. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 2804 (ii).
——— Order for Consdn. of Res. (remarks) 2069, 2511 (ii)
Newmarket and Holland River Canal, Survey, Estimate, &c. (Ques.) 1565 (i).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1648 (i).
——— on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) ref. to Rep. of Com., 2107 (ii).
——— Refusal of Mr. Preston to answer Questions, on M. (Mr. Monk) 4480 (iii).
Placer Mining Yukon B. 153 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 3424 (ii).
Public Works Expenditure, Condemnation of, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 3453 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of, Par. in Toronto 'Daily Star,' 1750 (i).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Macpherson) *re* interruptions in Debate (remarks) 3071 (ii).
Qu'Appelle Long Lake & Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Carvell) in Com., 2707 (ii).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners B. 177 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 4812 (iii).
Railway Act (liability) Amt. (B. 17) 1° m., 250; 2° m., 884 (i).
——— Consideration of (remarks) on M. to take in Mondays, 4570 (iii).
Ry. Act (express cos.) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 809 (i).
Ry. Act (general) Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 1585 (i), 2585 (ii).

Lennox, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Ry. Act Amt. Bill, Ref. to Special Com. (remarks) 4539 (iii).

Ry. Mail Clerks appointed from N. York (Ques.) 330 (i).

Returns of Previous Session, Inquiry for, 162, 213 (i).

Returns, on Inquiry for, 2237 (ii).

Roads and Road Allowances B. 202 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5560 (iii).

Rural Mail Delivery, Free, Information *re* U.S. System (Ques.) 216 (i).

Rural Mail Delivery, (remarks) *re* Return, 712, 1572 (i).

Sterling Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 105) 1°*, 1465 (i); in Com., 5499 (iii).

SUPPLY :

Canals—Trent (tugs) 5360 (iii).
Civil Govt.—Public Works (salaries) 372 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (carbide supplies) 4879, 4966 (iii).
Miscellaneous (insurance inspection) 309 (i).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 4863; (patrol boat, Hudson's Bay) 4867 (iii).
Post Office (mail service) 536 (iii).
Weights and Measures (inspections) 2605 (ii).

Supreme and Exchequer Courts Bill withdrawn, 4568 (iii).

Toronto Street Ry. Litigation, Retainer of Hon. Mr. Aylesworth (Ques.) 3252 (ii).

Trent Canal, Memorial presented to Prime Minister (read) 5360 (iii).

Vancouver and Lulu Island Ry. Co.'s B. 29 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 1141, 1296 (i).

Windsor, Essex and Lake Shore Rapid Ry. Co.'s B. 150 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 5226 (iii).

Leonard, Mr. J. E. E., *Laval.*

Baril, Alfred, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 834 (i).

Judges, Circular Letter, Replies to (remarks) 1573 (i).

Montmagny Postmaster, Apptmnt. of, complaints *re*, Occupation, &c. (Ques.) 3404 (ii).

Payette, Philias, Compensation *re* Damage to Health on N.T.Ry. Construction (Ques.) 5321 (iii).

Rivière Jésus Wharf, Amount expended, Completion, &c. (Ques.) 453 (i).

St. Hypolite Mail Service, Pets. *re* Improvement (Ques.) 2267 (ii).

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary Employees, Increase of Salaries, Rep. *re* (Ques.) 2268 (ii).

——— Guards' Salaries, Increase of (Ques.) 454 (i).

Terrebonne and Ste. Therese Post Offices, Revnue *re* (Ques.) 2721 (ii).

Terrebonne Wharf, Amount expended, Completion, &c. (Ques.) 454 (i).

Lewis, Mr. E. N., *West Huron.*

Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. 207 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 5894 (iii).

Lord's Day B. 12, in Com., (Jews) 6350 (iv).

Merchant Marine for Canada, Decrease of, &c. (M.) to Adjn., 1160 (i).

Logan, Mr. Hance J., *Cumberland.*

Immigration to Canada, False Representations *re* Labour Market, on prop. Res. (Mr. R. Smith) 2960 (ii).

Indemnities to Members, Privilege, Ques. of *re* Par. in Toronto 'World,' 2621 (ii).

I.C. Ry., on Annual Statement (Mr. Emmerson) 280 (i).

——— Passes issued by Conservative Govt. (remarks) 351 (i).

Ry. Subsidies, Authorization B. 214 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 6179; in Com., 6839 (iv).

Veterans of Fenian Raids, Claims for Compensation, on prop. Res., (Mr. Monk) 642 (i).

Loggie, Mr. W. S., *Northumberland, N.B.*

Canada Eastern Ry., Purchase by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5052 (iii).

Fruit Marks Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2564 (ii).

G.T.P. Ry., Surveys between Quebec and Moncton, on M. (Mr. Crocket) for Ret. 1720 (i).

SUPPLY :

Railways—I.C.R. (bridges) 5052 (iii).

Macdonald, Mr. E. M., *Pictou.*

'Arctic' Str. Expedition, Com. of Investigation *re* Expenditure, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3657 (ii).

Budget, The, 3898 (ii).

Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s (B. 39) 1°*, 444 (i); in Com., 2668 (ii).

Canada Evidence Act Amt. B. 68 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 1752, 1763 (i).

Grimsby Park, Fees, &c. (remarks) in Com. on B. 12, 6671 (iv).

I.C.R., Freight Rates, Control of by Ry. Commission, ref. to in Com. on Ry. Bill, 2569 (ii).

——— Investigation by Public Accounts *re* Purchases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7495 (iv).

Judges of Provincial Courts Act (arbitrators, &c.) Amt. B. 13 (Mr. Lennox) on M. for 2°, 873 (i).

Judges of Provincial Courts Act (travelling) Amt. B. 83 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 1771 (i).

Macdonald, Mr. E. M.—*Con.*

Lord's Day B. 12, in Com. (industrial plants) 6630; on Ques. of Order (Mr. Monk) *re* Discussion of Principle, 6263; (provincial legislatures) 6577; in Com., 6605; on Senate Amts., 7691 (iv).

Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 479 (i).

Orangemen and Party Politics (remarks) 4730 (iii).

Personal Explanation, Montreal Meeting *re* Lord's Day Bill, 7637 (iv).

Pictou Voters' Lists, Names fraudulently put on, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3946 (ii).

Pilotage Act Amt. B. 219 (Mr. Brodeur) on M. for 1°, 6539 (iv).

P.E.I. Winter Service, Ice-breakers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4780 (iii).

Ry. Act Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 2569 (ii); (telephones) in Com., 6236 (iv).

Railways Subsidies Authorization B. 214 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 6180 (i); in Com., 6831 (iv).

Representation of Provinces, Amt. to B.N.A Act, on M. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 1117 (i).

SUPPLY :

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 4826; (ice-breakers) 4780 (iii); (navigation schools) 3401 (ii).

Quarantine (animals, health) 7440 (iv).

Macdonell, Mr. A. C., *South Toronto.*

Copyright Act Amt. (B.189) 1° m., 4791 (iii).

Cyclone Woven Wire Fence Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 136) 1°*, 1743 (i).

Flags flying on Parlt. Buildings on Dom. Day (remarks) 7186 (iv).

G.T.P. Ry., Act Amt. B. 215 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6857 (iv).

G.T.P. Ry., Food Supplies, Purchase of (Ques.) 1152 (i).

Insurance Cos.' Bonds accepted by Inland Rev. Dept. (remarks) 1467 (i), 2067 (ii).

Judges of Provincial Courts (arbitrators) B. 13 (Mr. Lennox) in Com., 5365 (iii).

Judges of Provincial Courts Act (travelling) Amt. B. 83 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 1767 (i).

Labour Organizations, False Representations &c. (remarks) on M. to take in Mondays, 4571 (iii)

Lord's Day B. 12, in Com. (foreign newspapers) 6277 ; (Jews) 6288 ; (provincial legislatures) 6580 (iv).

Money Lenders Act Amt. B. 11 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 352 (i).

Montreal Harbour Commissioners B. 222 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 6852 (iv).

Niagara Camp, Tenders *re* Forage Supplies (Ques.) 4800 (iii).

Macdonell, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Port Burwell Harbour, Tenders *re* Improvements, Advertisement &c. (Ques.) 982 (i).

Port Stanley Harbour Improvements, Tenders *re* Advertisement (Ques.) 984 (i).

Preston, Mr. W.T.R., Removal from Office as Immigration Agent, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6895 (iv).

Railways, Provincial, Dom. Subsidies *re*, Govt Aid (M for ret.*) 3277 (ii).

Ry. Subsidies Authorization B. 214 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 3°, 6841 (iv).

Ry. Subsidies to Provincial Rys., &c. (Ques.) 2727 (ii).

Rondeau Harbour Improvements, Tenders, Advertisements for (Ques.) 983 (i).

Russian Jews, Massacre of (prop. res.) 226 (i).

Ships Safety B. 48 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 6863 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Justice—Miscellaneous (Revised Statutes) 7537 (iv).

Penitentiaries—Kingston (binder twine) 7532 (iv).

Public Works—Dredging—Ontario and Que. (generally) 7014 (iv).

Railways—I.C.R. (side ladders) 7501 (iv).

Telephone Committee of 1905, Conclusions, Recommendations, &c. (Ques.) 979 (i).

Temiskaming and Northern Ontario Ry Co. (remarks) on M. for 3° of Ry. Subsidies Bill, 6841 (iv).

Theatrical Advertising Matter, Application *re* Removal of Duty, &c. (Ques.) 5507 (iii).

Toronto Barracks, Erection of, Purchase of Site at Humber River (Ques.) 5506 (iii).

Toronto City (B. 137) 1°*, 1743 (i).

Toronto Harbour Breakwater Extension, Payments *re* Cor. &c. (M. for copies*) 997 (i).

Toronto Harbour Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7014 (iv).

Toronto Harbour (eastern entrance) Dredging, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 4800 (iii).

——— Improvements, Payments *re*, Cor. &c. (M. for copies*) 997 (i).

Toronto Old Fort, Application *re* Transfer (Ques.) 1370 (i)

Toronto Post Office, Construction of, Purchase of Site, &c. (Ques.) 5505 (iii.)

——— Fire, Destruction of Mails (remarks) 2238 (ii).

Toronto Terminal Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 138) 1°*, 1743 (i); in Com. 4397 (iii).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 14 (Mr. Campbell) on M. for 3°, 2974 (ii).

Western Loan and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 35 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 3240 (ii).

Maclean, Mr. A. K., *Lunenburg.*

'Arctic' Expedition, Charges *re* Expenditure, Rep. of Special Com. (presented) 6372 (iv).

Maclean, Mr. A. K.—*Con.*
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 477 (i).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract, Charges *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Sup., 2111 (ii).
——— Corrected Resolution (remarks) 2411 (ii).
——— Original Contract (remarks) 2083 (ii).
Royal Bank of Canada (B. 131) 1°*, 1743 (i); in Com., 4389, 4746, 6022 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Fisheries (overseers) 3694 (ii).
Marine Hospitals (Mar. Provs.) 3687 ; (shipwrecked seamen) 3687 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (navigation schools) 3399 (ii).

Maclean, Mr. W. F., *South York, Ont.*
Address, on The, 83 (i).
Adulteration Act Amt. B. 15 (Mr. Bergeron) on M. for 1°, 213 (i).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6150 (iv).
Bell Telephone Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Bureau) on M. for Com., 3953; in Com., 3964 (ii); 4195, 4388, 5995 (iii); on M. for 3°, (amt.) 6321 (iv); Neg. (Y. 24; N. 96) 6322 (iv).
See 'Ry. Bill 62.'
Court of Appeal, Man. (salaries) Bill (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 5009 (iii).
Customs Act (steel rails) Amt. B. 175 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5103 (iii).
Deputy Ministers, Official Dress, &c. (remarks) *re* Question, 343 (i).
Dominion School Lands Exchange B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 3234 (ii).
Electric Power and Gas Exportation Regulation B. 145 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 1°, 2160; in Com., 3078 (ii), 4059 (iii).
Fiscal Year B. 162 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5095 (iii).
Flag on Parlt. Buildings, Flying on Dom. Day (remarks) 7186 (iv).
Forest Reserves B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 3534 (ii).
Fruit Marks Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2564 (ii).
Grand River and Western Power Co.'s incorp. B. 216 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 6998, 7264 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry. Act Amt. M. 215 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6858 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry. Branch Lines Co's B. 75 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 5683, 5950 (iii).
G.T.P. Ry. Co.'s B 84 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 2254 (ii).
G.T.P. Telegraph Co.'s incorp. B. 61 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 2713 (ii).
Hay Trade Regulation, Penalties *re* Violation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beauparlant) 4015

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Hudson Bay and Northwest Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, (remarks) 6177 (iv).
Hudson Bay Whale Fisheries B. 223 (Mr. Broadeur) in Com., 6855 (iv).
Indemnity to Members, &c., 2° of Bill 18 (Neg. Y. 9; N. 167) 3062 (ii).
——— Wthdring. Motion (personal explanation) 2981 (ii).
See 'Senate B. 97,' 'Members.'
Insurance Commission Investigation, ref. to in deb. on Address, 88 (i).
——— Protest *re* Right of Parlt. (remarks) 10 (i).
——— Special Remarks *re* Motion, 3742 (ii).
Insurance Investigation Com., Conduct of Proceedings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 305 (i).
Insurance Investigation, Retirement of Directors of Manufacturers Life Co. (remarks) 2233 (ii).
——— (M.) for Special Com. of Investigation 3971 (ii).
——— Reps., &c., on Presentment (Mr. Fielding) 1840 (i).
Internal Economy Committee and Salaries of House of Commons Officials, 7055 (iv).
Iron and Steel Bounties on Canadian Ore, on prop. Res. (Mr. Conmee) 3778 (ii).
Judges of Provincial Courts Act (arbitrators, &c.) Amt. B. 13 (Mr. Lennox) on M. for 2°, 872 (i).
Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6161 (iv).
Loan Companies B. 40 (Mr. Zimmerman) in Com., 3277 (ii).
Lord's Day B. 12 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5652, 5699 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. T. Martin) *re* games, 7242; (Jews) 6310; (shooting) 6251, 6272; on M. for 3°, on Amt. (Mr. D. Ross) 7194; on Senate Amts., 7677 (iv).
Marble Workers of Toronto, Complaints *re* American Importation under Value at Customs (Ques.) 5321 (iii).
Marconi Wireless Tel. System across Atlantic (Ques.) 323 (i).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B 7 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 474 (i).
Members and Privy Councillors Indemnities (B. 18) Discussion *re* (remarks) 2067 (ii)
Members Indemnity and Privy Councillors Annuity (B. 18) 1° m., 316 (i); on Order being called for 2°, 887, 1711 (i); 2° m., 2511 (ii).
Members' Indemnity, ref. to in deb. on Address, 93 (i).
Members Indemnity Repeal Bill (personal explanation) 1855 (i).
Milk Cans: *See* 'Weights,' &c.

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Ministerial Changes, on Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 262 (i).
Money Lenders Act Amt. B. 11 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 352, 356 (i), 6807 (iv).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Indebtedness to Dom. Govt., on M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 436 (i).
Norwegian Shipping Competition, Par. in Sydney 'Record,' 4088 (iii).
Ottawa Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6176 (iv).
Penitentiary Salaries B. 176 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. on Res., 4080 (iii).
Preferential Trade with G.B., ref. to in deb. on Address, 83 (i).
Privy Councillors, Payment of Annuities, Names (Ques.) 2035 (ii).
Ry. Act (express and telephones) Amt. (B. 9) 1° m., 18; 2° m., 782; on 2° called (remarks) 349, 443, 818; on Order being called for Resuming adjnd. debate, 1710 (i); (remarks) 2069 (ii).
Ry. Act (General) Amt B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 1°, 751 (i); in Com.. 1589 (i), 2566, 2586 (ii), 4069, 6085, 6089 (iii), 6184, 6205; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 7105, (two-cent tariff) Neg. (Y. 8; N. 105) 7114 (iv).
Ry. Act Amts, by Govt. (remarks) 568 (i).
Ry. Act Amt. Bill (remarks) *re* Discussion, 3101 (ii).
Ry. Subsidiary Companies, &c. and Jurisdiction of Ry. Act, &c. (Ques.) 3969 (ii).
Ry. Subsidies, Amounts earned, &c. (remarks) 7063 (iv).
Ry. Subsidies (authorization) B. 214 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 6136 (iv).
Russian Jews, Massacre of, on prop. res (Mr. Macdonell) 230 (i).
St Mary's Post Office Site, Purchase, Price, &c. (Ques.) 4703 (iii).
Saskatchewan Protested Elections, Law *re* Trial of (Ques.) 3741 (ii).
Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7121 (iv).
Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 10 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. to ref. to Sel. Com., 351 (i).
Senate Reform, on prop, Res. Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 2317 (ii).
Sharbot Lake and Bathurst Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6143 (iv).
Steel and Iron Ores, Electrical Smelting Process (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5935 (iii).
Sterling Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. B. 105 (Mr. Lennox) in Com., 5499 (iii).
Stone, E. B., Lease of Land in Bow River District, Terms, &c. (Ques.) 3740 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt.—Indian Affairs (salaries) 366 (i).

Maclean, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Miscellaneous—(insurance inspection) 305; (Prince Arthur's visit) 315 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (D'Israeli wharf) 6954 (iv).
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, &c.) 5118 (iii).
Yukon Ter. (Govt. expenses) 5913 (iii).
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 67 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 3523 (ii).
Telephone Legislation, Letter from 'The Canadian Independent Telephone Association' (read) 347 (i).
Temiskaming and Northern Ont. Ry. Co.'s Subsidy (remarks) on M. for 3° of B. 214. 6842. (iv).
Toronto Post Office Fire, Construction of New Building (remarks) 2238 (ii).
Telegraph, Telephone Line and Express Cos. (Notice) of Motion, 1855 (i).
Telephone Committee, Sittings, &c. (remarks) 126 (i).
Toledo Glass Co.'s Patent Relief B. 110 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3738 (ii).
United Empire Bank of Canada B. 50 (Mr. Belcourt) in Com., 3242 (ii).
Water Powers of Canada, Lease, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Statement, 600 (i).
Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt B. 14 (Mr. Campbell) on M. for 2°, 877 (i).
Western Loan and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 35 (Mr. Adamson) in Com. 3237 (ii).
Wurts, Henry Patent Relief B. 106 (Mr. Belcourt) in Com., 2205 (ii).

Macpherson, Mr. R. G., *Vancouver City.*
'Arctic' Boiler Machinery, Payments *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4103 (iii).
'Arctic,' Expedition, Charges *re* Expenditure, on M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 6376 (iv).
——— Com. of Investigation *re* Expenditure, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3635 (ii).
B. C. Shipping Interests, Govt. Aid, on M. for Sup., 1469 (i).
Brothier, Desire, Convict in B. C. Penitentiary, Release of (Ques.) 5183 (iii).
——— Deportation of &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7526 (iv).
——— Questions *re*, (remarks) 5322 (iii).
D'Arcy Island Lazaretto, B. C., Supervision by Dom. Govt. (remarks) in Com. on Leprosy Bill, 2186 (ii).
Dom. Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 148) 1°*, 2321 (ii).
Fort William and Port Arthur Terminal Ry. and Bridge Co.'s incorp. (B. 120) 1°*, 1667, (i); in Com., 5400; 3° m., 5446 (iii).
House of Commons Rules, in Com. on Rep., 7617 (iv).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 170 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5219 (iii).

Macpherson, Mr. R. G.—*Con.*

Iron and Steel Ore, Bounties on Canadian Ore, on prop. Res. (Mr. Conmee) 3776 (ii).

'Kestrel' Str., Expenditure *re* (remarks) 3635 (ii).

Leprosy B. 115 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2185 (ii).

Lord's Day B. 12, in Com. (fishermen) 6652; (foreign newspapers) 6278; (loading, &c., vessels) 6635 (iv).

Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 473 (i).

Pacific Marine Underwriters Limited incorp. (B. 54) 1°*, 656 (i).

Private Bills. Extension of Time (M.) 2820 (ii).

——— Irregularity of Procedure (remarks) 2325 (ii).

Privilege (Ques. of) Par. in Toronto 'News,' *re* Interruptions in House during debate, 3068 (ii).

Ry. Act (express cos.) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 785 (i).

Roberts and Stevens, Marine Engineers, Investigation *re* Certificates (remarks) on conc., 7593 (iv).

School Lands Exchange B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 3919 (ii).

Shanghaiing in B. C. (remarks) 4994 (iii).

Standing Orders Com., Rep. (presented) 2820 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice—Yukon (living allowances) 7523 (iv).
Adulteration of Food (penalties) 2620 (ii).
Indians—B. C. (medical attendance) 1082 (i).
Metric System (lectures) 2615 (ii).

Toledo Glass Co.'s Patent Relief B. 110 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3732 (ii).

Twelve Mile Power Co.'s incorp. B. (M.) to receive Pet., 3064 (ii).

Vancouver, Fraser Valley and Southern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 87) 1°*, 1252 (i); in Com., 2709, 3187 (ii).

Vancouver and Lulu Island, Island Ry. Co.'s (B. 29) 1°*, 350; in Com., 1141, 1295 (i).

Vancouver and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 119) 1°*, 1667 (i).

Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Co.'s (B. 41) 1°*, 485 (i).

White Horse and Alsek Ry. Co.'s (B. 31) 1°*, 350 (i).

McCarthy, Mr. L. G., *North Simcoe.*

'Arctic,' Str., Expenditure *re* Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3223 (ii).

British America Assurance Co.'s incorp (B. 198) Pet. (presented) 4991; 1° m., 5180; in Com., 5500 (iii).

British Canadian Loan and Investment Co.'s (B. 70) 1°*, 890 (i).

Brothier, D., Release of from B. C. Penitentiary (remarks) 5330 (iii).

McCarthy, Mr. L. G.—*Con.*

Canada Evidence Act Amt. B. 68 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 1762 (i).

Cinq-Mars before Bar of Hse., on Amt. (Mr. Aylesworth) 5286 (iii).

Coal purchased for the Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2918, 3612 (ii).

D'Israeli Wharf, Expenditure *re*, 3477 (ii).

Duryea, Chester B., Patent Relief B. 79 (Mr. Belcourt) in Com., 2200 (ii).

Electric Power and Gas Exportation Regulation B. 145 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 3093

Exchequer Court Act (liability) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 3525 (ii).

Fields, Jane Francis, Relief (B. 191) 1°*, 5081 (iii).

Files of Dept., Open to Inspection by Members (remarks) 2946 (ii).

Forest Reserves B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 3329, 3537 (ii).

French River Lighthouse, Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3602 (ii).

G.T.P. Ry. Branch Lines B. 75 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 5487 (iii).

G. T. P. Ry. Co.'s (B. 58) 1° m., 1147 (i).

G. T. P. Ry. Co.'s (B. 84) 1°*, 1149 (i); in Com., 2244, 2703 (ii).

Grand Trunk Pacific Tel. Co.'s incorp. (B. 61) 1°*, 744 (i); in Com., 2712 (ii); in Com., 4539, 4746; 3° m., 4995, 5000 (iii).

Judges of Provincial Courts Act (travelling) Amt. B. 83 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 1766 (i).

Judges of Provincial Courts (arbitrators, &c.) B. 13 (Mr. Lennox) in Com., 5383 (iii).

Lord's Day B. 12, in Com., on Amt (Mr. D. Ross) 7207; on Amt. (Mr. T. Martin) *re* ball games, 7235; in Com., (trains, &c.) 5701; in Com., 5815 (iii).

Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 472 (i).

Pacific Northern and Omenica Ry. Co.'s (B 80) 1°*, 999 (i).

Private Bills, (M.) to extend time, 5082 (iii).

Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7137 (iv).

Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. (B. 16) 1° m., 250; 2° m., 1148 (i).

SUPPLY:

Ocean and River Service (maintenance of strs,) 3223; (navigation schools) 3400 (ii).

Supreme Court of Judicature, N.B., B. 224 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7156 (iv).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 14 (Mr. Campbell) on M. for 3°, 2973 (ii).

Western Assurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 199) 1°*, 5181; in Com. (amt.) 5501 (iii).

McCarthy, Mr. M. S., *Calgary.*

Agricultural or Grazing Lands, Sales in N.W. T., Conditions of Sale, &c (Ques.) 324 (i).

McCarthy, Mr. M. S.—*Con.*
Alberta Mineral, Gas and Oil Borings, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 1674 (i).
Athabaska Landing, &c., Depth of Borings for Oil, &c. (Ques.) 1675 (i).
Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s (B. 77) 1°*, 999 (i).
Calgary Land Titles Office, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 1676 (i).
Canadian Oil and Mines Co., &c., Names of, (remarks) in Com. on B. 163, 3914 (ii).
Crooked Lake Indian Reserve, Surrender, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 951 (i).
Crown Lands, Administration of by Dept. of the Interior, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 4438 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Ames) to Com. of Sup., 3138 (ii).
Forest Reserves B 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2836 (ii).
Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. 207 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5897 (iii).
Grand Forks Cattle Co., Information *re*, Land Sales to, &c. (Ques.) 2036 (ii).
G.T.P. Ry., Branch Lines incorp. B. 75 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 5958 (iii).
Homestead Entries and Land Sales, 1905, Total Acreage, &c. (M. for ret.*) 210 (i).
Homesteads in N.W.T., Blanketing System, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1357 (i).
Homestead Inspectors in Man. and N.W. Ter., Days Absent, Expenses, &c. (M. for ret.*) 210 (i).
Land Grant or Sale in Alberta to Syndicate or Company from Iowa O.Cs. Reps., &c. (M. for copies*) 1871 (i).
Land Grants to Rys. in N.W. Ters., Location, Mileage, &c. (Ques.) 2075 (ii).
Lord's Day B. 12 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. (trains, &c) 5717 (iii).
Man. and Southeastern Ry., Land Grants to, Location, &c. (Ques.) 2075 (ii).
Milk River Cattle Co., Sale of Land and Valuation, Rep. *re* (Ques.) 2035 (ii).
Personal Explanation *re* Statement with ref. to Sen. J. H. Ross and Homestead Regulation, 3235 (i)).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 2580 (ii).
Rocky Mountains Park Act Amt. B. 164 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 4743, 4760 (iii).
Sarcee Indian Reserve, Negotiations *re* Surrender (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 959 (i).
School Lands Exchange B. 163 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 3914 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Immigration (agents, &c.) 1360 (i); (printing, &c. in G.B.) 5867 (iii).
Indians—Man. and N.W.T. (surveys) 951 (i).
Interior—Miscellaneous (payments *re* mining rights) 5862 (iii).

McCarthy, Mr. M. S.—*Con.*
Wagner, Philip, Charges *re* Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. Fowler) to Com. of Sup., 5589 (iii).

McColl, Mr. J. B., *West Northumberland, Ont.*
Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 24) 1°*, 349 (i).

McCool, Mr. C. A., *Nipissing.*
Cobalt Range Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 159) 1°*, 3064 (ii).
Hay Trade Regulations, Penalties *re* Violation, in Com. on Res. (Mr. Beauparlant) 4018 (ii).
Iron and Steel Bounties on Canadian Ore, on prop. Res. (Mr. Conmee) 3781 (ii).
Ontario Northern and Timagami Ry. Co.'s (B. 132) 1°*, 1743 (i).
Revillon Bros., Ltd. (B. 76) 1°*, 999 (i); in Com., 3672 (ii); on Senate Amts., 6706 (iv).
Timagami, Cobalt and Temiskaming Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 217) 1°*, 6543 (iv).
Trent Canal, Eastern Section, Depth of (Ques.) 836 (i).

McCraney, Mr. G. E., *Saskatchewan.*
'Arctic' Expedition, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) to conc. in Rep. of Special Com. and Amt. (Mr. Northrup) 6506 (iv).
Dominion Lands, Administration of by Govt., on Amt. (Mr. Ames) in Com. to Sup., 3191
Hudson's Bay Co.'s Retired Employees, Land Claims, Pets., Papers, Cor. &c. (M.) for Copies, 3742 (ii).
Southern Central Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 140) 1°*, 1743 (i).

McIntyre, Mr. G. H., *South Perth.*
Conmee & Bowman, Charges *re* Dredging Contract, on Ques. of Order, 1308 (i).
Grimsby Park, Collection of Fees (remarks) in Com. on B. 12, 6671 (iv).
House of Commons Rules, in Com. on Rep., 7471, 7616 (iv).
Kootenay and Arrowhead Ry. Co.'s B. 30 (Mr. Galliher) in Com., 1146 (i).
Lord's Day B. 12 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5785 (iii); (Jews) 6340; in Com., 6662 (iv.).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 1626 (i), 6225; on Senate Amts., 7645 (iv).
Ry. Act (crossings) Amt. B. 8 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 858 (i).
Senate and House of Commons Act (indemnity) Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 2°, 1777 (i).
Senate Reform, prop. Res., 2276 (ii).
——— Reply *re* prop. Res., 2318 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (St. Mary's) 6739 (iv).
Ventilation of Chamber (remarks) 7360 (iv).

McIntyre, Mr. W., *Strathcona.*

Dominion Lands, Administration of by Govt., on Amt. (Mr. Ames) to Com. of Sup., 3178 (ii).

Gagné, Judge, Legal Firm of Price & Co., and connection with Judge Gagné's sons, &c. (Ques.) 7371 (iv).

Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. 207 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5900 (iii).

McKenzie, Mr. P. H., *South Bruce.*

Agricultural Products, American vs. Canadian Duties, on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 4911 (iii).

Agriculture and Colonization, 3rd Rep. of Com. (M.) to conc., 2021 (ii).

——— 5th Rep. (presented) 4152 (iii).

Burk's Falls and French River Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 158)—(M.) to introduce, 2810; 1°*, 3064 (ii).

Lord's Day B. 12 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5809 (iii); (Jews) 6315 (iv).

McLean, Mr. A. A., *Queen's, P.E.I.*

'Arctic' Str. Expedition, Com. of Investigation *re* Expenditure, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3656 (ii).

——— Expenditure *re* Supplies, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3205, 3398 (ii).

Blooming Point Post Office, P.E.I., Change of Establishment (Ques.) 332 (i).

Canada and Mexico SS. Subsidies, Contracts *re* (M. for copies*) 2038 (ii).

Charlottetown Ry. Station, Tenders *re* Contruction (Ques.) 2271 (ii).

French Village Post Office, P.E.I., Change of Location (M. for pets.*) 345 (i).

'King Edward' Str., Explanation *re* Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4790 (iii).

McRae, Mr. E., Claims *re* Loss of Letter sent to Bank of N.B. inclosing money (Ques.) 6930 (iv).

Montague and Cardigan Bridge, P. E. I. Ry., Damages for Lands expropirated, Cor. Reps., &c. (M. for copies*) 1206 (i).

Montreal Marine Agency, Number of Employees (Ques.) 1101 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3591 (ii).

Mugford, J. C., Claim for Damages *re* Fire on P. E. I. Ry. (Ques.) 585 (i).

Murray River Branch, P.E.I. Ry., Expropriated Lands, Settlement of Claims, &c. (remarks) 5993 (iii).

North Lake to Black Point, Post Office, Removal of and return, &c. (M. for cor.*, &c.) 2274 (ii).

Pictou Voters' Lists, Affidavits *re* Names (read) in Com. of Sup., 3946-7 (ii).

Pisquid Road Mail Service, Pet. *re* (Ques.) 1565 (i).

McLean, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*

P.E.I. and G. B. Mail Service, Number of Trips, &c. (Ques.) 426 (i).

P.E.I., Dredging, Apptmnt. of Supt., Crapaud Harbour Channel, &c. (Ques.) 329 (i).

——— Ice-breaker for Northumberland Straits (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3945 (ii).

P.E.I. Ry., Damages to Expropriated Lands (remarks) *re* Return, 2825 (ii).

——— Land Purchase, Inadequate Compensation, Charges *re* (Ques.) 1864 (i).

P.E.I. Winter Service, Ice-breakers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4779, 4823 (iii).

Representation of Provinces, Amt. to B.N.A. Act, on M. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 1125 (i).

Smith, Mrs. Sarah, Dismissal from Mount Buchanan Post Office, P.E.I., and Apptmnt. of Mr. Bishop (M. for cor.*) 2038 (ii).

Souris Fish Drier, Construction, Total Cost &c. (Ques.) 1373 (i).

Steamer, new, being constructed in England, Plans, Specifications, &c. (M. for copies*) 1871 (i).

SUPPLY:

Geological Survey (borings) 5984 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies, rents, &c.) 3591 (ii).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 3945 (ii); (ice-breakers) 4779 (iii); (maintenance of strs.) 3205 (ii).

Railways—P.E.I. (Charlottetown) 5153 (iii).

Weeks, W. A., Appmnt. by Govt. *re* P. E. I. Ry. Claims (Ques.) 586 (i).

Winter Communication P.E.I. and Mainland, Construction of Steamer, &c. (Ques.) 336 (i).

McLennan, Mr. A., *Inverness.*

SUPPLY:

Fisheries (dog fish) 3707; (overseers) 3696; (protection service) 3703 (ii).

Williams, J. J., Dismissal from Port Hawkesbury Post Office (Ques.) 2926 (ii).

Martin, Mr. A., *Queen's, P.E.I.*

'Arctic,' Str., Expenditure *re* Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3211 (ii).

Coffin, David D., Dismissal as Postmaster, P. E. I. (M. for cor.*) 3997 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 3065 (ii).

Dom. Coal Co., Inquiry for Ret., 1581 (i).

Experimental Farms, Number maintained by Govt. in Can., &c. (Ques.) 974 (i).

Experimental Station at P.E.I. (Ques.) 574 (i).

Glace Bay Harbour Improvement, Cor., Specifications, Plans, &c. (M. for copies*) 428 (i).

Iona Postmaster, Dismissal of Mr. Jos. McCabe, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 345 (i).

Lord's Day B. 12 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5785 (iii).

Mount Vernon, P. E. I. Mail Service, Pet. *re* (Ques.) 1567 (i).

Martin, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Newfoundland and West Indies, Steps *re* Confederation (Ques.) 333 (i).

Orangemen and Party Politics, Misrepresentations in Press (remarks) 4733 (iii).

Pinette Harbour Dredging, P. E. I., Pet. *re* &c. (Ques.) 332 (i).

P. E. I. Ry., Branch Lines to Stanley Bridge, Survey, Reps. Memoranda, &c. (M. for copies*) 996 (i).

See '*S*tanley Bridge', &c.

——— Cardigan and Montague Branch, Completion of Construction, &c. (Ques.) 1866 (i).

——— Facilities, Pets. *re* Extension (Ques.) 444 (i).

P. E. I. and Magdalen Islands, &c., SS. Service (Ques.) 445 (i).

P. E. I. Mail Service, Charlottetown to Belfast, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5480 (i).

P. E. I. and Mainland Winter Navigation, Cor. *re* New Steamer and Mr. Duguid's Rep. *re* Recommendation, &c. (M. for copies*) 1870 (i).

P. E. I., New Dredge, Completion of, &c. (Ques.) 332 (i).

P. E. I., Provincial Subsidy, Cor. &c. *re* Basis of Agreement (M. for copies*) 774 (i).

P. E. I., Steamer for Icebreaking in Northumberland Straits (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3934 (ii), 4760 (iii).

——— Winter Communication, Total Yearly Expenditure (Ques.) 835 (i).

——— Winter Service, Ice-breakers (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 4821 (iii).

——— Rep. *re* 'Montcalm,' (remarks) 971 (i).

Representations of Provinces, Amt. to B. N. A. Act., on M. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 1114 (i).

Returns, Inquiry for, 1368 (i).

Savage Harbour, P. E. I., Payments to Certain Persons, Names, &c. (Ques.) 3066 (ii).

Silver Coins, Redemption of old Coins, &c. (Ques.) 333 (i).

Stanley Bridge Branch Line P. E. I. Ry., Survey, Authority *re*, Deficiency in Ret., 3317 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (census) 7381; (experimental farms) 7406 (iv).

Ocean and River Service, (icebreakers) 4760 (iii); (Govt. steamers, repairs,) 3804, 3934; (maintenance of strs.) 3211 (ii).

Post Office (letter carriers) 552; (postmasters' salaries) 548 (i).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Glace Bay) 6774 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Belle River) 6956; (Point Prim) 6931; (Rustico Harbour) 6931; (Wood Island jetty) 6933 (iv).

Public Works — Telegraph Lines — (Mar. Provs. Cape Breton Island) 7011; (P. E. I. and mainland) 6769 (iv).

Railways—P. E. I. (Charlottetown) 5149 (iii).

Martin, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Weeks, Mr. W. A., Apptmt. to investigate *re* Dispute with P. E. I. Ry., O. C. *re* (M. for copy*) 997 (i).

Winter Communication with P. E. I., Str. 'Montcalm,' used in Northumberland Straits (remarks) 1257 (i).

Wood Island Breakwater, P. E. I., Repairs, to (Ques.) 332 (i).

Martin, Mr. T., *North Wellington.*

Agricultural Produce, American vs Canadian Duties, on M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 4907 (iii).

——— (personal explanation) 5082 (ii).

Coal purchased by Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3613 (ii).

Lord's Day B. 12 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5726, 5802 (iii); (industrial plants) 6623; on Amt. (Mr. D. Ross) *re* industrial processes, 7209; on Amt. (Mr. Galliher) 7255; (amt.) *re* ball games, 7233, agreed to (Y. 52; N. 42) 7246; on M. (Mr. Aylesworth) to strike out amt. *re* ball games, 7283; (loading grain) 6654; (towing logs, &c.) 6656 (iv).

Mutual Reserve Life Ins. Co., Charges for Larceny, &c. (Ques.) 419 (i)

Ry. Act Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 7088 (iv).

SUPPLY:

Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies) 3611 (ii).

Miller, Mr. H. H., *South Grey.*

Cinq-Mars, Before Bar of House, on Amt. (Mr. Aylesworth) 5284 (iii).

Georgian Bay Islands, Sale of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 938 (i).

Judges of Provincial Courts (arbitrators, &c.) B. 13 (Mr. Lennox) in Com., 5375 (iii).

King's Most Gracious Majesty, Invitation to visit Canada, on M. (Mr. Belcourt) 1690 (i).

Lord's Day B. 12, in Com., 5663, 5763 (iii), 6266; (foreign newspapers) 6279 (iv); (newspapers) 5746 (iii); (Jews) 6304 (iv); in Com., (trains, &c.) 5702 (iii); on Senate Amts., 7674 (iv).

North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract, Charges *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Sup., 2327 (ii).

——— Mr. Preston's Refusal to answer Questions, on M. (Mr. Monk) 4518 (iii).

Orangemen and Conservative Party, Misrepresentations in Press (remarks) 4731 (iii).

Privilege, Ques. of, *re* Vote on Lord's Day Bill, 7565 (iv).

Ry. Act (telephones) Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 6239 (iv).

Senate and House of Commons Act (indemnity) Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on M. for 2°, 1779 (i).

Miller, Mr. H. H.—*Con.*
Sterling Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. B. 105 (Mr. Lennox) in Com., 5500 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Fisheries (hatcheries) 3701 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (repairs) 4139 (iii).
Penitentiaries—Kingston (binder twine) 7532 (iv).
Yukon Council, Supervision by Dom. Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1211 (i).

Monk, Mr. F. D., *Jacques Cartier.*
Acetylene Gas Buoys in St. Lawrence Channel, Recommendation of Transportation Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2898 (ii).
Agriculture and Colonization, 3rd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc. (amt.) 2021 (ii).
——— 5th Rep. of, (M.) *re* consideration, 4152 (iii).
Anse aux Griffons Works, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 1151 (i).
Appeal Court, Man. (salaries) Bill (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. on Res., 5008 (iii).
'Bavarian' Str., Cause of Wreck (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2898 (ii).
Bell Telephone Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Bureau) in Com., 6003 (iii); on M. for 3°, 6320 (iv).
See 'Ry. B. 62,' &c.
Cinq-Mars, Criticism in 'La Presse,' *re* Member, on M. (Mr. Foster) to summon before Bar of Hse., 4711 (iii).
Co-operative and Industrial (B. 144) Discussion *re* (remarks) 2975 (ii).
See 'Industrial.'
D'Israeli Wharf, Construction, Expenditure, &c., (Ques.) 1377 (i).
——— Expenditure *re*, 3462 (ii).
Duryea, Chester B., Patent Relief B. 79 (Mr. Belcourt) in Com., 2205 (ii).
Forest Reserves B. 417 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2837, 3581 (ii).
Fox River Breakwater, Total Expenditure (Ques.) 1151 (i).
Georgian Bay Canal Survey, Amount expended, &c., (Ques.) 335 (i).
Godin, Dr. A., Payment *re* Claim for Damages *re* Chambly Canal Overflow (Ques.) 6087 (iii).
Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines B. 75 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 5461 (iii).
G. T. P. Ry. Co.'s Act Amt., B. 215 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6857 (iv).
Grand River and Western Power Co.'s incorp. B. 216 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 6998 (iv)
Grande Vallée des Monts Wharf, Date of Completion, &c. (Ques.) 1370 (i).
——— Revenue *re* (Ques.) 1150 (i).
——— Total Cost, Income, &c. (Ques.) 341 (i).
——— Par. in 'Le Canada' Ques. of Privilege, 3796 (ii).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
Hay Trade Regulation, Violation, Penalties, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beauparlant) 4005 (ii).
Hudson Bay Whale Fisheries B. 223 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 6855 (iv).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 170 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5213, 5229; on M. for 3°, 5533; (Amt.) 5563; M. to ref. back to Com., 5566; in Com., 5567 (iii); on Senate Amts., 7116 (iv).
Immigration from Belgium (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1639 (i).
Indian Act (fines) Amt. (B. 66) 1° m., 829 (i); 2° m., 2069 (ii).
Industrial and Co-operative Societies (B. 144) 1° m., 1841 (i).
See 'Co-operative.'
Insurance, Life, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) for Special Com., 3992 (ii).
Judges of Provincial Courts Act (arbitrators, &c.) Amt. B. 13 (Mr. Lennox) on M. for 2°, 869 (i).
——— (travelling) Amt. B. 83 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 1764 (i).
Lachine Canal, Coal Tolls, Charges, &c., (remarks) 7063 (iv).
Laprairie Ice Pier, Contract to Messrs Amiot & Lemay, &c. (Ques.) 763 (i).
Lord's Day B. 12, in Com. (amt.) electric rys., 7246; (Jews) 6308; (provincial legislatures) 6564; (shooting) 6267; (trains, &c.) 5706 (iii); (amt.) to M. for 3°, 7350, Neg. (Y. 15; N. 102) 7352 (iv).
——— on Ques. of Order *re* amts., 7234 (iv).
——— Ques. of Order *re* Discussion of Principle of Bill, 6262 (iv).
——— Consideration of (remarks) 7061 (iv).
Maple Syrup Adulteration, on prop. Res. (Mr. Boyer) 1412 (i).
Money Lenders Act Amt. B. 11 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6809 (iv).
Montreal Barracks, Delay in Purchase of Site (Ques.) 334 (i).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners B. 124 (Mr. Brodeur) on M. for 1°, 1669 (i); 2°*, and in Com., 2190 (ii).
——— B. 222 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 6846 (iv).
Montreal Post Office, Employees Absence, &c., Payments for Overtime, &c. (Ques.) 340 (i).
——— Improvements, &c. (Ques.) 335 (i).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Indebtedness to Dom. Govt. (M. for ret.) 436 (i).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contracts, Charges against, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Sup. (M.) to adjn. debate, 1839 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Sup., 1941 (i).
——— Instructions to Mr. Scott *re* Telegram to Lord Strathcona (remarks) 1157 (i).
——— Refusal of Mr. Preston to answer Question (M.) to Summon before Bar of Hse., 4451, Neg., 4533 (iii).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
Postal Employees Grievances, &c. (remarks) *re* Legislation, 3582, 3795 (ii).
Public Works, Expenditure, Condemnation of, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 3462 (ii).
Preston, Mr. W. T. R., Removal as Immigration Agent in G. B. (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 6868; Neg. (Y. 39, N. 89) 6928 (iv).
Preston, W. T. R.: *See* 'North Atlantic Trading Co.'
Quebec Bridge, Co.'s Books, Inspection of (Ques.) 445 (i).
——— Financial Statement, Directors, Bonds, &c. (M. for copies) 428 (i).
——— Govt. Representatives on Board of Directors, &c. (Ques.) 338 (i).
——— Payment of Subsidies, Bonds, &c. (Ques.) 445 (i).
——— Total Amount paid, Bonds guaranteed, &c. (Ques.) 338 (i).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners B. 174 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 4808 (iii).
Quebec Immigration Hospital for Trachoma Treatment, Amount expended, &c. (Ques.) 334 (i).
Ry. Act (telephones) Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 6233, 7083 (iv).
Ry. Subsidies Authorization B. 214 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 6171; in Com., 6839 (iv).
Returns, Statement *re* Preparation by Min. of Int. (remarks) 2819 (ii).
Ste. Agathe des Monts Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6171 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Excise (salaries) 1552; (tobacco stamps) 1558 (i).
Immigration (agents, G. B., &c.) 1637 (i); (agencies, &c.) 5511 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (compensation *re* gas explosions) 4869 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, Que. —Marine, St. Lawrence Ship Channel (dredging) 2894; (lighting) 2898 (ii); Miscellaneous (transportation commission) 7021 (iv).
Supreme Court Judges, Absence of, Apptmnt. of Ad Hoc Judges (Ques.) 1103 (i).
Supreme Court, Postponement of Quebec Cases, &c. (remarks) 3075, 3910 (ii).
Taschereau, Sir Henri, Resignation from Supreme Court (remarks) 2243 (ii).
Transcontinental Ry. Commissioners, Expropriation of Land in Prov. of Quebec (Ques.) 446 (i).
Veterans of Fenian Raids, Claims for Compensation (prop. res.) 613; Neg. (Y. 40; N. 90) 646 (i).
Water Powers in Canada, Leased or Alienated, &c. (M.) for statement, 594 (i).
Water Powers in Prov. of Quebec, Sale of, Inquiry *re* (remarks) 4991 (iii).

Monk, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
Woods Co., Amounts paid by Govt. (Ques.) 422 (i).
——— Amounts paid for Supplies for Georgian Bay Canal Survey (Ques.) 423 (i).
——— Amounts paid to for Supplies to Transcontinental Ry. Construction Commission (Ques.) 449 (i).

Morin, Mr. J. B., *Dorchester.*
Cape Tourmente and Murray Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6149 (iv).
Cullers' Office at Quebec, Apptmnt of Supervisor (Ques.) 3245 (ii).
D'Israeli Wharf, Expenditure *re*, 3497 (ii), 6946 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry., Amount of Construction Contract from Quebec Westward (Ques.) 1745 (i).
Immigration to Canada, False Representations *re* Labour Market, on Prop. Res. (Mr. R. Smith) 2968 (ii).
I.C.R., Number of Employees from 1899 to 1905 (Ques.) 216 (i).
Pilotage Act Amt. B. 219 (Mr. Brodeur) on M. for 1°, 6538 (iv).
Public Works, Expenditure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 3497 (ii).
Quebec Central Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6157 (iv).
Ry. Subsidies, Authorization B. 214 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 6149 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Interior—Miscellaneous (boundary surveys) 5860 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings — Ottawa (rents) 6763; Que. (Actonvale) 6728; (Montmagny) 6731 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S.-(Canning wharf) 6787; Que. (D'Israeli wharf) 6946; (Grand Rivière) 6973; (Lake Megantic piers) 6974; (Montmorency Falls) 6975; (Quebec harbour) 6771; (Rivière Oullee pier) 6977; (St. Anne de Chicoutimi) 6980 (iv).
Railways—G. T. P. (surveys, &c.) 5126; I.C.R. (bridges) 5029 (iii).

Northrup, Mr. W. B., *East Hastings.*
Acetylene Gas Buoys in St. Lawrence Channel (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2898 (ii).
Ahearn & Soper, Amounts paid for Supplies, &c. (Ques.) 4797 (iii).
Arbitrations and Awards, Payments *re* to Civil Servants (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 391 (i).
'Arctic' Str. Expedition, Com. of Investigation *re* Expenditure, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3649 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) to conc. in Rep. of Special Com., 6471; (M.) to ref. back to Com. for Amended Rep., 6498, Neg. (Y. 37; N. 93) 6535 (iv).
'Arctic' Str., Expenditure *re* Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3357 (ii).

Northrup, Mr. W. B.—*Con.*
Central Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 98) 1°*, 1364 (i).
Cinq-Mars, before Bar of Hse., on Amt. (Mr. Aylesworth) 5284 (iii).
Empire Trust Co.'s (B. 135) 1°*, 1743 (i).
Gobeil, Mr., Dep. Min. of Pub. Works, Payments as Arbitrator (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 391 (i).
Govt. Steamers, Repairs, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4097 (iii).
King's Most Gracious Majesty, Invitation to Visit Canada, Address from Parliament Seconded, 1684 (i).
Mackintosh, Eileen Mary, Relief (B. 185) M. to ref. back to Com., 5438; in Com., 6045 (iii).
'Maisonneuve' Str., Answer to Questions (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2918 (ii).
——— Cost of Maintenance, &c., 1904-5 (Ques.) 1566 (i).
Marine Supplies, Purchases from Monopolists (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4141 (iii).
Merwin, Geo. F., Amounts paid to by Govt. (Ques.) 3411 (ii).
'Montcalm,' Govt. Ice-breaker, Expenditure *re* Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3376 (ii).
Montreal Marine Agency, Rent and Furnishings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3593 (ii).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract, Charges *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 1968 (i).
——— Mr. Preston's Refusal to answer Questions, on M. (Mr. Monk) 4487 (iii).
Port Arthur Harbour, Payments *re* Tugs (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4094 (iii).
Public Accounts Com., Rep. ref. back to Com., (remarks) *re* Motion, 3904 (ii).
Questions answered by Officials in Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2918 (ii).
Russian Jews, Massacre of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Macdonell) 234 (i).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt., Public Works (salaries) 391 (i).
Indians—Ont. and Que. (legal expenses) 730 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies) 3593, 3606 (ii).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. strs.) 3357 4094 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que.—St. Lawrence channel (lighting) 2898 (ii).
Thames River Floods, Relief for, Cor., Plans, &c., on M. (Mr. Clements) for Copies, 779 (i).
Woods, James W. Co., Limited, Payments by Govt. for Rental from 1896 (Ques.) 4701 (iii).

Oliver, Hon. Frank, (Minister of the Interior), *Edmonton.*
Address. on The, 113 (i).

Oliver, Hon. Frank—*Con.*
Agricultural or Grazing Lands, Sales in N.W. Ter., Conditions of Sale, &c. (Ans.) 324 (i).
See 'Lands,' &c.
Alberni Industrial School—B.C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1091 (i).
Alberta Mineral, Oil and Gas Borings, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 1675 (i).
Alberta and Saskatchewan, O.C. *re* Lands (Ans.) 1374 (i).
Athabaska Landing, Depth of Boring for Oil, &c. (Ans.) 1675 (i).
Banff Park Act Amt. (B. 164) 1° m., 3234 (ii).
Blood Reserve, Lease to McEwan Cattle Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 955 (i).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 3796 (ii).
Brown, H. O., Transfer of Grazing Lease to Galway Cattle Co., &c. (Ans.) 5183 (iii).
Caldwell, C. F., Application *re* Coal Lands (remarks) 1001, 1466 (i).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 2545 (ii).
Calgary Land Titles Office, Expenditure *re* Construction (Ans.) 1676 (i).
Canadian Labour Bureau, Action of Govt. *re* Leopold's Work (Ans.) 3407 (ii).
Canadian Northern Railway Lands, Authority *re*. Selection (Ans.) 1739 (ii).
See 'Lands.'
——— Deptl. Letter, Sept. 16, 1904 (Ans.) 3971 (ii).
——— Extension or Transfer of Area (Ans.) 1859 (i).
——— Patents of Land Grants, &c. (Ans.) 2076 (ii).
C.P.R. Land Grants, Issue of Patents, &c. (Ans.) 331 (i).
——— Time Limit *re* Selection (Ans.) 765 (i).
Coal Lands in N.W.T., Applications by Mr. C. F. Caldwell (remarks) 1001 (i).
See 'Caldwell.'
Colonization or Land Companies, Purchase of Land from Govt. since 1898 (Ans.) 1863 (i).
Crooked Lake Indian Reserve, Surrender of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 946 (i).
Crown Lands, Administration of by Govt., on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 4188 (iii).
Dom. Lands Commissioner for 1902, 1903, 1904 (Ans.) 2268 (ii).
Dom. Lands, Exceeding 160 Acres, Sale of (Ans.) 5502 (iii).
Doncaster Indians, Complaints *re* Timber Cut (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1248 (i).
Forest Reserves Establishment (B. 47) 1° m., 559 (i); 2°* and in Com., 2832; in Com., 3318; List of Reserves (read) 3319; in Com., 3528 (ii), 5537; (amts.) 5417 (iii); on Senate Amts., 6829 (iv).

Oliver, Hon. Frank—*Con.*
'Free Press,' Man. and 'Der Norwester Publishing Co.,' Payments to by Govt. (Ques.) 991 (i).
French River Water Power Privileges, Pending Applications (Ans.) 5003 (iii).
Games Preservation Act (unorganized ters.) Amt. (B. 154) 2°*, and in Com., 2825 (ii).
Geological Survey Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5879 (iii).
Georgian Bay Indian Reserves, Surveys (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 724 (i).
Georgian Bay Timber Lands, Leases to Peter Ryan (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 933 (i).
Giant's Tomb Island Timber Lands, Lease to Peter Ryan (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 932; Memorandum (read) 1233 (i).
Grand Forks Cattle Co., Information *re*, Sale of Land to (Ans.) 2036 (ii).
G.T.P. Ry. Co., Mining Rights in Lands, O.C., &c., on Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3715 (ii).
——— on Inquiry for Cor. (Mr. Foster) 3909 (ii).
Half-Breed Scrip Claims (remarks) on M. for Sup., 7572 (iv).
Halifax Trachoma Hospital taken over by Govt., Value, &c. (Ans.) 1747 (i).
Hamilton, P. J., Qualifications as Farm Instruction, &c. (Ans.) 1674 (i).
——— Apptmt. as Indian Farm Instructor (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1241 (i).
Hand-book of Townships in Man., Sask. and Alberta, Compiling of (Ans.) 583 (i).
Hatfield: *See* 'Rainmaking.'
Hetherington, Thos. P., Emplymt. as Immigration Agent (Ans.) 5502 (iii).
Homestead Entries, Cancellation, Applicants, Original Names, &c. (Ans.) laid on Table, 5003 (iii).
——— Blanketing System, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1355 (i).
——— Outside Service, New Appointments, List (read) in Com. of Sup., 5936 (iii).
——— on Inquiry for, 2236 (ii).
Immigrants to Canada, Bonus paid, Regulations *re* Payment (Ans.) 196 (i).
Immigrants deported during five years, Number settled, &c. (Ans.) 180 (i).
Immigrants *re* Contract with North Atlantic Trading Co., Investigation *re* SS. Tickets, Destination, &c. (Ans.) 4703 (iii).
See 'North Atlantic,' &c.
Immigrants at Quebec, Letter of Rev. Mr. Williams *re* Treatment of (Ans.) 5104 (iii).
Immigration Act (restriction) Amt. (B. 170) 1° m., 3712 (ii); 2°*, and in Com., 5196, 5227; (amts.) 5407; 3° m., 5533, 5563; on M. to ref. back to Com., 5566; in Com., 5567 (iii); on Senate Amts., 7116 (iv).

Oliver, Hon. Frank—*Con.*
Immigration Agents and Employees, Appointments and Salaries, List read, in Com. of Sup., 5967 (iii).
——— in G.B. &c., Statement *re* Expenditure (read) 5509 (iii).
——— G.B. and Ireland, Charges by Mr. Preston *re* Travelling Expenses (Ans.) 1864 (i).
——— Ont. and Dom. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1346 (i).
——— Winnipeg, Supplying Miners, &c. (Ans.) 995 (i).
Immigration, Amount expended for Promotion of, &c. (Ans.) 177 (i).
Immigration from Belgium (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1637 (i).
Immigration to Canada, False Representations *re* Labour Market, on prop. Res. (Mr. R. Smith) 2965 (ii).
——— Investigation *re* Destination, Name of Officials, &c. (Ans.) 5184 (iii).
——— Irregularities, Charges *re* (Ans.) 1673 (i).
——— Printing Contracts in G.B., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5515 (iii).
——— Regulations *re* Organized Labour (Ans.) 3406 (ii).
Imperial Pulp Mill Co.'s Water Power at Sturgeon Falls, Sale &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 943 (i).
Indian Act (intoxicants) Amt. B. 66 (Mr. Monk) on M. for 2°, 2073 (ii); (M.) 6 m. h., 2074 (ii).
Indian (J. W. Lewis) Enfranchisement (B. 85) 2°* and in Com., 2827 (ii).
See "Lewis".
Indian Act Amt. (B. 194) 2°* and in Com., 5422 (iii).
Indian Affairs, Number of Employees, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 1097 (i).
Indian Lands at East and West Algoma, Agents, Remuneration, &c. (Ans.) 2079 (ii).
Indian, Non-Treaty Expenditure, 1904-5 (Ans.) 5006 (iii).
Indian Reserves, B.C., Surrender of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 953 (i).
Indian Reserves, Opened for Settlement (Ans.) 331 (i).
——— Ownership of Timber, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1248 (i).
Indian Schools, Complaints *re* Curriculum, Qualifications of Teachers, &c. (Ans.) 3249 (ii).
Indian Trust Fund, Amount collected (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1250 (i).
Indians, Victoria County, N.S., Number, Medical Attendance, Payments *re* &c. (Ans.) 2455 (ii).
See "Doncaster", &c.

Oliver, Hon. Frank—*Con.*
Industrial and Boarding Schools, B.C., for Indians, List of Denominations (read) in Com. of Sup., 1088 (i).
Information Bureau, Concord, Advertisements *re* in British Press (Ans.) 574 (i).
Interior, Deptl. Rep., on Inquiry for, 568, 716 (i).
Japanese Deportations in B.C. *re* Par. in Vancouver World (remarks) 3153 (ii).
Keewatin District, Proclamation *re* N. W. Ter. Act, (Ans.) 325 (i).
Lafferty, Dr., Payments to *re* Indians (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 962 (i).
Lake St. Francis Islands, Number and Owners (Ans.) 7638 (iv).
Land Grants to Man. & Southeastern Ry. &c. in N. W., Location, &c. (Ans.) 2076 (ii).
Land Grants to Rys., Selection by Ry. Cos., Govt. Policy *re*, on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) to Com. of Sup., 1069 (i).
Land Grants, Selection by Qu'Appelle &c. Ry. and SS. Co. and Man. and Southeastern Co. (Ans.) 769 (i).
Land Patents issued in Man., Sask. and Alberta, from 1901 to 1905, &c., on M. for ret. (Mr. Ames) 2275 (ii).
Land Sales in Blocks in Man., N. W. T. and B. C., Prices paid, &c. (Ans.) 569 (i).
Land Sales in B. C., Conditions &c. (Ans.) 5753 (iii).
Land Sales by Govt. and Rys. Cos., to Private Corporations, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 195 (i).
Lands: *See* "Agrl.", "Can. Northern", "Crown Lands", "C.P.R.", "Dom. Lands", "Grand Forks", "Qu'Appelle", "Ry. Lands", "Saskn. Valley", "School Lands Bill", "Supply", &c.
Lewis, J. W., Enfranchisement of Moravian Indian (B. 85) 1°*, 1149 (i).
See "Indian Act Bill".
McLeod, Rod. A., Homestead Entry Duties, &c. (Ans.) 5503 (iii).
McRae, Hector, Original Purchaser of Land, B.C., Terms, &c. (Ans.) 6245 (iv).
Martin, Sugrue and Sylvestre, Messrs., Investigation into Irregularities in Yukon Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5932 (iii).
Militia (land grants) N. W. Rebellion (B. 177) 1°*, 4154, (iii), 2°*, and in Com., 4805; 3° m., 4897 (iii)
Milk River Cattle Co, Information *re* Directors, &c., Sale of Land to, &c. (Ans.) 2036 (ii).
Muscowequan Indian School Reserve, &c., Property (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1246 (i).
Nelson, J. F., and Sutherland, C., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 188, 453 (i).
Nixon, Jos., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 194 (i).

Oliver, Hon. Frank—*Con.*
Nixon, Jos., Claims of James Daley *re* Payments to (Ans) 1103 (i).
——— Claims of Mrs. Hodge, *re* Payments to (Ans.) 1102 (i).
——— Further Rep. *re* Charges against (Ans.) 452 (i).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Amounts claimed *re* Bonus (Ans.) 329, 830 (i).
——— Contract, Cancellation of (remarks) in Com of Sup., 5971 (iii).
——— Contract, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Sup., 1816 (i).
——— Documents quoted from in Speech, on Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1850 (i).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 3235 (ii).
——— Instruction to Mr. W. D. Scott *re* Tegram to Lord Strathcona (remarks) 1157 (i).
——— Investigation *re* Operations (Ans.) 452
——— Names of, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1651 (i).
——— Number deported, Payments to Govt. by Co., Form of Deposit, &c. (Ans.) 2453 (ii).
——— Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1648 (i).
See 'Immigrants', 'Preston', &c.
N. W Elections, Frauds, &c., ref. to in deb. on Address, 113 (i).
Oka Indian Reserves, Claims *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 728 (i).
Parke, Mr. Philip, Sale of Land to, Location, Condition, &c. (Ans.) 1866 (i).
Pasquah's Indian Band, Surrender of Land &c. (Ans.) 5503 (iii).
Peigan and Blood Indian Agencies, Purchase of Cattle, &c. (Ans.) 4702 (iii).
Placer Mining in Yukon (B. 153) 1° m., 2452; 2°* and in Com., 3412 (ii), 4802 (iii); on Senate Amts., 6828 (iv).
Pontiac County, Geological Formation *re* (Ans.) 1673 (i).
Port Arthur and Fort William, Tenders for Dredging (remarks) 1856 (i).
Preston, Griffiths, Messrs., and High Commissioner, on Inquiry for Ret., 1748 (i).
Preston, W.T.R., Immigration Agent in London, Rental of House, &c. (Ans.) 3906 (ii).
——— Visit to Canada *re* High Commissioner's Office (Ans.) 172 (i).
——— Removal from Office of Immigration Agent, G.B., on Amt. (Mr Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6886 (iv).
See 'North Atlantic', &c.
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Land Grant, Indebtedness to Govt., &c. (Ans.) 317 (i).
——— Question, (remarks) 170 (i).
——— Land Grant, O. C., Notice to Co. by Govt. (Ans.) 425 (i).

Oliver, Hon. Frank—*Con.*
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Land Grant, Ret. laid on Table (remarks) 2321 (ii).
——— Information *re* O.C. of Aug. 1902, on Inquiry for Ret., 3317 (ii).
——— (explanation *re* cor.) 3504 (ii).
Quebec Immigration Detention Hospital, Amount expended, &c. (Ans.) 334 (i).
Ry. Lands, Policy of Govt. *re* Selection by Ry. Cos. (Ans.) 571 (i).
——— on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) to Com. of Sup. 914 (i).
Rainmaking in the Yukon, Expenditure *re*, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1211 (i).
——— Failure of Mr. Hatfield (remarks) 7187 (iv).
——— Payment for by Council, on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 565 (i).
——— on Inquiry (Mr. Foster) for O. C. 1008 (i).
Ray and Bronson Mining Concession in Yukon, Date of Grant, Condition Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 1744 (i).
Returns of Previous Session, on Inquiry for, 12 (i).
——— Delay in Producing (remarks) 1941 (i).
——— on Inquiry for, 2234 (ii).
——— Statement *re* Preparation, List (read) 2811 (ii).
——— from Interior Dept., Supplemental Documents laid on Table with Explanations, 3151 (ii).
Returns for Parliament, Access to Public Files by Members (remarks) 2927 (ii).
Riding Mountain Timber Reserve, Policy *re* Squatters ref. to in Com. on Forest Bill, 2850 (ii).
——— Change in Boundary (Ans.) 765 (i).
——— Prohibition of Settlers by Govt. (Ans.) 996 (i).
Road Allowances for Alberta and Saskatchewan (B. 202) 1° m., 5363; 2°*, and in Com., 5560 (iii).
Rocky Mountains Park Act Amt. (B. 164) 2°*, and in Com., 4734; 3°*, 4805 (iii).
St. George, E.C.S., Sale of Land to, Conditions, &c. (Ans.) 1866 (i).
Salvation Army Immigrants, Number, Location, &c. (Ans.) 185 (i).
——— and S. America (remarks) 6801 (iv).
Sarcee Indian Reserve, Negotiations *re* Surrender (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 959 (i).
Saskatchewan Public Lands, Transference to Private Corporations (Ans.) 325 (i).
Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Date of Contract, Conditions *re* Settlement, &c. (Ans.) 2027 (ii).
——— Date of Purchase from Can. Northern Ry. Co., Transfer, &c. (Ans.) 1745 (i).

Oliver, Hon. Frank—*Con.*
Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Purchase of Homestead Lands, Selection, &c. (Ans.) 420 (i).
——— Sale to A. D. Davidson, Papers *re* (Ans.) 1569 (i).
——— Valuation of Lands sold, &c. (Ans.) 425 (i).
Sauvalle, Marc, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 3245 (ii).
School Lands Exchange (B. 163) 1° m., 3233; 2°*, and in Com., 3910 (ii); Memorandum (read) 5191 (iii).
School Lands disposed of in Man., Sask. and Alberta, during six months, 1905, Average Price, &c. (Ans.) 192 (i).
——— Quantity still unsold, &c. (Ans.) 192 (i).
South-East Quarter Section, 28, West of 5th Meridian, Sale of (Ans.) 584 (i).
Speer, C. W., Rep. *re* Land sold to Col. Davidson, on Inquiry for Ret., 2701 (ii).
Stafford, Mr. J. A., Offer to purchase Georgian Bay Islands (Ans.) 5007 (iii).
Steamer for Coast Agency, B. C. Indians (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1095 (i).
Steel and Iron Ores, Electrical Smelting Process (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5934 (iii).
Stone, E. B., Lease of Land in Bow River Country, Terms, &c. (Ans.) 3740 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Civil Govt.—Geological Survey (director's salary) 5978 (iii); (salaries) 405; Indian Affairs (salaries) 365 (i), 5985 (iii); Interior (salaries) 362, 404 (i), 5509, 5975 (iii).
Dom. Lands (Banff roads, &c.) 5943; (contingencies) 5939; (litigation) 5944; (maps, &c.) 5977; (mines branch) 5941; outside service, salaries) 5936; (salaries) 5614; (supt. of mines) 5934; (surveys) 5882, 5977; (tree culture) 5939; (Yoho park roads) 5944 (iii).
Geological Survey (borings) 5983; (coast survey, launch) 5979; (experimental borings) 5982; (gold gravels, Yukon) 5981, 5985 ; (Nicolas, F., payments to) 5980 ; (specimens) 5983; (translation, &c.) 5983; (Yukon map) 5980 (iii).
Govt of N. W. T. (registry offices) 5528 ; (schools) 5880 (iii).
Immigration (agents, G.B., &c.) 1342; List of Agents (read) 1343; (agents, G.B., &c.) 1635 (i), 5509, 5967, 5862; Statement (read) 5862; (literature, &c.) 5875; (medical inspection, Halifax) 5872; (printing, &c.) 5514; (printing in G.B.) 5863; (special payments for service) 5871; (uniforms) 5873 (iii).
Indians—B.C. (industrial schools) 1087 ; (medical attendance) 1079; (miscellaneous) 1094 ; (relief) 1078 ; (salaries) 1078 ; (schools) 1087; (seed) 1079; (steamer, coast agency) 1095; travelling expenses) 1094 (i).
Indians—Generally (Treaty No. 8) 1251 (i).
Indians—Man. and N.W.T. (annuities) 734 (i); (boarding schools) 5990 (iii); (general expenses) 961 (i); (insane asylums)

Oliver, Hon. Frank—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

5990 (iii); (live stock) 735; (provisions, &c.) 932; (schools) 947; (seeds, &c.) 735; (Sioux) 960; (surveys) 947; (tools, &c.) 735; (triennial clothing) 943 (i).

Indians—Mar. Provs. (schools) 718 (i).

Indians—N.B. (agents salaries) 734; (medical attendance) 734 (i).

Indians—N.S. (seed grain) 734 (i).

Indians—Ont. and Que. (legal expenses) 727; (medical attendance) 717; (Robinson annuities) 722; (schools) 717 (i), 5986; (Seven Islands survey) 5987 (iii); (surveys) 724 (i); (treaty payments) 5988 (iii); (Treaty No. 9) 734 (i).

Indians—Yukon (medical attendance) 1207; (relief) 1206; (schools) 1228 (i).

Interior (assay office, B.C.) 5945; (boundary surveys) 5858 (iii), 5876; (Calgary and Edmonton Ry., payments *re* mining rights) 5861; (caves in B.C., payment to C. H. Deutschman) 5858; (maps, &c.) 5946; (mining institute) 5950, 5978; (registry offices, N.W.T.) 5978 (iii).

Yukon Ter. (Govtl. expenditure) 5907, 5929; (roads and local council, &c.) 5934 (iii).

Swamp Lands, System of Classification, &c. (Ans.) 447 (i).

Swan Lake Indian Reserve, Settlement *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1246 (i).

Timber Leases in Man. and N.W.T., Applications for between 1880 and 1896 (Ans.) 5503, 5753 (iii).

Tyerman, Dr., Medical Officer for Twatt's Band of Indians (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1245 (i).

Wagner, Philip, Charges *re* Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. Fowler) to Com. of Sup., 5588 (iii).

——— Emplymt. by Govt., Previous Imprisonment, &c. (Ans.) 194 (i).

Whitefish Island, Plans *re* Expropriation by Ry. Cos. (Ans.) 191 (i).

——— Name of Purchaser (Ans.) 2454 (ii).

——— Number of Tenders (Ans.) 3406 (ii).

Wilson, Mr. Alex., Apptmnt. as Special Agent for Immigration (Ans.) 1864 (i).

Wire Fencing on Boundary Line, Contracts *re* (Ans.) 1677 (i).

Yukon, Charges *re* Wood Contracts (remarks) 6801, 7639 (iv).

——— Citizens' Meeting, Res. *re* Cancellation of Hydraulic Concessions (remarks) 6549 (iv.)

——— Concessions, Cancellation of (remarks) 1856 (i).

——— Council, Election by People, Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) 2889 (ii).

——— Council, Supervision by Dom. Govt. *re* Expenditures, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1211 (i).

——— Gold Royalty, Amount collected from 1897 to 1905 (Ans.) 5004 (iii).

——— Gold Royalties, Investigation *re* (remarks) 5929 (iii), 7639 (iv).

Oliver, Hon. Frank—*Con.*

Yukon Ter., Gold, Value of Output, 1897-1905 (Ans.) 2031 (ii).

——— Indians, Schools, Officials, &c. (Ans.) 2272 (ii).

——— Placer Mining (B. 153) 1° m., 2452 (ii). *See* 'Placer.'

——— Representative Institutions, on M. (Mr. Thompson) for Sup., 5109 (iii).

Osler, Mr. E. B., *West Toronto.*

Arbitrations and Awards, Payments to Civil Servants *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 375 (i).

Crown Lands, Administration of by Dept. of Interior, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 4690 (iii).

Forest Reserves B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. 2840, 3319, 3534 (ii).

Gelinas, Mr., Travelling Expenses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 400 (i).

Gobeil, Mr., Dep. Min. Public Works, acting as Arbitrator (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 375 (i).

Immigration Act Amt B. 170 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5235 (iii).

Indemnity to Members and Privy Councillors B. 18 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 3017 (ii).

Investigation *re* Charges of Govt. Expenditure (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4113 (iii).

Money Lenders Act Amt. B. 11 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 354 (i).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Investigation *re* Operations (Ques.), 452 (i).

San Francisco Disaster, Govt. Aid applied to Relief of Canadians (remarks) 2891 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Civil Govt.—Geological Survey (salaries) 406; Interior (salaries) 405; Post Office (salaries) 402; Public Works (salaries) 375 (i).

Ocean and River Service (navigation schools) 3401 (ii).

Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, &c.) 5137 (iii).

Paquet, Mr. E., *L'Islet.*

Béland, Mr., Expenditure *re* Cottage at Grosse Isle, &c. (Ques.) 2269 (ii).

Dionne, Louis, Harbour Master, Montmigny, Salary, Revenues, &c. (Ques.) 4707 (iii).

Elgin Road Station, I.C.R. Piling Grounds, Purchase by Govt. of Grounds (Ques.) 583 (i).

I.C.R. Station at Lévis, Amount expended *re* Asphalt Pavement (Ques.) 4708 (iii).

Lévis Quarantine, Amount expended (Ques.) 4707 (iii).

L'Ile aux Grues, Channel, Deepening &c. (Ques.) 200 (i).

Maple Syrup Adulteration, on prop. Res. (Mr. Boyer) 1404 (i).

Paquet, Mr. E.—*Con.*
Montmagny Cigar Factory, Suspension of Excise Officer Michon (Ques.) 2269 (ii).
"Montmorency" Yacht, Cost of Maintenance, &c. (Ques.) 2269 (ii).
Quebec Deep Water Wharfs, Construction of (Ques.) 583 (i).
St. Aubert and St. Pamphile Mail Service, Expiration of Contract (Ques.) 2266 (ii).
Transportation for Passengers and Freight, Increase in Rates, I.C.R., St. Jean Port-Joli, Lévis (Ques.) 583 (i).

Pardee, Mr. F. F., *West Lambton.*
"Arctic" Expedition, Charges *re* Expenditure, on M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) to conc. in Rep. of Special Com., 6412 (iv).
Lord's Day B. 12, in Com. (loading, &c., vessels) 6633 (iv).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 465 (i).
Members and Privy Councillors, Indemnity Repeal B. 18 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 2533 (ii).
SUPPLY:
Lighthouse and Coast Service (lightkeepers) 3588 (ii).
United Empire Life Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 90) 1°*, 1252; on Senate Amts., 7271, 7370 (iv).
West Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 26) 1°*, 350; in Com., 1140 (i).

Parent, Mr. Geo., *Montmorency.*
Agricultural Committee of H. of C., Translation of Reports (Ques.) 575 (i).

Parmelee, Mr. C. H., *Shefford.*
Aud. Gen.'s Rep., French Edition (remarks) 5886 (iii).
Drug and Proprietary Medicine Trade, Mr. A. E. DuBerger's Rep. (M. for copy *) 1871 (i).
Lord's Day B. 12, in Com. (Jews) 6349 (iv).
Monarch Bank of Canada (B. 186) 1°*, 4801 (iii).
Printing of Parlt., Joint Com., 3rd Rep. (presented) 5081 (iii).
——— on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. to Internal Economy Com. (remarks) 7056 (iv).
Provincial Subsidies, Conference *re* Readjustment, &c. (Ques.) 95 (i).
——— Cor. between Govts. *re* Readjustment (M. for copies*) 211 (i).
Wight, Fred. Wm., Relief (B. 193) 1°*, 5081 (iii).

Paterson, Hon. Wm. (Minister of Customs), *Brant.*
Arbitrations and Awards, Payments to Civil Servants *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 392 (i).

Paterson, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*
Baker, I. G., Claim *re* Yukon Supplies, Statement read, in Com. of Sup., 520 (i).
Bounties paid on Iron, Steel, and Binder Twine, Amounts paid since 1896 (Ans.) 7371 (iv).
Brantford, Amount of Excise Duty collected, &c. (Ans.) 571 (i).
——— Customs Revenue, Duty collected, &c. (Ans.) 339 (i).
Budget, The, 3866 (ii).
Business of the Hse, (remarks) 713, 742, 889, (i).
Canned Meat and Fluid Beef, Amount imported from U.S. (Ans.) 5005 (iii).
Cinq-Mars, Before Bar of Hse., on Amt. (Mr. Aylesworth) 5280 (iii).
Civil Servants, Policy of Govt. *re* Extra Work, (Ans.) 327 (i).
Coal, Bituminous, Bonding in Canada, Refund of Duties, &c. (Ans.) 1860 (i).
Conmee & Bowman, Charges *re* Dredging Contracts, on Ques. of Order, 1308 (i).
Customs Dept., Criticism *re* Certain Entries for Dredges (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4846 (iii).
——— Deptl. Ret., on Inquiry for, 6802 (iv).
Dionne, Louis, Harbour Master, Montmagny, Salary, Revenues, &c. (Ans.) 4707 (iii).
Emerson Customs Collector, Re-instatement of Collector (remarks) 5995 (iii).
Emerson Custom House, Irregularities *re* (remarks) 1582 (i).
Fruit Marks Act (apples) Amt. B. 101 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2163 (ii).
Geological Survey Director, Apptmnt. of (remarks) 712 (i).
German Discriminatory Duties on Green and Dried Apples, Change *re* (Ans.) 978 (i).
German Surtax, Restrictions, Exports *re*, &c. (Ans.) 326 (i).
German Tariff on Canadian Goods and American Goods (Ans.) 989 (i).
German Tariffs in Relation to Canada, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 1896 (i).
——— on Inquiry for, 1202, 1259 (i); 3713 (i); 7359 (iv).
Govt. Vessels, Number of Officers, Crews, &c. (Ans.) 995 (i).
Grain Inspection Act, Memorials from Man., &c., *re* Changes (Ans.) 976 (i).
Hogs imported and slaughtered for Export, &c. (Ans.) 177 (i).
Imperial Institute, Explanation of Vote (remarks) on M. for 1° of Supply Bill, 667 (i).
Indian (J. W. Lewis) Enfranchisement B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2830 (ii).
Insurance Commission, Expenditure and Remuneration (remarks) on M. for 1° of Supply Bill, 695 (i).
Interior, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 781 (i).

Paterson, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*
Iron and Steel Bounties on Canadian Ore, on prop. Res. (Mr. Conmee) 3781 (ii).
Jacks imported for Breeding Purposes, Duty *re* (Ans.) 836 (i).
Lord's Day B. 12, in Com. (Jews) 6335 (iv).
Marble Workers at Toronto, Complaints *re* American Marble entered at undervaluation at Customs (Ans.) 5321 (iii).
Members' Indemnity B. 18 (Mr. Maclean) on Order being called for 2°, 887 (i).
Methyl.-Alcohol, Import and Excise Duty; Quantity imported, &c. (Ans.) 5507 (iii).
N.S., Lt.-Governorship, Apptmnt. of Mr. Fraser (remarks) 837 (i).
Piping, Butt and Lap Welded, Quantity imported, and Duty collected, &c. (Ans.) 175 (i).
Port Stanley, Port Burwell, &c., Customs receipts since 1896, &c. (Ans.) 171 (i).
Preferential Trade with Britain, False Declarations *re* (Ans.) 2548 (ii).
Prince Arthur of Connaught, on Arrival in Canada (remarks) 742 (i).
P.E.I. and G. B. Mail Service, Number of Trips, &c. (Ans.) 426 (i).
Rainmaker's Contract, Inquiry for O. C. *re* (remarks) 839 (i).
Returns ordered, Delay in bringing down (remarks) 714 (i).
Returns, Preparation of by Sec. of State (remarks) 838 (i).
Returns, on Inquiry for, 1008 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie Farm and Garden Produce entered for Duty, Value, &c., 1905 (Ans.) 2079 (ii).
Seaforth Public Buildings, Total Rents (Ans.) 1567 (i).
Senate Reform, on prop. Res. (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 2311 (ii).
Supply (B. 56) 1° m., 658; 2°*, in Com. and 3°*, 711 (i).
SUPPLY:
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 305 (i).
Civil Govt.—Customs (contingencies) 7514 (iv); (salaries) 360; Justice (salaries) 359; Interior (salaries) 364; Privy Council (salaries) 358 (i).
Customs—Miscellaneous (refunds to I. G. Baker & Co.) 516 (i), 7515 (iv); (miscellaneous) 515; (outside ports) 491 (i); (ports of entry) 7514; (printing, &c.) 7515 (iv); (statistics) 511; (Yukon) 516 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Pelee Islands) 7557 (iv).
Post Office (Yukon) 558 (i).
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, &c.) 5143 (iii).
Yukon Ter. (Govtl. expenses) 5913 (iii).
Tariff Commission, Evidence, Printing, of, &c. (Ans.) 201 (i).
——— Copy laid on Table, 201 (i).
Theatrical Advertising Matter, Application *re* Removal of Duty (Ans.) 5507 (iii).

Paterson, Hon. Wm.—*Con.*
Tobacco, Raw Leaf, Increase of Duty, &c. (Ans.) 176 (i).
Trade and Commerce, Rep. (presented) 125 (i).
——— Deptl. Rep. (presented) 4034 (iii).
Trade and Nav. Rep. (presented) 125 (i).
Transportation Commission, Rep., Evidence, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Bennett) 2046 (ii).
Ventilation of Chamber, &c. (remarks) 7363 (iv).
Wiley, Daniel, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 986 (i).
Wire Fencing, Inspection of Importations, &c. (Ans.) 176 (i).
Woodstock Collector of Customs, Appmt. of, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 3251 (ii).
Yukon Council Expenditures, Supervision by Dom. Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1225 (i).

Perley, Mr. G. H., *Argenteuil.*
Chicoutimi Pulp Co., Contract *re* Piers and Booms (M. for copy*) 1379 (i).
Chicoutimi, Saguenay River Piers and Booms, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 993 (i).
Forest Reserves B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2864, 3552, 3568 (ii).
Great Northern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6167 (iv).
Imperial Institute, Explanation of Vote (remarks) on M. for 1° of Supply Bill, 699 (i).
Montfort and Gatineau Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6167 (iv).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract, Charges *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Sup., 2003 (i).
Ry. Subsidies, Authorization B. 214 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 6167 (iv).
St. Maurice Slides and Booms, Total Expenditure, Revenue, &c. (Ques.) 1100 (i).
SUPPLY:
Culling Timber (supervisors) 7543 (iv).
Customs (outside ports) 509 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Halifax and W. Indies) 7551 (iv).
Public Works—Slides and Booms (Saguenay River) 7016 (iv).
Victoria Memorial Museum, Change of Plans (Ques.) 1152 (i).
——— Name of Contractor, Stone used, &c. (Ques.) 1152 (i).
——— Specifications *re* Material, Cor. &c. (M. for copies*) 1741 (i).
Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 14 (Mr. Campbell) on M. for 3°, 2974 (ii).

Piche, Mr. C., *Montreal, St. Mary's.*
Bell Telephone Co. (personal explanation) *re* Vote, 6555 (iv).
Chateauguay and Beauharnois Inner Channel, Buoying of (Ques.) 2724 (ii).
Fruit Marks Act (apples) Amt. B. 101 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2163, 2553, 2565 (ii).

Piche, Mr. C.—*Con.*
Lord's Day B. 12 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5645, 5798 (iii); (Jews) 6307; (provincial acts) 6555; (shooting) 6269 (iv); (trains, &c.) 5731 (iii); Amt. *re* Provincial Legislation, 6557 (iv.
Lord's Day Bill, Montreal Public Meetings, Par. in 'La Patrie,' 6818 (iv).
Lake St. Louis, Hydrographic Surveys, Completion of Maps, &c. (Ques.) 330 (i).
Lake of Two Mountains, Hydrographic Surveys, Completion of Maps, &c. (Ques.) 330 (i).
Naval School of Instructions, Lectures *re* (Ques.) 2726 (ii).
Pontiac County, Geological Formation, Reps. *re* (Ques.) 1673 (i).
Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 14 (Mr. Campbell) on M. for 2°, 878 (i).

Pickup, Mr. S. W. W., *Annapolis.*
SUPPLY:
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Annapolis wharf) 6774 (iv).

Porter, Mr. E. G., *West Hastings.*
Bell's Rapids Post Office, Establishment of, &c. (Ques.) 201 (i).
Lord's Day B. 12 on M. for 3°, 7296; on Senate Amts., 7677 (iv).
Trent River Waters, Control of Water Power by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 199 (i).
Trent Valley Canal, Investigation *re* Route, Damage to Lift Locks, &c. (Ques.) 202 (i).

Pringle, Mr. R. A., *Stormont.*
'Alert' Str., Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4836 (iii).
Bell Telephone Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Bureau) in Com., 5996 (iii).
G.T.P. Ry., Branch Lines B. 75 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 5468 (iii).
Lord's Day B. 12 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5698, 5760 (iii); on M. (Mr. Aylesworth) to strike out Amt. (Mr. T. Martin) *re* ball games, 7280; on Amt. (Mr. T. Martin) *re* games, 7245; (loading, &c., grain) 6648 (iv); (newspapers) 5744; (trains) 5700 (iii); (amt.) *re* destination of trains, 7258, 7272; on Senate Amts., 7676 (iv).
Privy Councillors Annuities Repeal B. 220 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7630 (iv).
Railway Accidents Inspector, Apptmt. of (Ques.) 6087 (iii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 1631 (i), 6097 (iii), 6218, 7072 (iv).

Prcuix, Mr. E., *Prescott.*
Privilege, Ques. of, *re* Vote on Lord's Day Bill, 7565 (iv).

Ratz, Mr. V., *North Middlesex.*
Huron and Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 112) 1°*, 1576 (i).

Reid, Mr. J. D., *Grenville.*
Acetylene Gas Buoys in St. Lawrence Channel (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2902 (ii)
'Arctic', Str. Expedition, Com. of Investigation *re* Expenditure, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3662 (ii).
——— Charges *re* Expenditure, on M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) to conc. in Rep. of Special Com., 6407 (iv).
——— Expenditure *re* Supplies, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3210 (ii).
Brooks & Co., Banking Arrangements and Dept. of Marine (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 4840 (iii).
Caldwell, C. F., Applications *re* Coal Mining Lands (M. for cor.*) 1741 (i).
——— Information *re*, 1465 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 2545 (ii).
——— (remarks) 1000 (i).
Cement purchased from Charles Strubbe (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4922 (iii).
Cement purchased from Geo T. Merwin and F. L. Brooks & Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 3366 (ii)
Coal purchased by Govt. for Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2910, 3597 (ii).
Davis Contract *re* Cornwall Canal Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5345 (iii).
Farran's Point Acetylene Lighting Plant, Total Expenditure (Ques.) 1677 (i).
G.T.P. Ry., Branch Lines incorp. B. 75 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 5950 (iii).
House of Commons Rules, in Com. on Rep., 7612 (iv).
Imperial Institute, Explanation of Vote (remarks) on M. for 1° of Supply Bill, 692 (i).
Loan Companies B. 40 (Mr. Zimmerman) in Com., 3278 (ii).
Masters and Mates Certificates B. 7 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 464; in Com., 474 (i).
Montreal Marine Agency, Rents, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3594 (ii).
Ry. Act (express cos.) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 787 (i).
Ry. Act. Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 2591 (ii).
Returns to Parlt., Expenditure *re* (remarks) 2944 (ii).
——— Statement *re* Preparation by Min. of Int. (remarks) *re*, 2819 (ii).
Returns, Inquiry for, 2811 (ii), 4035 (iii).
St. Lawrence Power Co., Amounts paid *re* Electric Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5345 (iii).

Reid, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

SUPPLY:

Administration of Justice—Yukon (living allowances) 7523 (iv).
Canals—Cornwall (Davis contract) 5344 (iii).
Canals—Galops (channel completion) 5158 (north channel) 5158; (north channel dam) 5357 (iii).
Canals—Lachine—(coal tax) 7511 (iv).
Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (construction) 5165 5357, (iii).
Canals—Soulanges (construction) 5357 (iii).
Canals—Trent (Holland river) 5171 (iii).
Canals—Welland (electric plant) 5161 (iii); (Port Colborne entrance) 5165 (iii).
Canals—Williamsburg (gate-lifter) 5358 (iii).
Civil Govt.—Post office (salaries) 403 (i).
Excise (salaries) 1548 (i).
Fisheries (Lake Winnipeg steamers) 7563 (iv).
Indians—B.C. (medical attendance) 1082; Ontario and Que. (legal expenses) 726; (medical attendance) 720; (schools, 717; Yukon (relief) 1206 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies, rents, &c.) 3594 (ii); (carbide supplies) 4881 (iii); (lighthouses) 3619 (ii); (maintenance 4147 (iii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and S. Africa) 7553 (iv).
Metric System (lectures) 2616 (ii).
Militia (annual drill) 5013 (iii).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 4028, 4098 (iii); (maintenance of strs.) 3210 (ii).
Penitentiaries—Kingston — (binder twine) 7529 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. ("Galveston" dredge) 2922; St. Lawrence Channel (lighting) 2898 (ii).
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys) 5147; I.C.R. (bridges) 5018; (coal-handling machinery) 5357; (double tracking) 5356 (iii).
Weights and Measures (inspections) 2601 (ii).

Tate Dry Dock, Name of Lessee, Rental, &c. (Ques.) 1374 (i).
Williamsburg Canal, Staff and Repairs, Total Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 982 (i).
Worthington Pump, Purchase by Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4108 (iii).

Rivet, Mr. L. A. A., *Hochelaga.*

Lord's Day B. 12 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5786 (iii).
Lord's Day Bill, Montreal Public Meeting, Par. in La Patrie, 6821 (iv).
Montreal Harbour Board, Reorganization, Cor. Documents &c. (M.) for Copies, 1132, 1206 (i).

Roche, Mr. Wm., *Halifax.*

"Arctic" Expedition, Charges *re* Expenditure, on M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) to conc. in Rep. of Com., 6376 (iv).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 170 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., on Amts., 5412 (iii).
I.C.R., Moncton Land Purchase from Mr. Hewson, on Amt. (Mr. Ames) to Com. of Sup., 5849 (iii).

Roche, Mr. Wm.—*Con.*

Lord's Day B. 12 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5626, 5666, 5758; (trains, &c.), 5701 (iii).
Public Accounts Com., 10-15th Reps. (presented) 7458 (i).

SUPPLY:

Lighthouse and Coast Service (lightships) 7458 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—P.E.I. (Wood Island jetty) 6934 (iv).

Roche, Mr. W. J., *Marquette.*

Animals, Health, Compensation *re* Slaughtering &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2686 (ii).
Aylmer, Mr. F., Resignation and re-Apptmnt. &c. (Ques.) 5096 (iii).
Bell Telephone Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Bureau) on M. for Com., 3955 (ii).
Birnie Postal Facilities, Pet. *re* (Ques.) 5006 (iii).
C. P. Ry. Lands, Time Limit *re* Selection, &c. (Ques.) 765 (i).
Canadian Northern Ry. Lands, Selected and Patented, &c. (M. for ret. *) 2951 (ii).
——— Selection of *re* O. C. Aug. 1903 &c. (M. for ret.*) 3277 (ii).
——— Patents *re* &c. (Ques.) 2725 (ii).
Coal Rights in Man., Cor., with Jos. Rirm, &c. (M. for copies*) 3997 (ii).
Crooked Lake Indian Reserve, Surrender &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 946 (i).
Crown Lands, Administration of by Interior Dept., on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 4616 (iii).
Emerson Customs Officials, Charges against Reps., Evidence, &c. (M. for copies*) 2038 (ii).
Forest Reserves B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2839, 3335, 3578 (ii), 5540; on Amts., 5419 (iii),
Great Northwest Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 78) 1°*, 999 (i).
Half-Breed Allotments from 1896 to 1905, in Man., Land Scrip, &c. (M. for ret.*) 210 (i).
Half-Breed Allotments in Man. and N. W. T. Land Scrip &c. (M. for ret.*) 210 (i).
Homestead Entries, Change in form of Declaration (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1359 (i).
Immigration Act Amt B. 170 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5237 (iii).
Judges of Provincial Courts Act (travelling) Amt. B. 83 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 1776 (i).
Keewatin Territory, Jurisdiction by N. W. M. Police (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4981 (iii).
Keewatin District, Proclamation *re* N. W. Ter. Act (Ques.) 325 (i).
Lafferty, Dr., Payments to *re* Indians (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 961 (i).
Land Grants, Selection by Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. and SS. Co. and Man. & Southeastern Co. (Ques.) 769 (i).

Roche, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*

Lands: *See* 'Homestead,' 'Crown,' 'Ry. Lands,' &c.

Mallein Test *re* Glanders, Res. from B. C. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2691 (ii).

Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Conference with Ont. &c. (Ques.) 198 (i).

Manitoba Govt. Telephone System Bill, Consideration of (remarks) on M. to take in Mondays, 4572 (iii).

See 'Telephones.'

Man. Telephone Lines, Expropriation of, Memorial *re* (remarks) 6247 (iv).

Militia Dept., Expenditure *re* Coal Supply at Winnipeg, Tender for, (Ques.) 2080 (ii).

Money Scrip redeemed and Land purchased from 1875 to 1905 (M. for ret.*) 210 (i).

Prince Albert Mail Service, Contract from Station to Post office (Ques.) 1745 (i).

Ry. Land Grants, Selection by Ry. Cos., Govt. Policy, on M. for Sup., 890; Amt. Neg. (Y. 58; N. 111) 1077 (i).

Riding Mountain Timber Reserve, Reps. *re* (M. for copy.*) 1740 (i).

——— (Ques.) 996 (i).

——— Change in Boundary (Ques.) 765 (i).

——— Policy *re* Squatters, Ref. to in Com.

——— on Forest Reserves Bill, 2846; cor. &c. (read) 2847, 3336 (i).

Shellmouth Bridge, Man., Contract *re* Construction (Ques.) 2270 (ii).

SUPPLY:

Dom. Lands (surveys) 5977 (iii).
Fisheries (hatcheries) 3702; (protection service) 3703 (ii).
Immigration (agents, and employees, salaries) 5968 (iii); (agents, G. B.) 1666 (i); (literature) 5874; (printing, &c.) 5512 (iii).
Indians—B.C. (medical attendance) 1083 (i).
Indians—Man., &c. (annuities) 734 (i); (industrial schools) 5991 (iii); (live stock) 735; (general expenses) 961; (schools) 947; (triennial clothing) 946 (i).
N. W. M. Police (N. W. Ter.) 4981 (iii).
Quarantine (animals health) 2686 (ii).

Telephone Lines in Man., Memorial *re* Expropriation by Govt. (Ques.) 3250 (ii).

Telephone Govt. Systems, Man. (B. 167) 1° m., 3315 (ii).

See 'Man,' &c.

Winnipeg-Selkirk Mail Service, Tenders *re* Contract (Ques.) 3405 (ii).

Ross, Mr. D., *Yale-Cariboo.*

Ashcroft, Barkerville and Fort George Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 89) 1°*, 1252 (i); on Senate Amts., 5401 (iii).

Bell Telephone Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Bureau) in Com., 6004 (iii).

Boundary Kamloops and Cariboo Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 73) 1°*, 969 (i).

Ross, Mr. D.—*Con.*

Cinq-Mars, Criticism in 'La Presse' *re* Members, on M. (Mr. Foster) to summon before Bar of House, 4719 (iii).

——— on M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 5090 (iii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Aylesworth) on Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Foster) 5278; 'Censor of Press,' &c., 5301 (iii).

Forest Reserves B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2876 (ii).

Fort William Terminal Ry. and Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. 120 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 5401 (iii).

G.T.P. Ry., Branch Lines incorp. B. 75 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 5956 (iii).

Great West Land Co., Purchase of C.P.R. Lands, Litigation *re*, Ref. to in debate on North Atlantic Trading Co., 1963 (i).

Indian Act Amt. B. 194 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5426 (iii).

Judges of Provincial Courts (arbitrators, &c.) B. 13 (Mr. Lennox) in Com., 5378 (iii).

Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s (B. 103) 1°*, 1562 (i).

Lord's Day B. 12, in Com., 5698, 5771 (iii); (fishermen) 6653; (foreign newspapers) 6276; (forest fires) 6657; (hiring rigs, &c.) 6641; (industrial plants) 6603, 6627, 7208; (loading, &c. vessels) 6635 (iv); (newspapers) 5740 (iii); (provincial legislatures) 6565; (amt.) *re* saving of property, 7206 (iv); (trains &c.) 5705 (iii); (24 hours' rest) 6661; on M. for 3° (amt.) 7193 (iv).

——— Ques. of Order, (Mr. Maclean) *re* Discussion, &c., 7194 (iv).

North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract, Charges *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Sup., 1956 (i).

Privilege, Ques. of, Par. in Toronto 'News' *re* interrupting Speakers in debate, 3069 (ii).

Ry. Act (telephones) Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 6211, 7073 (iv).

Ry. Subsidies, Authorization B. 214 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 6180 (iv).

Ramsay, Asenath, Relief (B. 190) 1°*, 5081 (iii).

SUPPLY:

Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Osoyoos) 6758 (iv).
Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, &c.) 5138 (iii).

Temperance Colonization Co., Contract *re* Settlers, ref. to in deb. on North Atlantic Trading Co., 1960-1 (i).

Vancouver, Fraser Valley and Southern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 87 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 2712 (ii).

Ross, Mr. J. A., *Rimouski.*

Mutual Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 88) 1°*, 1252 (i); in Com., 4942 (iii).

Savoie, Mr. F. T., *Megantic.*
'Arctic' Boiler Machinery, Payments *re* (remarks) on Com. of Sup., 4104 (iii).
Gasolene, Payments *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4151 (iii).
Railway Subsidies Authorization B. 214 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 6839 (iv).

Schaffner, Mr. F. L., *Souris.*
Beef Cattle Industry, Complaints from Man. Ranchers, &c. (Ques.) 4705 (iii).
Bounties on Steel, Iron and Binder Twine, Amounts paid since 1896 (Ques.) 7371 (iv).
Forest Reserves B. 47 (Mr. Olivre) in Com., 2857 (ii), 5544 (iii).
Lord's Day B. 12 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5676 (iii); (forest fires) 6657; (Jews) 6336; (loading, &c., grain) 6650 (iv); (trains, &c.) 5713 (iii).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 206 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5905 (iii).
Ry. Land Grants, Selection by Ry. Cos., Govt. Policy: on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) to Sup., 899 (i).
St. Andrews Locks, Expenditure, on (Ques.) 1375 (i).
Turtle Mountain Forest Reserve (remarks) in Com. on B. 47, 2857 (ii).
Winnipeg 'Free Press,' Amount paid by Govt., 1904-5 (Ques.) 3969 (ii).
——— Amounts paid for all Purposes, &c. (Ques.) 5752 (iii).

Schell, Mr. J. T., *Glengarry.*
Canadian Minnesota Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. 91 (Mr. Dyment) in Com., 2510 (ii).
Conmee & Bowman, Charges *re* Dredging Contracts, on Ques. of Order, 1310 (i).
Grand River and Western Power Co.'s incorp. B. 216 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 7265 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry. Tenders, Detail *re* two sections of N.T.R. (remarks) 4034 (ii).
Indemnity to Members and Pensions to Privy Councillors B. 18 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 2999 (ii).
Transportation Commission, Evidence Rep., &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Bennett) 2059, 3294 (ii).

Schell, Mr. M. S., *South Oxford.*
Erie, London and Tilsonburg Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 117) 1°*, 1667 (i).
Fruit Marks Act (apples) Amt. B. 101 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2175 (ii).
German Tariffs in Relation to Canada, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 1906 (i).
Ry. Act (telephones) Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 6107 (iii), 6227 (iv).
Senate Reform, on prop. Res. (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 2291 (ii).

Sifton, Hon. C., *Brandon.*
Brandon Transfer Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 43) 1°*, 485 (i).
Crown Lands, Administration of by Dept. of Interior, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 4267 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Ames) to Com. of Sup., 3122 (ii).
Milk River Cattle Co., Grand Forks Cattle Co., Denial *re* Purchase of Interests, 4606 (iii).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Mr. Preston's Refusal to Answer Questions, on M. (Mr. Monk) 4527 (iii).
——— (personal explanation) 2457 (ii).

Sinclair, Mr. J. H., *Guysborough.*
Coal purchased by Marine Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2918 (ii).
Freight Charges on Steel and Fish Products, &c., I.C.R. (Ques.) 449 (i).
Lord's Day B. 12 in Com. (industrial plant) 6632; (loading, &c., vessels) 6637 (iv).
Masters and Mates Certificates B. 7 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 463 (i); in Com., 471 (i).
Montreal Harbour, Revenue, Total Expenditure, Bonded Debt, &c., for 1905 (Ques.) 2729 (ii).
Postmasters' Salaries, Policy *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7447 (iv).
Post Office Savings Banks, N.B., and N.S., Number transferred (Ques.) 1101 (i).
Ry. Act (express cos.) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 805 (i).
Ry. Subsidies Authorization B. 214 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 3°, 6842 (iv).
Ships Safety Act (accidents) Amt. (B. 48) 1° m., 559; in Com., 1148 (i), 4024 (ii); 3° m., 1205 (i); in Com., 6863 (iv).
SUPPLY:
Civil Govt.—Post Office (postmasters) 7447 (iv).
Fisheries (overseers) 3696 (ii).
Marine Hospitals (Mar. Provs.) 3687 (ii).

Sloan, Mr. W., *Comox-Atlin.*
B. C. Shipping Interests, Govt. Aid to, on M. for Sup., 1483 (i).
Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s (B. 28) 1°*, 350 (i).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 170 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5230 (iii).
Lord's Day B. 12 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5738 (iii).
Seymour Narrows Survey, Rep. of Royal Commission on Transportation (Ques.) 5321 (iii).

Smith, Mr. E. D., *Wentworth.*
Apples, Inspection for Export, Quality, Cor., &c. (M.) for Copies, 1380 (i).

Smith, Mr. E. D.—*Con.*
Militia Supplies, &c., Contracts, &c. (M. for copies*) 773 (i).
Quebec Bridge, Obstruction to Navigation in St. Lawrence, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) to Adjn. 219 (i).
Ry. Act. Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) to M. for 3°, 7113 (iv).
Ry. Act (express cos.) Amt B. 9 (Mr. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 807 (i).
Stony Creek Armoury, Damages by Fire, &c. (Ques.) 327 (i).
Ventilation on SS., carrying Perishable Goods, &c. (Ques.) 569 (i).
Thermograph Records, on Ocean Steamers (M. for copies*) 427 (i).
Trans-Atlantic Steamship Subsidies, Contracts *re* with Govt. (M. for copies*) 1741 (i).

Smith, Mr. Geo., *North Oxford.*
Lord's Day B. 12, in Com. (Jews) 6283 (iv).

Smith, Mr. R., *Nanaimo.*
B. C. Shipping Interests, Govt. Aid, &c., on M. for Sup., 1475 (i).
Canadian Labour Bureau, Action *re* Leopold's Work (Ques.) 3407 (ii).
G.T.P. Ry. Construction, Emplmt. of Chinese Labour (remarks) 1000 (i).
——— Protection of Labourers, &c. (Ques.) 336(i).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 170 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5241 (iii).
Immigration Regulations *re* Organized Labour, &c. (Ques.) 3406 (ii).
Immigration to Canada, False Representations *re* Labour Market (prop. res.) 2952 (ii).
Lethbridge Coal Miners Strike, Cor. *re* Calling out of N. W. M. Police (M. for copies*) 998 (i).
Lord's Day B. 12 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5631, 5670, 5758 (iii); (Jews) 6331 (iv); (newspapers) 5741 (iii); (shooting) 6260 (iv); (trains, &c.) 5716 (iii).
Plasterers' Labourers at Winnipeg, Non-Payment by Contractors (Ques.) 1372 (i).
Ry. Act. Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 2581 (ii).
Ry. Subsidies, Authorization B. 214 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com on Res., 6143 (iv).
Wellington and Union Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6143 (iv).
Wrecks on Pacific Coast, Loss in Life, Causes &c. (M for ret.*) 428 (i).
——— (Ques.) 338 (i).

Speaker, Mr. (Hon. R. F. Sutherland), *North Essex.*
Address, Gov. Gen.'s Speech from Throne (read) 4 (i).
Bills, Royal Assent. Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (read) 3152 (ii), 4247 (iii), 6165 (iv).
Burks Falls and South River Ry. Co's Bill, on M. to Introduce, Expiration of Time (ruling) 2811 (ii).
Cannington Postmaster, Dismissal, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Zimmerman) Ruling, 2460 (ii).
——— (ruling) *re* Irrelevancy of Quotations, 2467 (ii).
Cape Breton Electoral District (notification) 889 (i).
Cinq-Mars, Summoned before Bar for further Examination, 5266 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Aylesworth) 5274 (iii).
——— Res. of Censure (read) 5320 (iii)
——— Proceedings, *re*, 4793 (iii).
——— Questions asked, 4796 (iii).
——— Statement (read) 5290; Defence read by Mr. Cinq-Mars, 5290 (iii).
Conmee and Bowman, Charges *re* Dredging Contracts, on Ques. of Order (ruling) 1305, 1327 (i).
Controverted Elections, Judges' Certificates (presented) 2 (i).
Election Appeals, Supreme Court Judgments (presented) 2 (i).
Election Petition dismissed, Judges' Reps. (presented) 2 (i).
Election Petition dismissed, Supreme Court Judgments (presented) 1 (i).
Elections, New Members, Certificates of Election (notification) 3 (i).
Electoral Districts, Vacancies, Issue of Writ (notification) 3 (i).
Elgin, East Electoral District, Issue of Writ (notification) 6165 (iv).
German Tariffs, &c., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Bennett) *re* 'Criminal Courts' (ruling) 1931
G.T.P. Ry., Branch Lines incorp. B. 75 (Mr. Crawford) on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) to M. for 3°, (remarks) 6616 (iv).
Great Lakes Dredging Co., *re* Bowman and Conmee's Contracts, Ques. of Order, 1305 (i).
Indemnity to Members B. 18, on 2°, Decorum in Debate (ruling) *re* Members' Remarks, 3067; Remarks checked, 2981 (ii).
King's Most Gracious Majesty, Reply from Senate *re* Mess. (read) 2244 (ii).
Library of Parlt., Joint Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Lord's Day B. 12, Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) *re* Discussion on 3°, (ruling) 7195; on M. (Mr. Aylesworth) to strike out amt. (Mr. T. Martin) *re* ball games (ruling) 7278; on Senate Amts., 7664, 7697 (iv).
Mess. from His Ex., Internal Economy (read) 125 (i).
——— Reply to Address (read) 1940 (i).
——— Suppl. Estimates (1906)—(read) 2016 (i).
——— Suppl. Estimates (read) 5697 (iii).

Speaker, Mr. (Hon. R. F. Sutherland)—*Con.*
North Atlantic Trading Co., Irregularity of Debate (remarks) 1160 (i).
——— on Ques. of Order (sir Wilfrid Laurier) ref. to Rep. of Com., (ruling) 2106, 2108 (ii).
Norfolk Election, Pets. *re* (notification) 485 (i).
Opening of Parliament: Mess. from His Ex., 1 (i).
Order, Ques. of, *re* Question of Privilege, Members Remarks checked, 4728 (iii).
Petitions, Presenting of, Time expired (remarks) 828 (i).
Pilotage Commission Investigation, Members' Remarks checked, 6805 (iv).
Prince Arthur of Connaught Reception in Senate Chamber (remarks) 1749 (i).
Private Bills, Expiration of Time (ruling) 2811 (ii).
Prorogation, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec., 7695, 7698 (iv).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. (remarks) *re* Amt. of Min. of Rys., 7092 (iv).
——— Discussion on First Readings (remarks) 753 (i).
Ry. Act (express cos.) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Maclean) Members' Remarks checked, 809 (i).
Renfrew, N., Issue of Writ *re* Electoral District, (notification) 6165 (iv).
Senate and House of Commons B. 97 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) *re* Discussion (ruling) 1780 (i).
Speech from Throne (read) 4 (i).
Strathcona Electoral District, Certificate of Election (notice) 1840 (i).
SUPPLY:
House of Commons (debates) 7573; (sessional clerks) 7572 (iv).
Vacancies: *See* 'Electoral Districts.'

Speaker, Deputy (Mr. C. Marcil), *Bonaventure.*
House of Commons Rules, in Com. on Special Rep., 7467 (iv).
Ingram, A. B., M.P., Resignation (notice) 5184 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service, Member called to Order *re* Use of Word 'Coward,' 4140 (iii).
Lord's Day B. 12, in Com. (fourth commandment—(ruling) 6660 (iv); Members' remarks checked, 5628 (iii); on Ques. of Order *re* amts. (ruling) 6350; (rulings) *re* amts. being moved &c., 7233; on Ques. of Order (Mr. Monk) *re* discussing Principle, 6262; on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) (ruling) 6561; on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) *re* Amts. (ruling) 7207 (iv).
Vancouver and Lulu Island Ry. Co.'s B. 29 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., (ruling) *re* Amts., 1145 (i).

Sproule, Mr. T. S., *East Grey.*
Acetylene Gas Buoys in St. Lawrence Channel (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2906 (ii).
Acoustics in Chamber (remarks) 7360 (iv).
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6142 (iv).
Annual Drill, Compensation for Injuries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7580 (iv).
Apples, Inspection for Export, Quality, &c., Cor., on M. for copies (Mr. E. D. Smith) 1390 (i).
See 'Fruit Bill 101.'
'Arctic,' Str., Expenditure *re* Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3352, 3396 (ii).
Aud. Gen.'s Rep., Presented in Instalments (remarks) 6127 (iv).
Bell Telephone Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Bureau) in Com., 3967 (ii), 6005 (iii).
Birthday Honours, Conferring of, Responsibility, &c., Par. in 'Globe,' (read) 7459 (iv).
Blood Indian Reserve, Lease to McEwan Cattle Co., Cor. &c. (M. for Copies*) 2274 (i).
Brockville, Westport and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s Subsidy in Com. on Res., 6164 (iv).
Brothier, D., Release of from B. C. Penitentiary, Res. from Moral Reform Ass'n. (read) 5325 (iii).
Budget, The, 3875 (ii).
Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. 139 (Mr. Macdonald) in Com., 2668 (ii).
Canadian Minnesota Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. 91 (Mr. Dyment) in Com., 2499 (ii).
Cape Tourmente and Murray Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6148 (iv).
Cinq-Mars before Bar of Hse., on Amt. (Mr. Aylesworth) 5288; Res. of Censure (remarks) 5320 (iii).
Civil Service Appointments, Inquiry for Ret., 715 (i); 2160, 2699 (ii), 7358 (iv).
Coal purchased by Marine and Fisheries Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3614 (ii).
Conmee & Bowman, Charges *re* Dredging Contract, on Ques. of Order, 1306 (i).
Criminal Code (lotteries) Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7660 (iv).
Currency Act Amt. B. 169 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5557 (iii).
Davis Contract *re* Cornwall Canal Lighting (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5348 (iii).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 2022 (ii).
See 'Internal,' &c.
Duryea, Chester B., Patent Relief B. 79 (Mr. Belcourt) in Com., 2196 (ii).
Electric Power and Gas Exportation Regulation B. 145 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 3079 (ii).
Embargo on Canadian Cattle, Repeal of, Representations *re* (Ques.) 183 (i).
Fire Extinguishers for Lighthouses (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4960 (iii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Fiscal Year B. 162 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 5095 (iii).
Forest Reserves B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 3326, 3547 (ii), 5539 (iii).
Fraser River Lightships, Reps. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4914 (iii).
Fruit Marks Act (apples) Amt. B. 101 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2179, 2550 (ii).
Game Preservation Act (unorganized ters.) Amt. B. 154 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2826 (ii).
Georgian Bay Indian Reserves, Survey (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 724 (i).
German Tariffs in Relation to Canada, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 1887 (i).
Glanders, Number of Mallein Tests during 1905 (Ques.) 179 (i).
Gold and Silver Marks Act Amt. B. 211 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7567 (iv).
Grand River and Western Power Co.'s incorp. B. 216 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 7009 (iv).
Great Northern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6171 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry. Co.'s B. 58 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) on M. for 1°, 1147 (i).
——— B 215 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6858 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry., Branch Lines Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., 5684, 5951 (iii); on M. for 3°, 6610; on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) to M. for 3°, 6616 (iv).
G. T. Pacific Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 61 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 4539, 4749; on M. for 3°, (amt.) 4995, neg. (Y. 29; N. 60) 5001 (iii).
G.T.P. Ry. Co., Mining Rights in Lands, O.C., &c.,, on Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3715 (ii).
Gray, Franklin Montgomery, Patent Relief B. 122 (Mr. Campbell) in Com.,, 4948 (iii).
Hogs imported into Canada and slaughtered for Export, &c. (Ques.) 176 (i).
House of Commons Rules, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to consider Rep. in Com., 7461; in Com., 7466, 7601 (iv).
Hudson Bay Whale Fisheries B. 123 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6709 (iv).
Immigrants deported during last Five Years, Number settled, &c. (Ques.) 180 (i).
Immigrants returning, Dissatisfied, Par. in Toronto "News", (read) 3075 (ii).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 170 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5196, 5238, 5408, 5567 (iii); on Senate Amts., 7116 (iv).
Immigration, Amount spent in Promoting, &c. (Ques.) 177 (i).
Immigration to Canada, False Representations *re* Labour Market, on prop. Res. (Mr. R. Smith) 2966 (ii).
Immigration from Belgium (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1647 (i).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Imperial Institute, Explanation of Vote (remarks) on M. for 1° of Supply Bill, 663 (i).
Indemnity to Members and Privy Councillors B. 18 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 2987 (ii).
See "Senate and H. of C. Bill".
Indian (J. W. Lewis) Enfranchisement B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2832 (ii).
Insurance, Life, on M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) for Special Com., 3984 (ii).
Insurance Investigation, Delay in Proceedings &c. (remarks) 3802 (ii).
——— Expenditure and Remunerations, on M. for 1° of Supply Bill, 696 (i).
I.C.R., Moncton Land Purchase from Mr. Hewson, on Amt. (Mr. Ames) to Com. of Sup., 5852 (iii).
Internal Economy Com. and Salaries of House of Commons Officials (remarks) 7057 (iv).
See 'Debates', &c.
Iron and Steel Bounties on Canadian Ore, on prop. Res. (Mr. Conmee) 3772 (ii).
Japanese Deportations from B. C., Par. in Vancouver Paper (read) 3152 (ii).
Judges acting as Directors or otherwise in Business, (Ques.) 183 (i).
Judges of Provincial Courts (arbitrators, &c.) B. 13 (Mr. Lennox) in Com., 5366 (iii).
Judges of Provincial Courts Act (travelling) Amt. B. 83 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 1765 (i).
Keewatin Territory, Jurisdiction by N. W. Police Force (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4983 (iii).
Lake St. John Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6164 (iv).
Land Sales in Blocks in Man., N.W.T. and B.C., 1903-4-5 &c. (Ques.) 569 (i).
——— (M. for ret.*) 774 (i).
Lighting System *re* St. Lawrence Route, Inquiry for Ret., 6545 (iv).
Leprosy B. 115 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2185 (ii).
Lord's Day B. 12 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5643, 5698 (iii); (hiring rigs, &c.) 6641; (Jews) 6345; (industrial plants) 6629; Ques. of Order, *re* Amts. (Mr. Piché) 6560; Ques. of Order, Amt. (Mr. D. Ross) 7206; on Ques. of Order (Mr. D. Ross) *re* Discussion on 3°, 7196; on M. (Mr. Aylesworth) to strike out amt. (Mr. T. Martin) *re* ball games, 7277; on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* Amt. (Mr. Porter) 7297; on Senate Amts., 7686 (iv).
McRae, Hector, Original Purchaser of Land, B.C., Terms, &c. (Ques.) 6245 (iv).
Magnetawan Lighthouse Supplies, Charges *re*, on Inquiry for Rep., 6799 (iv).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 206 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 3°, 6128 (iv).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 6142 (iv).
Maple Syrup Adulteration, on prop. Res. (Mr. Boyer) 1409 (i).
Members of Parlt., Apptmnt. to Positions of Emolument, Names, &c. (Ques.) 214 (i).
——— Imperfect Answer to Question (remarks) 350 (i).
Mexican Tramways Co.'s B. 96 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 2666 (ii).
Militia Pensions Act Amt. B. 200 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com. on Res., 5188 (iii).
Money Lenders Act Amt. B. 11 (Mr. Fitzpartick) in Com., 356 (i), 6805 (iv).
Montreal Harbour (reorganization) Commissioners B. 124 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 2653 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners B. 222 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6707 (iv).
Nipigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6151 (iv).
North Atlantic Trading Co., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1647 (i).
——— Mr. Preston's refusal to answer Questions, on M. (Mr. Monk) 4494 (iii).
Orangemen and Conservative Party, Misrepresentation in Press (remarks) 4719 (iii).
Owen Sound and Meaford Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6161 (iv).
Patent Medicines, Legislation *re*, Sale of (Ques.) 183 (i).
Pilotage Act Amt. B. 219 (Mr. Brodeur) on M. for 1°, 6539 (iv).
Postmasters' Salaries, Policy of Govt. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 539 (i).
Preston: *See* 'North Atlantic.'
Printing of Parlt., Joint Com., 3rd Rep., 5081 (iii).
Private Bills, Irregularity of Procedure (remarks) 2325 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. Calvert) to place on Order Paper (remarks) 6317 (iv).
——— on M. (Mr. Macpherson) to extend time, 2821 (ii).
Privy Councillors Annuities Repeal B. 220 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7631 (iv).
Prorogation on 12th July (remarks) 7600 (iv).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake, Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Carvell) in Com., 2667, 2708 (ii).
Qu'Appelle, Lake Long and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Carvell) in Com., 2667 (ii).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners B. 174 (Mr. Brodeur) on prop. Res. (Mr. Brodeur) 3503; in Com. on Res., 3928 (ii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Ry. Act (express cos.) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 789 (i).
Ry. Act (General) Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 1°, 760; in Com., 1621 (i); 2591, 6089, 6184,6205, 7068 (iii); on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) to M. for 3°, 7108; on M. for 3° (amt.) 7115, Neg. (Y. 21; N. 86) 7115 (iv).
Railway Committees, M. (Mr. Campbell) to meet concurrently with sessions of Hse., 5363 (iii).
Ry. Subsidies Authorization B. 214 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 6137; in Com., 6833 (iv).
Returns, Delay in presenting (remarks) 13 (i).
——— Expenditure *re* (remarks) 2940 (ii).
Revillon Bros., Limited B. 76 (Mr. McCool) in Com., 3672 (ii); on Senate Amts., 6706 (iv).
Roads and Road Allowances B. 202 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5560 (iii).
Roberval and Quebec Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6156 (iv).
Rules: *See* 'House of Commons.'
St. Rose and Orangedale Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6164 (iv).
San Francisco Disaster, Govt. Aid applied to Canadians (remarks) 2893 (ii).
Senate and House of Commons Act Amt. B. 97 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7123 (iv).
——— Ques. of Order, *re* Discussion, 1780 (i).
Senate and House of Commons Employees, Number and Names (Ques.) 1672 (i).
——— (M.) for Ret., 1869 (i).
Senate Employees, Mess. *re* Number of Employees (M.*) 2273 (ii).
Sharbot Lake and Bathurst Ry. Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6144 (iv).
Ships of Safety B. 48 (Mr. Sinclair) in Com., 6863 (iv).
Standard Trusts Co.'s B. 147 (Mr. Bole) on M. for 2°, 2720 (ii); in Com., 4944 (iii).

SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice—Yukon (living allowance) 7518 (iv).
Adulteration of Food (penalties) 2617 (ii).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 2670 (ii), 7378; (census, statistics) 7379 (iv); (Patent Record) 2681 (ii), 7379 (iv); (Year Book) 2682 (ii), 7384 (iv).
Canals—Cornwall (Davis contract) 5344 (iii).
Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen.'s Office (salaries) 7574; Customs (contingencies) 7514; Finance (salaries) 7454 (iv); Marine and Fisheries (Private Sec's allowance) 4896 (iii); Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 7558 (iv); Militia (salaries) 360 (i); Public Works (promotions) 7022 (iv).
Customs (outside ports) 500 (i); Miscellaneous (refund to I. G. Baker & Co.) 7517 (iv).
Dom. Lands (surveys) 5881 (iii).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Electric Light Inspection (salaries) 2608 (ii).

Excise (methylated spirits) 1561; (salaries) 1556; (tobacco stamps) 1560 (i).

Finance Dept.—Miscellaneous (tariff commission) 7457 (iv).

Fisheries (bounty distribution) 3706; (Canadian exhibition) 3706; (dog-fish reduction) 3709 (ii); (fish-breeding stations) 7564 (iv); (fish-curing) 3707; (Georgian Bay Laboratory) 3707; (hatcheries) 3700; (inspectors) 3707; (overseers) 3692; (protection service) 3704, 3709 (ii).

Govt. of N.W.T. (schools, &c.) 5880 (iii).

House of Commons (debates) 7573; (sessional clerks) 7572 (iv).

Immigration (agents, G.B., &c.) 1342, 1635, 1647 (i), 5862 ; (printing &c. in G. B.) 5865 (iii).

Indians—B.C. (medical attendance) 1081 (i), Ont. and Que. (Oka reserve) 728 (i), (Robinson annuities) 722; (schools) 717; (surveys) 724 (i).

Insurance (Royal Commission) 7581 (iv).

Interior, (maps, &c.) 5946 ; Miscellaneous (boundary surveys) 5876 (iii).

Labour Dept. (Gazette) 7445 (iv).

Interior—Miscellaneous (caves in B. C.) 5859 (iii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (agencies) 3605 (ii); (aids to navigation) 7584 (iv); (compensation *re* gas explosions) 4870 ; (gas buoys) 4951, 4962 (iii) ; (lighthouses) 3617 (ii) ; (Marconi stations, Cape Race) 7561 (iv).

Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions (Canada and Mexico) 7554 ; (Newcastle and Miramichi) 7556 ; (Pelee Islands) 7557 ; (St. Catherines and Tadousac) 7554 (iv).

Metric System (lectures) 2615 (ii).

Militia (annual drill) 7179 ; (rifles, &c.) 7169 (iv).

Miscellaneous (Arctic Polar expedition) 7580; (legal advice, Aud. Gen.) 7577 ; (Pacific cable) 7577 ; (scientific literature) 7576 (iv).

N. W. Mounted Police (Yukon) 4972 (iii).

Ocean and River Service (govt. steamers) 3352, 3803 (ii), 4787, 4816 (iii) ; (ice breakers) 7559 (iv) ; (naval schools) 3399 (ii).

Penitentiaries—Kingston (binder twine) 7533

Pensions (militia) 7575 (iv).

Post Office (mail service) 535, 539 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (rents, &c.) 6759 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg postal station) 6752 ; (Winnipeg post office) 6749 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Belleville) 6733 ; (Guelph armoury) 6734 ; (Hamilton drill hall) 6735; (Owen Sound) 6738, 7013; (Simcoe) 6741; (Toronto customs) 6741 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 6710; (new buildings) 6725; (Parlt. Buildings, extension) 6712; (Royal Mint) 6711; (Victoria museum) 6713; (western deptl. block) 6714 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Chicoutimi) 6728 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. and Alberta (Calgary public building) 6752; (Edmonton) 6753; (Moosejaw) 6753; (Prince Albert) 6754 (iv).

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (St. Anne's Rapids) 7036 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Amherst Point) 6773; (Canning wharf) 6787; (Georgeville wharf) 6782; (Inverness mines) 6788 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Blanche river) 6985; (Bronte) 6986; (Collingwood) 6986; (Goderich) 6989; (Owen Sound) 6990; (Port Arthur, &c.) 6772; (Port Burwell) 6990 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (D'Israeli wharf) 6951, 6972 (iv); ('Galveston' dredge) 2922 (ii); (Pointe aux Trembles) 6975 (iv); St. Lawrence Ship channel (dredging) 2894, 2924; (lighting) 2899 (ii).

Public Works—Miscellaneous (clerical assistance) 6767; (engineering staff) 6767 (iv).

Public Works—Telegraph Lines—N. W. T. (Athabaska-Edmonton) 7012; Que. (Grosse Isle) 7011; (Marconi system) 6771; Yukon (Ashcroft-Dawson) 6771 (iv).

Public Works — Transportation Facilities (Georgian Bay) 6772; (Port Colborne) 6772 (iv).

Quarantine (animals, health) 2689 (ii).

Railways—G.T.P. (surveys, &c.,) 5115, 5139 (iii).

Scientific Institutions (hydrographic surveys) 3685; (meteorological service) 3685 (ii).

Steamboat Inspection (fog alarms) 3691 (inspectors) 3688 (ii).

Trade and Commerce (commercial agencies) 7557 (iv).

Yukon Ter. (Govtl. expenses) 5915 (iii).

Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act (Jurisdiction) Amt. B. 67 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 1261 (i), 3522 (ii).

Supreme Court of Judicature, N.B., B. 224 (Mr. Aylesworth) on M. for 1°, 6792 (iv).

Thames River Flooding, Relief of, Cor., Plans, &c., on M. for Copies (Mr. Clements) 778 (i).

Toledo Glass Co.'s Patent Relief B. 110 (Mr. Stewart) in Com., 3722 (ii).

Toronto, Niagara and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 134 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 4389 (iii).

Tower of West Block, Collapse, Inspection by Dept. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1279 (i).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6716 (iv).

Usury: *See* 'Money Lenders.'

Vancouver, Fraser Valley and Southern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 87 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 2709, 3187 (ii).

Vancouver and Lulu Island Ry. Co.'s B. 29 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 1141 (i).

West Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. 26 (Mr. Pardee) in Com., 1141 (i).

Windsor, Essex and Lake Shore Rapid Ry. Co.'s B. 150 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 5224 (iii).

Winter Communication in P.E.I., Str. "Montcalm" in Northumberland Straits (remarks) 1257 (i).

Yukon Gold Royalty, Amount collected from 1897 to 1905 (Ques.) 5004 (iii)

Sproule, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Yukon Govt., Charges against Judiciary &c. Letter of Graham Campbell to Gov. Gen. (read) 5915 (iii).

Staples, Mr. W. D., *Macdonald.*
Animals slaughtered, Compensation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2687 (ii).
Carman Post Office, Erection of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6750 (iv).
Galops Canals, at Cardinal, Original Estimate for Total Construction, Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 989 (i).
Glanders in Man., slaughtering horses, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7442 (iv).
——— Number of Horses tested with Mallein in Man. and N. W. Ters., (Ques.) 336 (i).
——— (M. for ret. *) 428 (i).
Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. 207 (Mr. Fisher) on M. for 2°, 5893; in Com., 5902 (iii).
Indian Garden Reserve, Investigation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1249 (i).
Manitoba Grain Act Amt. B. 206 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 5905 (iii).
Moberley, J. H., Appmt. as Guide *re* Census Enumerator (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7435 (iv).
Penitentiaries, Contract *re* Flour supplied (Ques.) 341 (i).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., (amt.) 7093 (iv).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (experimental farms) 7388; (farm reports, printing, &c) 7411; (grain inspection) 7428; (live stock) 7432; (quinquennial census) 7435 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings, B.C. (Ladysmith) 6757; (Osoyoos) 7858; Man. (Winnipeg post office) 6748 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Man. (Arnes, Lake Winnipeg) 6994; (Fairford river) 6994 (iv).
Quarantine (animals health) 2687 (ii), 7442 (iv).
Swamp Lands, Man., Cor. with Govt., O.Cs., &c. (M. for copies*) 345 (i).
——— (Ques.) 446 (i).
Swan Lake Indian Reserve, Settlement *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1246 (i).

Stewart, Mr. R., *Ottawa.*
Baker, Harriet Wesley, Relief (B. 179) 1°*, 4450 (iii).
Bills from the Senate (M.) to place on Order Paper, 4990 (iii).
Holmes, Charles Wm., Relief (B. 181) 1°*, 4451 (iii).
Irvine, Minnie Florence, Relief (B. 182) 1°*, 4451 (iii).
Ottawa Post Office Employees, Wages paid, Names, &c. (Ques.) 6245 (iv).
Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s (B. 173) in Com., 6056 (iii); 3° m., 6323, 6678 (iv).

Stewart, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Printing Bureau Employees, Names of Employees receiving less than $12 per week (Ques.) 7060 (iv).
Toledo Glass Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 110) 1°*, 1575 (i); in Com., 3674, 3715; Order for Com., 3952 (ii).
Tower of West Block, Collapse, Inspection by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 1291 (i).
Vaughan, Wm. Napoleon, Relief (B. 180) 1°*, 4451; in Com., 6035 (iii).
Veterans of Fenian Raids, Claims for Compensation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 645 (i).

Stockton, Mr. A. A., *St. John City and County.*
Atlantic Mail Service, Contracts, Names, &c. (Ques.) 189, 214 (i).
'Arctic' Expedition, Expenditure *re*, on M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) to conc. in Rep. of Special Com., 6372 (iv).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3208, 3355 (ii).
Belmont Disaster, Claims for Damages (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7508 (iv).
Brooks & Co., Govt. Guarantee *re* Banking Arrangements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4845 (iii).
Canada Evidence Act Amt. B. 68 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 1756 (i).
Canadian Minnesota Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. 91 (Mr. Dyment) in Com., 2504 (ii).
Cement purchased for Lighthouse Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4930 (iii).
Criminal Code (art unions) Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 7663 (iv).
Criminal Code (witnesses) B. 155 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 3101 (ii).
Election Committee, Reps. *re* Amendments to Election Laws (remarks) 4802 (iii).
Electric Power and Gas Exportation Regulations B. 145 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 3086 (ii).
Exchequer Court Act (liability) Amt. B. 156 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 3526 (ii).
Grain Elevator, St. John, N.B., Cost, Capacity, &c. (Ques.) 2272 (ii).
Grand River and Western Power Co.'s incorp. B. 216 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 7262 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry. Act Amt. B. 215 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6857 (iv).
G.T.P. Ry., Branch Lines incorp. B. 75 (Mr. Crawford) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Carvell) 6030 (iii).
G.T.P. Ry., Surveys between Quebec and Moncton, on M. (Mr. Crocket) for Ret., 1717 (i).
House of Commons Rules, in Com. on Special Rep., 7464, 7606 (iv).

Stockton, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*
Indian (J. W. Lewis) Enfranchisement B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2832 (ii).
Internal Economy Committee and Salaries of House of Commons Officials (remarks) 7056 (iv).
Judges of Provincial Courts Act (arbitrators, &c.) Amt. B. 13 (Mr. Lennox) on M. for 2°, 870 (i); in Com., 5374 (iii).
Lord's Day B. 12, in Com., on Amt. (Mr. D. Ross) *re* industrial processes, 7215; provincial legislatures, 6576 (iv).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 469 (i).
Medicines, Fraudulent and Deleterious, Sale of, (M.) for Com. to investigate, 2951; (M.) 3065 (ii).
Ministers and Deputy Ministers practising in Courts, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 2798 (ii).
Money Lenders Act Amt. B. 11 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 352 (i), 6816 (iv)
Montreal Harbour Commissioners B 124 (Mr. Brodeur) on M. for 1°, 1669 (i) ; in Com., 2209 (ii).
North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract, Charges *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Sup., 2429 (ii).
——— on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) ref. to Rep. of Com., 2108 (ii).
Pilotage Act Amt., B. 219 (Mr. Brodeur) on M. for 1°, 6538 (iv).
Postmasters Salaries, Policy *re* (remarks) in Com of Sup., 7446 (iv).
Preferential Trade in G.B. (remarks) in Deb. on Address, 83 (i).
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. Co.'s B. 86 (Mr. Carvell) in Com., 2706 (ii).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners B. 174 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 3931 (ii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 2583 (ii), 7067; on Senate Amts., 7641 (iv).
Ry Act (liability) Amt. B. 17 (Mr. Lennox) on M. for 2°, 887 (i).
Railway Subsidies Authorization B. 214 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 6830 (iv).
Representation of Provinces, Amt. to B.N.A. Act, on M. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 1123 (i).
Roberts and Stevens, Marine Engineers, Investigation *re* Certificate (remarks) on conc, 7595 (iv).
Standard Trust Co.'s B. 147 (Mr. Bole) in Com. 4943 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Administration of Justice—Yukon (living allowances) 7521 (iv).
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 2675 (ii) ; 7373 ; (experimental farms) 7386 ; (Patent Record) 7379 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Post Office (postmasters) 7446 (iv).
Stockton, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Customs—Miscellaneous (refund to I. G. Baker & Co.) 7518 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. Strs.) 3208 ; 3355 (ii), 4845 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, N.B. (Cape Tormentine) 6940 ; (Chance Harbour) 6940 ; (Dipper breakwater) 6941 (iv). (Quaco extension) 6941 ; (St. John harbour) 6942 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and River—Que. (D'Israeli wharf) 6943 (iv).
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt. B. 67 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 3521 (ii).
Supreme Court of Judicature N.B., B. 224 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7144 ; on M. for 3°, 7189 (iv).
Toronto, Niagara and Western Ry. Co.'s B. 134 (Mr. Guthrie) in Com., 4392 (iii).
Tyner's Head Fog Alarm, N.B., Cost of, Employees, &c. (Ques.) 2269 (ii).
Vancouver, Fraser Valley and Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 87 (Mr. Macpherson) in Com., 3187 (ii).
Yukon Concessions, Bronson & Ray's Claims, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Sup., 1532 (i).
Talbot, Mr. O. E., *Bellechasse.*
Militia Camps, Service Rolls *re* (remarks) 1004 (i).
Taylor, Mr. Geo., *Leeds.*
'Acadia' SS. Subsidy, Govt. Aid, &c. (Ques.) 3250 (ii).
Acetylene Gas Buoys between Lachine and Kingston, Number, Cost of Maintenance, &c. (Ques.) 982 (i).
See 'St. Lawrence', 'Windmill'.
Alien Labour Act, Appeal from Judgment of Mr. Justice Anglin (Ques.) 343 (i).
'Arctic' Str. Expedition, Com. of Investigation *re* Expenditure, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3658 (ii).
——— on Amt, (Mr. R. L. Borden) Pairs on Division (remarks) 3799 (ii).
'Arctic' Str., Expenditure *re* Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3379 (ii), 4100 (iii).
——— Letter from Robt. Scott (read) 4101 (ii).
——— Letter from Goldie & McCullough (read) 4106 (iii).
Bell Telephone Co.'s B. 81 (Mr. Bureau) in Com., 4196 (iii).
Blood Indian Reserve, Inquiry for Ret., 3796 (ii).
Brockville Cheese Curing Room, Total Expenditure and Revenue (Ques.) 585 (i).
——— Discrepancy in Answer (remarks) 1572 (i).
——— Further Reference to Answer of Question, 1005 (i).
See Cheese.

Taylor, Mr. Geo.—*Con.*
Brockville, Westport and Sault Ste. Marie Ry. Co.'s Subsidy, in Com. on Res., 6163 (iv).
Bronte Lighthouse, Construction of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4790 (iii).
Canadian Press Association, Annual Payments to, &c. (Ques.) 1369 (i).
Cement purchased for Lighthouse Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4927 (iii).
Central Experimental Farm, Total Expenditure from 1890 to 1905 (Ques.) 761 (i).
——— Total Expenditure for 1904-5 (Ques.) 2264 (ii).
Chaudière Falls Water Power, Leases, &c. (M. for ret.*) 3997 (ii).
Cheese Curing Rooms, Total Expenditure and Revenue (Ques.) 586 (i).
——— Statement *re* Answer to Questions, 2321
See 'Brockville.'
Cinq-Mars, Criticism in Newspapers, on M. (Mr. Foster) to summon before Bar of Hse., 4729 (iii).
Coal, Bituminous, Bonding in Can., Refund of Duties, &c. (Ques.) 1860 (i).
Daly & Hanman's Dredges, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 572, 761 (i).
Debates, Official, 2nd Rep. of Com., on M. to conc., 2026 (ii).
Dickenson's Landing Lighthouse, Cost for Installation, Maintenance, &c. (Ques.) 981 (i).
D'Israeli Wharf, Expenditure *re*, 3474 (ii).
Fruit Marks Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 2565 (ii).
Gorgian Bay Ship Canal, Instructions issued to Engineers, Names of Employees, &c. (M. for copies*) 2951 (ii).
German Tariffs in Relation to Canada, on M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Copies, 1935 (i).
Goldie & McCulloch, Purchase of Steel Boiler, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3379 (ii).
Imperial Institute, Explanation of Vote (remarks) on M. for 1° of Supply Bill, 679 (i).
Indemnity to Members, Ques. of Privilege, *re* Par. in Toronto 'World,' 2621 (ii).
See 'Members', &c.
Jack Straw and Red Horse Lights, Cost *re* Change to Acetylene Gas (Ques.) 584 (i).
Lands purchased by Companies, from Govt., &c., on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3277 (ii).
Letter Carriers Uniforms, Purchase of, Names of Firms, &c. (Ques.) 1747 (i).
Lord's Day B. 12 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5789 (iii); (provincial legislatures) 6587; on Amt. (Mr. T. Martin) *re* games, 7236; on M. (Mr. Aylesworth) to strike out amt. (Mr. T. Martin) *re* ball games, 7287 (iv).
McDonald Iron Co. &c., Yukon Ter., Payments to by Govt. (Ques.) 7059 (iv).

Taylor, Mr. Geo.—*Con.*
Machinery *re* Marine Dept., bought through Brooks & Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4099 (iii).
Martello Towers, Repairing, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7172 (iv).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Lancaster) in Com., 476 (i).
Members and Privy Councillors Indemnity, Repeal B. 18 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 2532 (ii).
See 'Indemnity', &c.
Money Lenders Act Amt. B. 11 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 6813 (iv).
'Montcalm,' Govt. Str., Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4832 (iii).
Naturalization Laws, of U. S. Citizens, Rep. *re* &c. (Ques.) 417 (i).
Orangemen and Conservative Party, Misrepresentations in Press (remarks) 4729 (iii).
Ottawa Buildings, Lease to Govt., Rentals, Leases, Value, &c. (Ques.) 187 (i).
Pairs on Division: *See* 'Arctic Debate &c.'
Penitentiary Supply of Flour, List of Names (M. for copy*) 774 (i).
——— (Ques.) 450 (i).
Pensions to Members of Parlt. (remarks) 4570 (iii).
Personal Explanation *re* hon. mem. for Carleton, N.B., and Orangemen, 4801 (ii).
Postal Rates on U.S. Publications, 'Ladies Home Journal' &c. (remarks) 5620 (iii).
——— Letter of Mrs. Webster (read) 5530 (iii).
Poultry Stations, Total Expenditure and Revenue (Ques.) 587 (i).
Privy Councillors Annuities Repeal B. 220 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7633 (iv).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) on Amt. (Mr. Maclean) to M. for 3°, 7108 (iv).
Ry. Subsidies Authorization B. 214 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 6163 (iv).
Renfrew, N., Vacancy in Electoral District (notice) 6125 (iv).
Returns to Parlt., Expenditure *re* (remarks) 2938 (ii).
——— Statement read by Mr. Oliver (remarks) *re*, 2818 (ii).
Rideau Canal Water Power, Applications *re* Leases, Names, &c. (Ques.) 3742 (ii).
St. Lawrence Lighthouses, Buoys between Lachine and Bay of Quinte, Cost of Maintenance, &c. (Ques.) 1150 (i).
——— (remarks) *re* Question, 1571 (i).
Sauvalle, Marc, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 3245 (ii).
Speaker's Apartments, Inquiry for Ret., 4035., 5185 (iii).
SUPPLY:
Canals—Rideau (swing bridges) 5174 (iii).

Taylor, Mr. Geo.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries) 365, 404; Post Office (salaries) 401; Public Works (salaries) 397 (i).

Customs (outside ports) 501; (statistics) 514 (i).

Dom. Lands (mines branch) 5942 (iii).

Electric Light Inspection (salaries) 2608 (ii).

Indians—B. C. (medical attendance) 1084 (i).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (compensation *re* gas explosions) 4868; (gas buoys) 4878; (gasolene supply) 4146 (iii).

Militia (tents, &c) 7170 (iv).

Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 3379 (ii), 4098, 4832, 4862 (iii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (D'Israeli wharf) 6961 (iv).

U. S. Citizens and Naturalization *re* N. W. Settlers (Ques.) 343 (i).

Ventilation of House of Commons (remarks) 5616 (iii).

Whitefish Reserve Timber Sale, Number of Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 3405 (ii).

Williams Head Quarantine Station, B.C., Permanent and Temporary Employees, &c. (Ques.) 5506 (iii).

Windmill Lighthouse, Installation of Acetylene Gas, Cost &c. (Ques.) 981 (i).

Windsor, Essex and Lake Shore Rapid Ry. Co.'s B. 150 (Mr. Clarke) in Com., 5226 (iii).

Woods, James W., Total Amount paid for Supplies from 1897-1905 (Ques.) 1858 (i).

Telford, Mr. W. P., *North Grey.*

Conmee & Bowman, Charges *re* Dredging Contracts, on Ques. of Order, 1310 (i).

Griffith Island, Sale of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 938 (i).

Lord's Day B. 12, in Com. (pleasure grounds) 6069 (iv).

SUPPLY :

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Owen Sound) 6737; Ottawa (western block) 6717 (iv).

Tower, Investigation *re* Collapse (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6717 (iv).

Veterans of Fenian Raids, Claims for Compensation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 644 (i).

Templeman, Hon. W. (Minister of Inland Revenue), *Victoria, B.C.*

B. C. Shipping Interests, Govt. Aid to, on M. for Sup., 1503 (i).

Fruit Conference at Ottawa, Printing of Rep. (Ans.) 5503 (iii).

Insurance Cos., Bonds accepted by Inland Rev. Dept., Answer to Question, 2067 (ii).

——— (remarks) 1469 (i).

Maple Syrup Adulteration, on prop. Res. (Mr. Boyer) 1407 (i).

Medicines, Fraudulent and Deleterious, Sale of, on M. (Mr. Stockton) for Com., 2952 (ii).

Methyl. Alcohol, Import and Excise Duty, Quantity imported, &c. (Ans.) 5507 (iii).

Templeman, Hon. W.—*Con.*

Montmagny Cigar Factory, Suspension of Excise Inspector Michon (Ans.) 2269 (ii).

SUPPLY :

Adulteration of Food (penalties) 2617 (ii).

Civil Govt.—Inland Revenue (salaries) 7513 (iv).

Electric Light Inspection (salaries) 2608 (ii).

Excise (duty collections) 7513 (iv); (salaries) 1548 (i).

Fisheries (overseers) 3693 (ii).

Gas and Electric Light (inspections) 2608 (ii); (salaries) 7513 (iv).

Metric System (lectures) 2611 (ii).

Weights and Measures (inspection) 2601; (metric system) 2607 (ii).

Vancouver Island Experimental Farm, Statement by Min. of Inland Rev. (Ans.) 576 (i).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 14 (Mr. Campbell) on M. for 2°, 877 (i).

Williams, J. J., Dismissal from Port Hawkesbury Post Office (Ans.) 2926 (ii).

Williams Head, Quarantine Station, B. C., Permanent and Temporary Employees (Ans.) 5506 (iii).

Thompson, Mr. A., *Yukon Territory.*

Placer Mining Yukon B. 153 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 3415 (ii), 4803 (iii).

SUPPLY :

N. W. Mounted Police (Yukon) 4969 (iii).

Twelve Mile Power Co.'s incorp. (B. 183) 1°*, 4451 (iii); on Senate Amts., 7271 (iv).

Yukon-Alaska Boundary Line (remarks) 5185 (iii).

Yukon Citizens' Meeting, Res. *re* Hydraulic Concessions, Cancellation (remarks) 6548 (iv).

Yukon Concessions, Bronson & Ray's Claims, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Sup., 1528 (i).

Yukon Council, Govt. Policy *re* Election by the People (remarks) 2889 (ii).

Yukon, Representative Institutions, &c., on M. for Sup., 5103 (iii).

Tisdale, Hon. D., *Norfolk.*

Cinq-Mars before Bar of Hse., on M. (Mr. Jackson) to translate article, 4796 (iii).

Electric Power and Gas Exportation Regulation B. 145 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 3079 (ii).

G.T.P. Telegraph Co.'s incorp. B. 61 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 4751 (iii).

Loan Companies B. 40 (Mr. Zimmerman) 1° m., 444 (i).

Lord's Day B. 12 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5624, 5655, 5761 (iii).

Mackintosh, Eileen Mary, Relief B. 185, on M. (Mr. Northrup) to ref. back to Com., 5441 (iii).

Militia Pension Act Amt. B. 200 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 5535 (iii).

Tisdale, Hon. D.—*Con.*
Militia Act Amt. B. 201 (Sir Frederick Borden) in Com., 5537 (iii).
Ry. Subsidies Authorization B. 214 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 6137 (iv).
St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.'s (B. 46) 1°*, 558 (i).

Tobin, Mr. E. W., *Richmond and Wolfe.*
D'Israeli Wharf Expenditure *re*, &c., 3448 (ii).
Public Works Expenditure, Condemnation of, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 3448 (ii).
Sherbrooke Military Camps, Purchase or Lease of Lands, &c. (Ques.) 328 (i).
SUPPLY :
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. (D'Israeli wharf) 6947 (iv).

Turriff, Mr. J. G., *East Assiniboia.*
Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.'s (B. 100) 1°* 1364 (i); in Com., 3187 (ii).
Cannington Postmaster, Dismissal of Mr. Talbot, Charges *re*, on M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Cor., 2485 (ii).
Crooked Lake Indian Reserve, Surrender, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 949 (i).
Crown Lands, Administration of by Dept. of Interior, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 4354 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Ames) to Com. of Sup., 3123 (ii).
Forest Reserves B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2841, 3325, 3562 (ii), 5542 (iii).
G.T.P. Ry., Branch Lines incorp. B. 75 (Mr. Crawford) on M. for 3°, 6613 (iv).
Heffernan, Inspector of N. W. M. Police and Political Interference (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4980 (iii).
House of Commons Rules, in Com. of Rep., 7617 (iv).
Privy Councillor, Annuities Repeal B. 220 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 7619 (iv).
Ry. Land Grants, Selection by Ry. Cos., Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) to Com. of Sup., 904 (i).
SUPPLY :
Indians—Man. and N.W.T. (surveys) 949 (i).
Wagner, Philip, Charges *re* Interference in Elections, on Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 5610 (iii).
Western Loan and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 35 (Mr. Adamson) in Com., 3237 (ii).

Verville, Mr. A., *Maisonneuve.*
Coal Strike at Lethbridge, Stmnt. by Lt. Col. Fred. White (Ques.) 573 (i).
Immigration Agents in Winnipeg, Supplying Miners, &c. (Ques.) 995 (i).

Verville, Mr. A.—*Con.*
Immigration to Canada, False Representations *re* Labour Market, on prop. Res. (Mr. R. Smith) 2960 (ii).
Italian Labourers, imported into Montreal, 1904, Rep. from Dep. Min. of Labour (M. for copy*) 1871 (i).
Members and Privy Councillors Indemnity B. 18 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 2523 (ii).
Preston, Mr. W.T.R., Removal from Office of Immigration Agent, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6913 (iv).
Printers' Complaint *re* Winnipeg Printer's Board of Trade, Cor. with Imp. Govt. (Ques.) 572 (i).
——— (M. for copies*) 998 (i).
Lord's Day B. 12 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com., 5791 (iii), 6365 ; (foreign newspapers) 6279 ; on Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) to M. for 3°, 7347 (iv).
Winnipeg Printers, Complaints of Rep. of Dep. Min. of Labour (M. for copy*) 1380 (i).
——— (Ques.) 1378 (i).

Walsh, Mr. R. N., *Huntingdon.*
Address on The, 106 (i).
Civil Servants and Outside Employment, Dismissals *re* (Ques.) 327, 455 (i).
Doncaster Indians, Rights *re* Timber cut and Confiscated by Charlemagne & Lecouvrier Co. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1248 (i).
Indian Reserves, Ownership of Timber &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1248 (i).
Maple Syrup Adulteration, on prop. Res. (Mr. Boyer) 1419 (i).
Members Indemnity, Ref. to in deb. on Address, 106 (i).
Murray Canal, Construction of Wooden Piers, &c. (Ques.) 6930 (iv).
St. Anicet and St. Barbe Waterway, Rep. of estimated cost, (Ques.) 7371 (iv).
——— Revenue, &c. (Ques.) 1566 (i).
SUPPLY :
Indians—General (agencies) 1248 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (gas buoys) 4873 (iii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Que. Châteauguay wharf) 6943 ; (St. Louis River) 6977 (iv).
Veterans of Fenian Raids, Claims for Compensation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 630 (i).

Ward, Mr. H. A., *Durham.*
Cochrane, Fred., Taken Prisoner by Russia (remarks) 841 (i).
Militia Camps, Service Rolls *re* (remarks) 1002 (i).
——— Modification of Order (remarks) 2624 (ii).
Militia Service Orders &c. (remarks) 3318 (ii).

Ward, Mr. H. A.—*Con.*
Trent Canal, Surveys from Rice Lake, Damages *re* Break in Lock (Ques.) 449 (i).

Watson, Mr. R. J., *Parry Sound.*
Magnetawan Lighthouse, Contract *re* Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4123 (iii).
Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s (B. 121) 1°*, 1667 (i).
Private Bills, on M. (Mr. Macpherson) to tend Time, 2822 (ii).
SUPPLY :
Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouses) 4123 (iii).
Transportation Commission's Rep., &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Bennett) 3288 (ii).

Wilmot, Mr. R. D., *Sunbury and Queen's, N.B.*
Hetherington, Mr. Thos. P., Emplymt. as Immigration Agent (Ques.) 5502 (iii).
Official Cars for Govt., Number, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 984 (i).
Washedemoak River, N. B., Deepening of (Ques.) 584 (i).

Wilson, Mr. N. F., *Russell.*
Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s (B. 173) 1°*, 3952 (ii).
St. Mary's River Bridge Co.'s (B. 172) 1°*, 3952 (ii).

Wilson, Mr. U., *Lennox and Addington.*
Address, on The, 119 (i).
'Arctic,' Str., Expenditure *re* Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3211 (ii).
——— Sale, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3351 (ii).
Galliher, L. O., Dismissal from Wilton Post office, Apptmnts. &c. (Ques.) 835 (i).
G. T. P. Tel. Co.'s incorp. B. 61 (Mr L. G. McCarthy) in Com., 4563 (iii).
Griffiths, Mr., and Mr. Preston and High Commissioner, Inquiry for Ret., 1854 (i).
Halifax Trachoma Hospital, Establishment, Construction, &c., O. Cs. Reps., Cor. &c. (M. for ret.) 1870 (i).
——— Taken Over by Govt., Value, &c. (Ques.) 1746 (i).
Homesteaders *re* Entry in Provs. of Man., Sask. and Alberta, Nationality, &c. (M. for ret.*) 207 (i).
House of Commons Rules, in Com. on Special Rep., 7473 (iv).
Hudson Bay Whale Fisheries B. 123 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6708 (iv).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 170 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5203; on Amts., 5407 (iii).
Immigration Agents in G. B., Charges by Mr. Preston *re* Travelling Expenses (Ques.) 1864 (i).

Wilson, Mr. U.—*Con.*
Immigration, Cor. between High Commissioner and W. T. R. Preston, &c. (M. for copies*) 206 (i).
——— Cor. between Mr. Preston and Mr. Griffiths, &c. (M. for copies*) 206 (i).
Immigration, Contract with North Atlantic Trading Co., *re* Bonus, Names of Directors, &c. (M. for ret.*) 206 (i).
See 'North Atlantic'.
Indemnity to Members, ref. to in deb. on Address, 119 (i).
See 'Privy Councillors'.
Indians, Victoria County, N.S., Number, Medical Attendance, Payments *re* &c. (Ques.) 2455
Lord's Day B. 12, in Com., on Amt. (Mr. D. Ross) *re* industrial processes, 7215 (iv).
Members and Privy Councillors Indemnity Repeal B. 18 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for 2°, 2526 (ii).
Mexican Tramways Co.'s B. 96 (Mr. Calvert) in Com., 2666 (ii).
Moberley, J. H., Apptmnt. as Guide *re* Census taking (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7436 (iv).
Napanee Postmaster, Dr. Lynch, Outside Business (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 547 (i).
North Atlantic Trading Co., on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* ref. to Committee's Rep., 2106 (ii).
——— Contract, Cancellation of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5970 (iii).
Preston, W. T. R., Immigration Agent, Visit to Canada *re* High Commissione's Office (Ques.) 172 (i).
——— Rental of House in London (Ques.) 3906 (ii).
Privy Councillors Annuities Repeal (B. 142) 1°*, 1743 (i).
——— B. 220 (Mr. Aylesworth) in Com. 7635 (iv).
See 'Members'.
Privy Councillors Pensions Bill (remarks) on M. to take in Mondays, 4568 (iii).
Quebec Harbour Commissioners B. 174 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 3927 (ii).
Ry. Subsidies, Amounts earned, &c. (remarks) 7062 (iv).
Ry. Subsidies, Authorization B. 214 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com. on Res., 6136; in Com., 6830 (iv).
Salvation Army Immigrants, Number, Location, &c. (Ques.) 185 (i).
Senate and House of Commons (indemnity) Amt. (B. 143) 1°*, 1743 (i).
Sorel Wharf, Investigation *re* Accident (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6983 (iv).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 2670 (ii); 7378; (experimental farms) 7387 (iv); (Patent Record) 2676 (ii), 7379 (iv); (Year Book) 2682 (ii), 7382 (iv).

Wilson, Mr. U.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Charges of Management (Receiver General) 7452 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Finance (salaries) 7455 (iv); Interior (salaries) 5976 (iii).
Dom. Lands (maps, &c.) 5977 (iii).
Immigration (agencies, &c) 5520; (employees &c., salaries) 5969; (printing, &c.) 5512, 5863; (literature, &c.) 5875; (uniforms) 5873 (iii).
Interior (registry offices, N.W.T.) 5978 (iii).
Marine (Lake St. Peter piers) 7561 (iv).
Post Office (contingencies) 553 ; (postmasters' salaries) 547 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (astronomical observatory) 6711; (western deptl. block) 6714; Marine (dredge) 7560 (iv).
Scientific Institutions (meteorological service) 3684 (ii).
Weights and Measures (inspections) 2602 (ii).
Western Loan and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. 35 (Mr. Adamson) in Com. 3237 (ii).

Worthington, Mr. A. N., *Sherbrooke.*
Boulanger, Lt. Col., O.Cs. Reps. &c. *re* Dismissal (M. for copies *) 345 (i).
Doull, Capt., Apptmnt. to Royal Canadian Regiment (Ques.) 4799 (iii).
Empire Trust Co.'s (B. 135) in Com., 4945, 5221, 5446 (iii).
Magog Post Office, Purchase of Site, &c. (Ques.) 341 (i).
Petewawa Military Ground, Purchase of, O.C. Surveys, Cors, &c. (M. for copies *) 344 (i).
Powell, Capt., Apptmnt. to Permanent Force (Ques.) 4798 (iii).
Ross Rifle, Commission *re* Examination, &c. (Ques.) 3408 (ii).
——— Contracts with Govt. &c. (M. for copies*) 1380 (i).
——— Incorporation, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 1372 (i).
——— Inspectorship, Appnmt. of Imp. Officer (Ques.) 423 (i).
——— Number manufactured, distributed, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 3246 (ii).
S. A. War, Contingent, Cost of Outfitting, &c. (Ques.) 1564 (i).
Sutherland Combination Sight, and Ross Rifles, Purchase of &c. (Ques.) 4703 (iii).
Three Rivers, St. Hyacinthe and Sherbrooke Drill Sheds, Cost of Construction (Ques.) 3251 (ii).
Veterans of Fenian Raids, Claims for Compensation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 628 (i).

Wright, Mr. A. A., *South Renfrew.*
Electric Power and Gas Exportation Regulation B. 145 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com., 3085 (ii).
Hay Trade Regulation, Penalties *re* Violation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beauparlant) 4014 (ii).
P.E.I. Winter Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4820 (iii).

Wright, Mr. A. A.—*Con.*
Quebec Harbour Commissioners B. 177 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 4813 (iii).
Ry. Act Amt B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 7090 (iv).
SUPPLY :
Customs (outside ports) 493 (i).
Electric Light Inspection (salaries) 2611 (ii).
Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. 14 (Mr. Campbell) on M. for 2°, 879 (i).

Wright, Mr. W., *Muskoka.*
Acoustics of Chamber, &c. (remarks) 7364 (iv).
'Arctic' Str., Expenditure *re* Supplies (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3209, 3353 (ii).
D'Escousse Wharf, Expenditure *re* Construction, 1903-5 (Ques.) 990 (i).
Dog-Fish Experiments, Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4938 (iii).
Huntsville, Baysville and Bracebridge Wharfs, Names of Engineers, &c. (Ques.) 2453 (ii).
——— Names of Govt. Officials (Ques.) 1868
Immigration Act Amt. B. 170 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5251 (iii).
Indian (J. W. Lewis) Enfranchisement B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2832 (ii).
Lamont, J. H., Payments to as Crown Prosecutor, 1905 (Ques.) 979 (i).
Roads and Road Allowances B. 202 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 5561 (iii).
SUPPLY :
Arts, Agriculture (census, &c.) 7439 (iv).
Immigration (agents) 1351 (i).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. strs.) 3353 (ii).
Public Works—Harbour and Rivers—Que. (D'Israeli wharf) 6954 (iv).
Tower of West Block, Collapse, Inspection by Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1275 (i).

Zimmerman, Mr. A., *West Hamilton.*
Cannington Postmaster, Dismissal, &c., Ques of Order, 2460 (ii).
Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 104) 1°*, 1465 (i).
Loan Companies (B. 40) 1° m., 444 ; 2° m., 888 (i) ; in Com., 3277 (ii).
Lord's Day B. 12, in Com. (industrial plants) 6625 ; on Amt. (Mr. Galliher) 7254 (iv).
National Fire Insurance Co. of Canada incorp. (B. 63) 1°*, 829 (i).
Ry. Act (telephones) Amt. B. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) in Com., 6115 (iii), 6238 (iv).
SUPPLY :
Canals—Welland (electric plant) 5163 (iii).
Customs (outside ports) 494 (i).
Excise (tobacco stamps) 1559 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (gas buoys) 4893 (iii)
Militia (clothing, &c.) 7176, 7181 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers) 4861 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (rents) 6762 (iv).

INDEX---PART II

SUBJECTS

'Acadia' SS. Subsidy, Govt. Aid to: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3250 (ii).

Acetylene Gas Buoys between Lachine and Kingston, Cost of Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 982 (i).

Acetylene Gas Buoys in St. Lawrence Channel, Rep. of Transportation Commission *re*: in Com. of Sup., 2898 (ii).
See 'Jackstraw', 'Marine', 'Windmill', &c.

Acoustics of Chamber: Remarks (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 7360 (iv).

Actonvale Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6728 (iv).

Address, Gov. Gen.'s Speech: Read (Mr. Speaker) 4 (i).

——— M. to consider, 7 (i).

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech from Throne: moved (Mr. Knowles) 20 (i).; seconded (Mr. Chisholm) 27 (i).

——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to present, 124 (i).

——— Mess. from His Ex.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 1940 (i).

Adjournment of Hse., Confusion by Members leaving Chamber before Speaker and Mace: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2017 (ii).
See 'House of Commons.'

Administration of Oaths of Office B. No. 1 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1°*, *pro forma*, 4 (i).

Adulteration Act Amt. B. No. 15 (Mr. Bergeron) 1° m., 213 (i).

Adulteration of Food, Penalties, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2617 (ii).

AGRICULTURE, &c.

Agriculture Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to add Names, 4450 (iii).

——— 3rd Rep. of Com.: M. to conc. (Mr. D. H. McKenzie) 2021 (ii).

——— 5th Rep.: Presented (Mr. P. H. McKenzie) 4152; M. (Mr. Monk) to consider, 4152 (iii).

——— Translation of Reports: Ques. (Mr. Parent) 575 (i).

Agriculture and Statistics: in Com. of Sup., 304 (i), 2669 (ii), 7372 (iv).

——— Dptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 369 (i).

AGRICULTURE, &c.—*Con.*

Agricultural Imports between Canada and U. S., Duty, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Clements) 2038 (ii).

——— M. (Mr. Clements) to Com. of Sup., 4898 (iii).

——— Personal Explanation (Mr. T. Martin) 5082 (iii).

Agricultural or Grazing Lands Sale in N.W.T., Conditions of Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 324 (i).

Animals Health Act, Quarantine, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2682 (ii), 7440 (iv).

Apples Inspection for Export, Complaints *re*, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. E. D. Smith) 1380 (i).

Archives Branch: in Com. of Sup., 6711, 7372 (iv).

——— Copying, &c., of Old Books, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2669 (ii).

Brockville Cheese Curing Room, Total Expenditure and Revenue: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 585 (i).

——— Correction of Answer to Mr. Taylor (Mr. Fisher) 969 (i).

——— Further Reference to Answer of Question (Mr. Taylor) 1005 (i).

——— Discrepancy in Answer: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 1572 (i).
See 'Cheese.'

Butter manufactured at N. S. Experimental Farms, Quantity, Cost, &c., Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5181 (iii).

Butter and Cheese Public Weigher, Apptmnt. at Montreal: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4704 (iii).

Cattle Diseases in Victoria County, Amounts paid for Losses: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 421 (i).

Cattle Embargo in G. B.: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Jackson) in Com. of Sup., 7433 (iv).

Census and Statistics: in Com. of Sup., 7379 (iv).

Cheese Curing Rooms, Total Expenditure and Revenue: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 586 (i).

AGRICULTURE, &c.—*Con.*
Cheese Curing Rooms, Explanation *re* Statement (Mr. Fisher) 2240 (ii).
See 'Brockville.'
——— Payments *re* Boxes, &c., Statement *re* Answer to Questions (Mr. Taylor) 2321 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Fisher) 2323 (ii).
Cold Storage and Atlantic Steamers: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 7412 (iv).
Experimental Farms: in Com. of Sup., 7386 (iv).
——— Additional Branch Stations: in Com. of Sup., 7411 (iv).
——— Central Farm, Total Expenditure for 1904-5: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 761 (i), 2264 (ii).
——— Farm Report: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 1561 (i).
——— Number maintained by Govt. in Can., &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 974 (i).
——— Stations at P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 574 (i).
Farm Bulletins, Printing and Distribution: in Com. of Sup., 7411 (iv).
Farm Produce, Exports to Germany from 1896 to 1905: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 773 (i).
Fruit Conference at Ottawa, Printing of Rep. Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5503 (iii).
Glanders, Number of Horses tested with Mallein in Man. and N.W. Ters.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 336 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Staples) 428 (i).
——— Compensation *re* Slaughtered Animals: Remarks (Mr. Barr) in Com. of Sup., 2683 (ii).
——— Res. from B. C.: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 2691 (ii).
——— Slaughtering of Horses: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 7442 (iv).
Hog Cholera, Cure of: Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 2692 (ii).
Live Stock, and Dairying Industries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7412 (iv).
'Patent Record': in Com. of Sup., 7379 (iv).
Pictou Cattle Disease: Remarks (Mr. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 7440 (iv).
Poultry Stations, Total Expenditure and Revenue: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 587 (i).
Quinquennial Census for Man., Sask. and Alberta: in Com. of Sup., 7435 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie, Value of Farm and Garden Products entered for Duty, &c., 1905: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 2078 (ii).
Tobacco Culture in Two Mountains, Requests for Seed, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 584 (i).
Vancouver Experimental Farms, Statement by Min. of Inland Rev., Ques. (Mr. Herron) 575 (i).
AGRICULTURE, &c.—*Con.*
Williams Head Quarantine Station, B.C., Permanent and Temporary Employees Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5506 (iii).
Year Book: in Com. of Sup., 7382 (iv).
Ahearn & Soper, Amounts paid for Supplies: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 4737 (iii).
——— Contract *re* Electric Lighting Astronomical Observatory: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1868 (i).
Aids to Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 4788 (iii), 7584 (iv).
Air Brakes, Freight Cars, I.C.R., in Com. of Sup., 5074 (iii).
Alaska-Yukon Boundary Line: Remarks (Mr. Thompson) 5185 (iii).
Alberni Industrial School, B.C.: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 1091 (i).
Alberta Land Co., Par. in Toronto 'Globe' *re* Signatories: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2017 (i).
Alberta and Athabaska Lands, O. C. *re* Cor., &c.: M. for copies* (Mr. Lefurgey) 1741 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1374 (i).
Alberta Mineral, Gas and Oil Borings, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 1674 (i).
Alberta Northern Ry. and Coal Co.'s incorp. B. No. 93 (Mr. Clarke) 1°*, 1252; 2°*, 1570 (i).
Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co. B. No. 100 (Mr. Turriff) 1°*, 1364; 2°*, 1570 (i); Order for Com., 3187; in Com., and 3°*, 3236 (ii).
'Alert,' Steamer, Expenditure *re*: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) in Com. of Sup., 4836 (iii).
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s Bill No. 125 (Mr. Dyment) 1°*, 1743 (i), 2°*, 2066; in Com., and 3°*, 3435 (ii).
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 6142 (iv).
Algoma Post Office, Pet. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 556 (i).
Alien Labour Act, Appeal from Judgment of Judge Anglin: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 343 (i); Remarks (Mr R. L. Borden) 343 (i).
See 'Naturalization'.
Allanburg and Marlatt's Crossing Bridge, Welland Canal, Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 580 (i).
Allan SS. Co., Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7543 (iv).
Allen, James, Relief B. No. 192 (Mr. Calvert) 1°*, 5081; 2°*, 5227; in Com., and 3°*, 6034 (iii).
Amaranth Township, Pet. *re* Establishment of Post Office: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 990 (i).
American Silver, Amount collected: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 1565 (i).
See 'Coins'.
Amherstburg Channel Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 6985 (iv).

Amherst Point Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 6772 (iv).
Anderson Puffed Rice Co.'s Patent Relief B. No. 45 (Mr. Hall) 1°*, 485 ; 2°*, 781 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 2205 (ii).
Animals Health Act, Quarantine &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2682 (ii), 7440 (iv).
Annapolis Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 6773 (iv).
Annapolis and G.B. Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 7555 (iv).
Annual Drill : in Com. of Sup., 5012 (iii), 7178 (iv).
——— Claims for Injuries : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 7580 (iv).
——— Instruction, 3rd District, Site &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2034 (ii).
See 'Militia'.
Annuities to Privy Councillors &c.: *See* 'Privy Councillors', 'Senate and House of Commons B. 97', &c.
Anse aux Griffons, Amounts Expended, Contractors, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1151 (i).
Antigonish Public Building, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 6727 (iv).
'Appeal to Reason' Newspaper, Prohibition of: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 1867 (i), 5615 (iii).
See 'Post Office', &c.
Apples, Dried and Green, German Duties, Changes *re* : Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 978 (i).
Apples, Inspection for Export, Complaints *re*, Cor. &c.: M. for copies (Mr. E. D. Smith) 1380 (i).
See 'Fruit Bill'.
Arbitration and Appeals, Payments to Civil Servants : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 371 (i).
Arbitrations &c. *re* Building Contracts : in Com. of Sup., 6765 (iv).
Archives Branch: in Com. of Sup., 6711, 7372 (iv).
——— Copying, &c., of Old Books, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2669 (ii).
Arcola and Regina Mail Service, Pet. *re* Improvement: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5006 (iii).
'Arctic' Str.' Amounts expended for Supplies, Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 980 (i).
——— Boiler and Machinery, Payments to Brooks & Co.: in Com. of Sup., 4100; Letter from Robt. Scott, Read (Mr. Taylor) 4101 ; Letter from Goldie & McCullough, Read (Mr. Taylor) 4106 (iii).
——— Expedition, Charges *re* Expenditure: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com. of Investigation, 3620, Agreed to (Y. 132 ; N. O.) 3671 (ii); Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3622; Neg. (Y. 45; N. 88) 3669 (ii).
——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Special Com., 3903 (ii).
——— Notice of Motion, Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3503 (ii).
'Arctic', Str., Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Notice for Committee, 3582 (ii).
——— Pairs on Division: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 3799 (ii).
——— Expenditure *re* Supplies, List of Articles sold, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3550 (ii).
——— Rep. of Special Com.: M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean) to conc., 6372; Amt. (Mr. Northrup) 6498, Neg. (Y. 37 ; N. 93) 6535 (iv).
——— Supplies: in Com. of Sup., 3201 (ii), 4089 (iii).
Armouries, Erection of, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 6758 (iv).
Arnes, Lake Winnipeg, Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6994 (iv).
Arsenal, Dom., Ammunition, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7177 (iv).
Art Gallery, Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 6767, 7576 (iv).
Ashcroft, Barkerville and Fort George Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 89 (Mr. D. Ross) 1°*, 1252; 2°*, 1570 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2666 (ii); Sen. Amts., 5401 (iii).
Assay Office, Vancouver, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 5944 (iii).
Assent: *See* 'Bills.'
Association for Comparative Legislation: in Com. of Sup., 7529 (iv).
Astronomical Observatory, Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 6709 (iv).
——— Contract *re* Electric Lighting: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1868 (i).
See 'Public Bldgs, Ottawa,' &c., 'Magnetic.'
Athabaska Landing, &c., Depth of Boring for Oil, &c.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 1675
Atlantic Mail Fast SS. Service, Contract *re*, Report, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 198 (i).
Atlantic Mail Service, Contracts with Govt., Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stockton), 189, 214 (i).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 64 (Mr. Gauvreau) 1°*, 829; 2°*, 974; in Com., and 3°*, 1569 (i).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 6150 (iv).
Aud. Gen's Rep., Delay in Presenting: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 14 (i).
——— Vol. 1, Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 124 (i).
——— Vol. 2, Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 169 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 484 (i).
——— French Edition: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 5754 (iii).
——— French Edition: Remarks (Mr. Parmelee) 5886 (iii).
——— Presented in Instalments: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6126 (iv).

Auditor Gen.'s Office, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).

Aylesworth, Hon. A. B., Acting as Counsel since Apptmnt as P.M.G.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 425 (i).

——— Resignation, Rumours *re*: (Mr. S. Hughes) 5437 (iii).

See 'Ministers and Deputies,' &c., 'Tor. St. Ry.'

Aylmer, Mr. F., Resignation and Re-appointment: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5006 (iii).

Aylmer Post Office Site, Pets., &c., *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ingram) 205 (i).

Baddeck Wharf, N.S., Location, Payments *re* Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 2457 (ii).

Bag-net and Trap-net Licenses, Queens County, N.S.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4156 (iii).

Baker Harriette Wesley, Relief B. No. 179 (Mr. Stewart) 1°*, 4450; 2°*, 4951, in Com., and 3°*, 5499 (iii).

Baker, I. G. & Co., Account *re* Supplies: in Com. of Sup., 516 (i).

——— Refund of Customs Duties: in Com. of Sup., 7515 (iv).

Ballot Frauds *re* N. W. Elections, ref. to in deb. on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 45 (i).

Banff Park Roads and Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 5942 (iii).

Baril, Alfred, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Léonard) 834 (i).

Battle River Bridge at Battleford: in Com. of Sup., 7020 (iv).

'Bavarian,' Str., Cause of Wreck: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 2898 (ii).

Bayfield Harbour, Total Expenditure up to 1896 and since: Ques. (Mr. Gunn) 578 (i).

Beauharnois Canal, Regulation Weir: in Com. of Sup., 7512 (iv).

Beaverton Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6985 (iv).

Béland, Mr., Services at Grosse Isle, Building of Cottage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2269 (ii).

Belgian Immigrants: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1637 (i).

Beef Cattle Industry, Complaints from Man. Ranchers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 4705 (iii).

Belcourt, Hon. N. A.: *See* 'Yukon, Bronson,' &c.

Bell, Dr., Apptmnt., and Salary as Director of Geological Survey: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 405 (i).

Belle River, Ont., Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6985 (iv).

Belleville Armoury, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6733 (iv).

Bell River, P.E.I. Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6956 (iv).

Bell's Rapids Post Office, Establishment of, &c.; Ques. (Mr. Porter) 201 (i).

Bell Telephone Co's. B. No. 81 (Mr. Bureau) 1°*, 999 2°*, 1298 (i); M. for Com., 3953; in Com., 3964 (ii), 4195; on Order for Com., 4388; in Com., 5995 (iii), 6317; Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean), Neg. (Y. 24; N. 96) 6322; 3°*, 6322 (iv).

——— Personal Explanation (Mr. Piché) *re* Vote, 6555 (iv).

See 'Railway Act B. 62' &c.

Bell Telephone Bill and Ry. Act: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 4250 (iii).

Belmont Disaster, Claims for Damages: Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Laurence) in Com. of Sup., 7506 (iv).

Bernier, Capt.: *See* 'Arctic.'

Bic Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6943 (iv).

Bills, Royal Assent, 6165, 7698 (iv).

——— Mess. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (read) 3152, 3163, 4247 (ii).

Bills from the Senate: M. (Mr. Stewart) to place on Order Paper, 4990 (iii).

Bills, printing in French: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 3243 (ii).

BILLS:

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

1°*, 4 (i).

Bill (No. 2) Further to amend the Dominion Elections Act, 1900.—(Mr. Borden, Carleton).

1°, 15; 2°, ref. to Sel. Com., 437 (i).

Bill (No. 3) Further to amend the Act respecting the House of Commons.—(Mr. Borden, Carleton).

1°, 16; 2°, and ref. to Sel. Com., 437 (i).

Bill (No. 4) Further to amend the Criminal Code, 1892.—(Mr. Borden, Carleton.)

1°, 16; 2° m., 437; ref. to Sel. Com., 443 (i); in Com., 7648; 3°*, 7648 (iv).

Bill (No. 5) Further to amend the Dominion Controverted Elections Act.—(Mr. Borden, Carleton).

1°, 16; 2°, 443 (i).

Bill (No. 6) In amendment of the Railway Act, 1903.—(Mr. Lancaster).

1°, 17; 2° m., 456; 3°*, 782 (i).

Bill (No. 7) To amend the Act respecting Certificates to Masters and Mates of Ships.—(Mr. Lancaster).

1°, 18; 2° m., 458; in Com., 841, 998 (i).

Bill (No. 8) In further amendment of the Railway Act, 1903.—(Mr. Lancaster).

1°, 18; on Order for 2°, 349, 483; 2° m., 844; ref. to Sel. Com., 859 (i).

Bill (No. 9) To further amend the Railway Act, 1903.—(Mr. Maclean).

1°, 18; on Order for 2°, 349, 443; 2° m., 782, 1710 (i), 2069 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 10) To amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick).

1°, 19; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 351 (i); in Com., 7648; 3°*, 7649; Sen. Amts., 7695 (iv).

Bill (No. 11) Respecting Money Lenders.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick).

1°, 19; 2° and in Com., 352; ref. to Sel. Com., 1259 (i); in Com., 6805; 3°*, 6818 (iv).

Bill (No. 12) Respecting the Lord's Day.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick).

1°, 19; 2° m., 1010; ref. to Sel. Com., 1014, 1203 (i); in Com., 5622, 5696, 5697, 5755 (iii), 6249, 6327, 6555, 6619; 3° m., 7193; ref. back to Com., 7206, 7272; Bill reported, 7277; M. (Mr. Aylesworth) to recom., 7277, agreed to (Y. 79; N. 42) 7286; in Com., 7287; Bill reported, 2° of amts., 7295; 3° m., 7300; Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) 7333, Neg. (Y. 15; N. 104) 7349; Amt. (Mr. Monk) 7350, Neg. (Y. 15; N. 102), 7352; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7353, Neg. (Y. 39; N. 77) 7357; 3°*, 7358; Sen. Amts., 7664, 7697 (iv).

Bill (No. 13) Respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts.—(Mr. Lennox).

1°, 20; 2° m., 859 (i); in Com., 5364 (iii).

Bill (No. 14) To amend the Weights and Measures Act.—(Mr. Campbell).

1°, 169; 2° m., 874; ref. to Agr. Com., 883 (i); in Com., 2068; 3°, 2971 (ii).

Bill (No. 15) To amend the Adulteration Act.—(Mr. Bergeron).

1°, 213 (i).

Bill (No. 16) To amend the Steamboat Inspection Act, 1898.—(Mr. McCarthy, North Simcoe).

1°, 250; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 1148 (i).

Bill (No. 17) Further to amend the Railway Act, 1903.—(Mr. Lennox).

1°, 250; 2° m., 884 (i).

Bill (No. 18) Respecting Annuities for certain Privy Councillors, and respecting the Senate and House of Commons.—(Mr. Maclean, South York).

1°, 316; on Order for 2°, 887, 1711 (i), 2511; 2° m., 2512, 2975 (ii).

Bill (No. 19) Respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Guthrie.)

1°*, 349; 2°*, 524; in Com., and 3°*, 1140 (i).

Bill (No. 20) To incorporate the Canadian Bible Society, Auxiliary to the British and Foreign Bible Society.—(Mr. Cockshutt.)

1°*, 349; 2°*, 524 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2666 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 21) Respecting the Huron and Erie Loan and Savings Company.—(Mr. Calvert.)

1°*, 349; 2°*, 524 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3739 (ii).

Bill (No. 22) Respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Calvert).

1°*, 349; 2°*, 524; in Com., and 3°*, 1140 (i).

Bill (No. 23) To incorporate the Quebec Midland Railway Company.—(Mr. Bureau.)

1°*, 349; 2°*, 524; in Com., 1297; 3°*, 1297 (i).

Bill (No. 24) Respecting the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. McColl.)

1°*, 349; 2°*, 524; in Com., and 3°*, 1140 (i).

Bill (No. 25) Respecting the Niagara, Queenston and St. Catharines Railway Company.—(Mr. Clarke.)

1°*, 349; 2°*, 524 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3672 (ii).

Bill (No. 26) Respecting the West Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Pardee.)

1°*, 350; 2°*, 525; in Com., 1140; 3°*, 1141 (i).

Bill (No. 27) To incorporate the Kamloops and Yellow Head Pass Railway Company.—(Mr. Galliher.)

1°*, 350; 2°*, 525 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2066 (ii).

Bill (No. 28) Respecting the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company. — (Mr. Sloan.)

1°*, 350; 2°*, 525; in Com., and 3°*, 1140 (i).

Bill (No. 29) Respecting the Vancouver and Lulu Island Railway Company.—(Mr. Macpherson.)

1°*, 350; 2°*, 525; in Com., 1141; ref. back to Sel. Com., 1295 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2066 (ii).

Bill (No. 30) Respecting the Kootenay and Arrowhead Railway Company. — (Mr. Galliher.)

1°*, 350; 2°*, 525; in Com., 1145; 3°*, 1147 (i).

Bill (No. 31) Respecting the White Horse and Alsek Railway Company. — (Mr. Macpherson.)

1°*, 350; 2°*, 525; in Com., and 3°*, 1297 (i).

Bill (No. 32) Respecting the Nakusp and Slocan Railway Company.—(Mr. Galliher.)

1°*, 350; 2°*, 525; in Com., 1297; 3°*, 1297

Bill (No. 33) Respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.— (Mr. Galliher.)

1°*, 350; 2°*, 525 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2066 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 34) Respecting the Columbia and Kootenay Railway and Navigation Company.—(Mr. Galliher.)
1°*, 350; 2°*, 525 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2066 (ii).

Bill (No. 35) To incorporate the Western Loan and Trust Company.—(Mr. Adamson.)
1°*, 443; 2°*, 569 (i); in Com., 3236; 3°*, 3434 (ii).

Bill (No. 36) Respecting the Canadian Niagara Power Company.—(Mr. German).
1°*, 444; 2°*, 569 (i).

Bill (No. 37) Respecting the Montreal Park and Island Railway Company.—(Mr. Geoffrion.)
1°*, 444; 2°*, 569 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3187 (ii).

Bill (No. 38) To incorporate the Temple Mutual Life Association.—(Mr. Bole.)
1°, 444; 2°*, 569 (i).

Bill (No. 39) Respecting the Canada Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Macdonald.)
1°*, 444; 2°*, 569 (i), in Com., 2668, 2721 (ii).

Bill (No. 40) Respecting certain Loan Companies.—(Mr. Zimmerman).
1°*, 444; 2°*, and ref. to Sel. Com., 889 (i); in Com., 3277 (ii); 3°*, 6997 (iv).

Bill (No. 41) Respecting the Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Railway Company.—(Mr. Macpherson.)
1°*, 485; 2°*, 781; in Com., and 3°*, 1569 (i).

Bill (No. 42) To incorporate the Buffalo, Niagara and Toronto Railway Company.—(Mr. German.)
1°*, 485; 2°*, 781 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3953 (ii).

Bill (No. 43) To incorporate the Brandon Transfer Railway Company.—(Mr. Sifton.)
1°*, 485; 2°*, 781 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2066 (ii).

Bill (No. 44) Respecting the Kingston and Pembroke Railway Company. — (Mr. Hall)
1°*, 485; 2°*, 781; in Com. and 3°*, 1569 (i).

Bill (No. 45) Respecting patent of the Anderson Puffed Rice Company.—(Mr. Hall.)
1°*, 485; 2°*, 781 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2205 (ii).

Bill (No. 46) Respecting the St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Company.—(Mr. Tisdale.)
1°*, 558; 2°*, 782; in Com., and 3°*, 1297 (i).

Bill (No. 47) Respecting Forest Reserves.—(Mr. Oliver.)
1°*, 559 (i); 2°, and in Com., 2832. 3318, 3412, 3528 (ii), 5416, 5537; 3°*, 5556 (iii); Sen. Amts., 6829 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 48) To amend the Act respecting the Safety of Ships and the prevention of accidents on board thereof.—(Mr. Sinclair.)
1° m., 559; 2°, and in Com., 1148; 3° m., 1205 (i); in Com., 4024 (ii), 6862; 3*, 6868 (iv).

Bill (No. 49) Respecting La Banque Prociale du Canada.—(Mr. Bergeron.)
1°*, 655; 2°*, 928 (i); in Com., 3236; 3°*, 3236 (ii).

Bill (No. 50) Respecting the Pacific Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Belcourt.)
1°, 656; 2°*, 928 (i); in Com., 3242; 3°*, 3243 (ii).

Bill (No. 51) Respecting a Patent of Henry Luther Houk.—(Mr. Campbell.)
1°*, 655; 2°*, 928 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3186 (ii).

Bill (No. 52) To incorporate the United Empire Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Belcourt.)
1°*, 656; 2°*, 928 (i).

Bill (No. 53) Respecting the Crawford Bay and St. Mary's Railway Company.—(Mr. Galliher.)
1°*, 656; 2°*, 928; in Com., and 3°*, 1569 (i).

Bill (No. 54) To incorporate the Pacific Marine Underwriters, Limited.—(Mr. Macpherson.)
1°*, 656; 2°*, 928 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3739 (ii).

Bill (No. 55) Respecting the powers of the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.—(Mr. Brodeur.)
1° m., 656 (i); 2°, and in Com., 2189; 3°*, 2189 (ii).

Bill (No. 56) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial year ending the 30th June, 1906.—(Mr. Paterson.)
In Com. on Ways and Means, 658; 1°* of B., 711; 2°; in Com., 712; 3°*, 712 (i).

Bill (No. 57) Respecting the Montreal, Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)
1°, 743; 2°*, 974 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 5400 (iii).

Bill (No. 58) Respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. McCarthy, Simcoe.)
1°, 743; on Order for 2°, 1147 (i).

Bill (No. 59) To incorporate the Women's Art Association of Canada.—(Mr. Grant.)
1°*, 744; 2°*, 974 (i).

Bill (No. 60) To incorporate the Inter-Ocean Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Bole.)
1°*, 744; 2°*, 974 (i); in Com., 3952; 3°*, 3953 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 61) To incorporate the Grand Trunk Pacific Telegraph Company.—(Mr. McCarthy, Simcoe.)

1°*, 744; 2°*, 1298 (i); in Com., 2712 (ii), 4539, 4746; 3° m., 4758, 4995 (iii).

Bill (No. 62) To amend the Railway Act, 1903.—(Mr. Emmerson.)

1° m., 744; 2°, and in Com., 1584 (i), 2566 (ii), 7065; 3° m., 7105; 3°*, 7116; Sen. Amts., 7570, 7639 (iv).

Bill (No. 63) To incorporate the National Fire Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Zimmerman.)

1°*, 829; 2°*, 974 (i).

Bill (No. 64) Respecting the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Gauvreau.)

1°*, 829; 2°*, 974; in Com., and 3°*, 1569 (i).

Bill (No. 65) Respecting the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company.—(Mr. Bureau.)

1°*, 829; 2°*, 974 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3739 (ii).

Bill (No. 66) To amend the Indian Act.—(Mr. Monk.)

1° m., 829 (i); 2° m., 2069; Amt. (Mr. Oliver) 6 m. h. agreed to, on Division, 2075 (ii).

Bill (No. 67, from the Senate), To amend the Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

1°*, 890; 2°, 1259; in Com., 1261; ref. back to Sel. Com., 1584 (i); on order for Com., 2161, 3506; 3°*, 3523 (ii).

Bill (No. 68, from the Senate) Further to amend the Canada Evidence Act.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

1°*, 890; 2°, and in Com., 1265, 1751 (i); 3°*, 2161 (ii).

Bill (No. 69) Respecting certain Patents of Henry Edmunds.—(Mr. Campbell.)

1°*, 890; 2°*, 1298 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2205 (ii).

Bill (No. 70) Respecting the British Canadian Loan and Investment Company, Limited. (Mr. McCarthy, Simcoe.)

1°*, 890; 2°*, 1298 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3434 (ii).

Bill (No. 71) To incorporate the Calgary and Fernie Railway Company.—(Mr. Galliher.)

1°*, 890; 2°*, 1298; in Com., and 3°*, 1792 (i).

Bill (No. 72) To incorporate the Quebec, Montreal and Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Demers.)

1°*, 890; 2°*, 1298 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3434 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 73) Respecting the Boundary, Kamloops and Cariboo Central Railway Company—(Mr. Ross, Yale-Cariboo.)

1°*, 969; 2°*, 1298; in Com., and 3°*, 1792 (i).

Bill (No. 74) Respecting the Harbour of North Sydney, in Nova Scotia.—(Mr. Brodeur.)

1°, 969 (i); 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 2189 (ii).

Bill (No. 75) To incorporate the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company.—(Mr. Crawford.)

1°, 999; 2°*, 1298 (i); in Com., 5460, 5683, 5950, 6023, 6075 (iii); 3° m., 6609; 3°*, 6706 (iv).

Bill (No. 76) Respecting Revillon Brothers, Limited.—(Mr. McCool.)

1°*, 999; 2°*, 1298 (i); in Com., 3672; ref. back to Ry. Com., 3674 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5400 (iii); Sen. Amts., 6706 (iv).

Bill (No. 77) Respecting the Calgary and Edmonton Railway Company.—(Mr. McCarthy, Calgary.)

1°*, 999; 2°*, 1298; in Com., and 3°*, 1792 (i).

Bill (No. 78) Respecting the Great Northwest Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Roche, Marquette.)

1°*, 999; 2°*, 1298; in Com., and 3°*, 1792 (i).

Bill (No. 79) Respecting certain Patents of Chester Burnell Duryea.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

1°*, 999; 2°*, 1298 (i); in Com., 2194 (ii).

Bill (No. 80) Respecting the Pacific Northern and Omineca Railway Company.—(Mr. McCarthy, Simcoe.)

1°*, 999, 2°*, 1298 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2066 (ii).

Bill (No. 81) Respecting the Bell Telephone Company of Canada.—(Mr. Bureau.)

1°*, 999; 2°*, 1298 (i); M. for Com., 3953; in Com., 3964 (ii), 4195; on Order for Com., 4388; in Com., 5995 (iii), 6317; Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) Neg. (Y. 24; N. 96) 6322; 3°*, 6322 (iv).

Bill (No. 82) Respecting Express Companies.—(Mr. Alcorn.)

1°, 999 (i); 2°, and ref. to Sel. Com., 4734 (iii).

Bill (No. 83) Respecting the Judges of Provincial Courts.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

1°, 1095; 2°, and in Com., 1764; 3°*, 1777 (i).

Bill (No. 84) Respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. McCarthy, Simcoe.)

1°*, 1149; 2°*, 1369 (i); in Com., 2244, 2702; 3°*, 2703 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 85) For the enfranchisement of Jamieson Webster Lewis, Indian, of the Moravian Band of the Thames, in the Province of Ontario.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°*, 1149 (i); 2°, and in Com., 2827, 3°*, 2832 (ii).

Bill (No. 86) Respecting the Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Company.—(Mr. Carvell).

1°*, 1252; 2°*, 1570 (i); in Com., 2667, 2703; 3°*, 2709 (ii).

Bill (No. 87) To incorporate the Vancouver, Fraser Valley and Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Macpherson).

1°*, 1252; 2°*, 1570 (i); in Com., 2709; M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 2712; in Com., 3187; 3°*, 3187 (ii).

Bill (No. 88) Respecting 'La Compagnie d'Assurance Mutuelle contre le feu des comtes de Rimouski, Témiscouata et Kamouraska,' and to change its name. —(Mr. Ross, Rimouski).

1°*, 1252; 2°*, 1570 (i); in Com., 4942; 3°, 4942 (iii).

Bill (No. 89) To incorporate the Ashcroft, Barkerville and Fort George Railway Company.—(Mr. Ross, Yale-Cariboo.)

1°*, 1252; 2°*, 1570 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2666 (ii); Sen. Amts., 5401 (iii).

Bill (No. 90) To incorporate the United Empire Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. Pardee.)

1°*, 1252; 2°*, 1570 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 6706; Sen. Amts., 7271, 7370 (iv).

Bill (No. 91) To incorporate the Canadian-Minnesota Bridge Company. — (Mr. Dyment).

1°*, 1252; 2°*, 1570 (i), Order for Com., 2067; in Com., 2499; in Com., and 3°*, 3187

Bill (No. 92) Respecting the Essex Terminal Railway Company.—(Mr. Clarke)

1°*, 1252; 2°*, 1570 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2066 (ii).

Bill (No. 93) To incorporate the Alberta Northern Railway and Coal Company. —(Mr. Clarke).

1°*, 1252; 2°*, 1570 (i).

Bill (No. 94) Respecting the Rio de Janeiro Tramway, Light and Power Company, Limited.—(Mr. Calvert).

1°*, 1252; 2°*, 1570 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2665 (ii).

Bill (No. 95) Respecting the Mexican Light and Power Company, Limited.—(Mr. Calvert).

1°*, 1252; 2°*, 1570 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2666 (ii).

Bill (No. 96) Respecting the Mexican Consolidated Electric Company, Limited, and to change its name to 'Mexican Tramway and Electric Company.'—(Mr. Calvert).

1°*, 1252; 2°*, 1570 (i); in Com., 2666; 3°*, 2667 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 97) To amend the Act respecting the Senate and House of Commons.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick).

1°, 1252; 2° m., 1777; in Com., 1793 (i), 7117; 3°*, 7143; Sen. Amts., 7570 (iv).

Bill (No. 98) Respecting the Central Ontario Railway.—(Mr. Northrup).

1°*, 1364; 2°*, 1570 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3187 (ii).

Bill (No. 99) Respecting the Mather Bridge and Power Company.—(Mr. German).

1°*, 1364; 2°*, 1570 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2666 (ii).

Bill (No. 100) Respecting the Alberta Railway and Irrigation Company.—(Mr. Turriff).

1°*, 1364; 2°*, 1570 (i); on Order for Com., 3187; in Com., and 3°*, 3236

Bill (No. 101) Further to amend the Fruit Marks Act, 1901.—(Mr. Fisher).

1° m., 1364 (i); 2°, and in Com., 2162; in Com., 2550; 3°*, 2566 (ii).

Bill (No. 102) Respecting the Schomberg and Aurora Railway Company.—(Mr. Campbell).

1°*, 1465; 2°*, 1710 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2666 (ii).

Bill (No. 103) Respecting the Quebec and Lake Huron Railway Company.—(Mr. Lachance.)

1°*, 1465; 2°*, 1710 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3434 (ii).

Bill (No. 104) To incorporate the Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Railway Company.—(Mr. Zimmerman,)

1°*, 1465; 2°*, 1710 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3672 (ii).

Bill (No. 105) To incorporate the Sterling Life Assurance Company.—(Mr. Lennox.)

1°*, 1465; 2°*, 1710 (i); in Com., 5499; 3°*, 5500 (iii).

Bill (No. 106) Respecting applications for Patents of Henry Wurts, junior.—(Mr. Belcourt.)

1°*, 1465; 2°*, 1710 (i); in Com., 2205; 3°*, 2205 (ii).

Bill (No. 107) Respecting the Erie Ontario Power Company.—(Mr. German.)

1°*, 1465; 2°*, 1710 (i); in Com., 2668; 3°*, 2668 (ii).

Bill (No. 108) Respecting the Kettle River Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Ross, Yale-Cariboo.)

1°*, 1562; 2°*, 1710 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2666 (ii).

Bill (No. 109) To repeal the Act to Provide for the Collection and Publishing of Labour Statistics.—(Mr. Fisher.)

1°*, 1562 (i); 2°*, 2161; in Com., 2161; 3°*, 2162 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 110) Respecting certain Patents of the Toledo Glass Company. — (Mr. Stewart.)
1°*, 1575; 2°*, 1792 (i); in Com., 3674, 3715; ref. back to Sel. Com., 3952 (ii).

Bill (No. 111) Respecting the Lake of the Woods Milling Company, Limited, and the Keewatin Flour Mills Company, Limited.—(Mr. Adamson.)
1°*, 1576; 2°*, 1792 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3186 (ii).

Bill (No. 112) Respecting the Huron and Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. Ratz.)
1°*, 1576; 2°*, 1792 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3435 (ii).

Bill (No. 113) Respecting the Great Northern Railway of Canada.—(Mr. Dubeau.)
1°* 1576; 2°* 1792 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2666 (ii).

Bill (No. 114) To incorporate the Canadian Lloyds, Limited.—(Mr. Bickerdike.)
1°*, 1576; 2°*, 1792 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5227 (iii).

Bill (No. 115) Concerning Leprosy.—(Mr. Fisher.)
1°*, 1576 (i); 2°*, and in Com., 2185; 3°*, 2189 (ii).

Bill (No. 116) To regulate the Hay trade.—(Mr. Beauparlant.)
1°, 1576 (i); 2°, and ref. to Agr. Com., 4023 (ii).

Bill (No. 117) To incorporate the Erie, London and Tillsonburg Railway Company.—(Mr. Schell, Oxford.)
1°*, 1667; 2°*, 1792 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 4197 (iii).

Bill (No. 118) Respecting the South Shore Railway Company and the Quebec Southern Railway Company. — (Mr. Devlin.)
1°*, 1667; 2°*, 1792 (i).

Bill (No. 119) To incorporate the Vancouver and Northwestern Railway Company.—(Mr. Macpherson.)
1°*, 1667; 2°*, 1792 (i).

Bill (No. 120) To incorporate the Fort William and Port Arthur Terminal Railway and Bridge Company.—(Mr. Macpherson.)
1°*, 1667; 2°*, 1792 (i); in Com., 5400; 3°, 5446 (iii).

Bill (No. 121) Respecting the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—(Mr. Watson.)
1°*, 1667; 2°*, 1792 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3435 (ii).

Bill (No. 122) Respecting certain Patents of Franklin Montgomery Gray.—(Mr. Campbell.)
1°*, 1667; 2°*, 1793 (i); in Com., 4945; 3°*, 4950 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 123) Respecting a Patent, Number 69140, of the Underwood Typewriter Company.—(Mr. Campbell.)
1°*, 1667; 2°*, 1793 (i).

Bill (No. 124) Respecting the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.—(Mr. Brodeur.)
1°, 1668 (i); 2°*, 2189; in Com., 2190, 2205, 2626 (ii).

Bill (No. 125) Respecting the Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Dyment.)
1°*, 1743 (i); 2°*, 2066; in Com., and 3°*, 3435 (ii).

Bill (No. 126) Respecting the Thorold and Lake Erie Railway Company.—(Mr. Calvert.)
1°*, 1743; 2°*, 1857 (i); in Com., and 3°* 3187 (ii).

Bill (No. 127) Respecting the Farmers Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Calvert.)
1°*, 1743; 2°*, 1857 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3236 (ii).

Bill (No. 128) Respecting Puebla Light and Power Company, Limited, and to change its name to 'Puebla Tramway, Light and Power Company.'—(Mr. Calvert.)
1°*, 1743 (i); 2°*, 2066; in Com., and 3°*, 2666 (ii).

Bill (No. 129) To incorporate the Winnipeg Loan and Trust Company.—(Mr. Lefurgey.)
1°*, 1743 (i); 2°*, 2066 (ii); in Com., 6053; 3°*, 6055 (iii).

Bill (No. 130) Respecting the Grand Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Calvert.)
1°*, 1743 (i); 2°*, 2066 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 6034 (iii).

Bill (No. 131) Respecting the Royal Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Maclean, Lunenburg.)
1°*, 1743; 2°*, 1857 (i); on Order for Com., 4389; in Com., 6022; 3°*, 6034 (iii).

Bill (No. 132) Respecting the Ontario Northern and Timagami Railway Company.—(Mr. McCool.)
1°*, 1743 (i); 2°*, 2066; in Com., and 3°*, 3435 (ii).

Bill (No. 133) Respecting the Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Railway Company.—(Mr. Calvert.)
1°*, 1743 (i); 2°*, 2066; in Com., and 3°*, 3953 (ii).

Bill (No. 134) Respecting the Toronto and Hamilton Railway Company, and to change its name to the 'Toronto, Niagara and Western Railway Company.'—(Mr. Guthrie.)
1°*, 1743 (i); 2°*, 2066 (ii); in Com., 4389; 3°, 4397 (iii).

Bill (No. 135) Respecting the Empire Trust Company.—(Mr. Worthington.)
1°*, 1743; 2°*, 1857 (i); on Order for Com., 4945; in Com., 5221, 5446, 5682; 3°*, 5683

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 136) Respecting a Patent of the Cyclone Woven Wire Fence Company, Limited.—(Mr. Macdonell.)
1°*, 1743; 2°*, 1857 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3187 (ii).

Bill (No. 137) Respecting the City of Toronto.—(Mr. Macdonell.)
1°*, 1743(i); 2°*, 2066 (ii).

Bill (No. 138) To incorporate the Toronto Union Station Company.—(Mr. Macdonell.)
1°*, 1743 (i); 2°*, 2720 (ii); in Com., 4397; 3°*, 4397 (iii).

Bill (No. 139) Respecting the Northern Commercial Telegraph Company, Limited.—(Mr. German.)
1°*, 1743 (i) ; 2°*, 2066 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 4397 (iii).

Bill (No. 140) Respecting the Southern Central Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. McCraney.)
1°*, 1743 (i); on Order for 2°, 2264; 2°*, 2720 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 6034 (iii).

Bill (No. 141) Respecting the Quebec, Saguenay and Gulf of St. Lawrence Railway Company.—(Mr. Girard.)
1°*, 1743 ; 2°*, 1858 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3435 (ii).

Bill (No. 142) To Repeal the Act respecting Annuities for certain Privy Councillors.—(Mr. Wilson, Lennox and Addington.)
1°*, 1743 (i).

Bill (No. 143) Respecting the Sessional Allowance of Members of Parliament.—(Mr. Wilson, Lennox and Addington.)
1°*, 1743 (i).

Bill (No. 144) Respecting Industrial and Co-operative Societies.—(Mr. Monk.)
1°, 1841 (i).

Bill (No. 145) To regulate the exportation of Electric Power and of certain Fluids and Gases.—(Mr. Fitpatrick.)
1°, 2159; 2° m., 3077; in Com., 3078 (ii), 4035 (iii).

Bill (No. 146) To incorporate the Windsor Chatham and London Railway Company. (Mr. Clarke.)
1°*, 2321; 2°*, 2721 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5227 (iii).

Bill (No. 147) Respecting the Standard Trusts Company.—(Mr. Bole.)
1°*, 2321; 2°, 2720 (ii); in Com., 4942; 3° m., 5002 (iii).

Bill (No. 148) respecting the Dominion Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Macpherson.)
1°*, 2321 (ii).

Bill (No. 149) Respecting the Central Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. German.)
1°*, 2321; 2°*, 2721 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5400 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 150) Respecting the Windsor, Essex and Lake Shore Rapid Railway Company.—(Mr. Clarke.)
1°*, 2321; 2°*, 2721 (ii); in Com., 5223; in Com., and 3°*, 5400 (iii).

Bill (No. 151) Respecting the Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Railway Company.—(Mr. Derbyshire.)
1°*, 2451; 2°*, 2721; in Com., and 3°*, 3435 (ii).

Bill (No. 152) To amend the Railway Act, 1903.—(Mr. Conmee.)
1°, 2451 (ii).

Bill (No. 153) Respecting Placer Mining in the Yukon Territory.—(Mr. Oliver.)
1°, 2452; 2°*, 3412; in Com., 3412 (ii), 4802; 3°*, 4805 (iii); Sen. Amts., 6828 (iv).

Bill (No. 154) To amend the Unorganized Territories' Game Preservation Act, 1894.—(Mr. Oliver.)
1°*, 2451; 2° and in Com., 2825; 3°*, 2826 (ii).

Bill (No. 155) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)
1°, 2452; 2°, 3099; in Com., and 3°*, 3101 (ii).

Bill (No. 156) To amend the Exchequer Court Act.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)
2°*, 3523; in Com., 3524; 3°*, 3528 (ii).

Bill (No. 157) To incorporate the Hillcrest Railway, Coal and Coke Company.—(Mr. Galliher.)
1°*, 2926; 2°*, 3243 (ii); in Com., 4398; 3°*, 4399 (iii).

Bill (No. 158) To incorporate the Burk's Falls and French River Railway Company.—(Mr. McKenzie.)
1°*, 3064; 2°*, 3243 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5400 (iii).

Bill (No. 159) To incorporate the Cobalt Range Railway Company.—(Mr. McCool.)
1°*, 3064; 2°*, 3243 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5499 (iii).

Bill (No. 160) Respecting Queen's College at Kingston.—(Mr. Harty.)
1°*, 3065; 2°*, 3243; in Com., and 3°*, 3953 (ii).

Bill (No. 161) Respecting the Trans-Niagara Bridge Company.—(Mr. Calvert.)
1°*, 3065; 2°*, 3243 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 6034 (iii); Sen. Amts., 7270, 7370 (iv).

Bill (No. 162) Respecting the Fiscal Year.—(Mr. Fielding.)
1°, 3065 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 5093, 5559; 3°*, 5560 (iii).

Bill (No. 163) To authorize the exchange of certain School Lands for other Dominion Lands.—(Mr. Oliver.)
1°, 3233; 2°*, 3910; in Com., 3910 (ii), 5191; 3°*, 5195 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 164) To amend the Rocky Mountains Park Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 3234 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 4734, 4759; 3°*, 4805 (iii).

Bill (No. 165) To amend the General Inspection Act.—(Mr. Hall.)

1°, 3234 (ii).

Bill (No. 166, from the Senate) To incorporate the Canadian Handicrafts Guild. —(Mr. Ames.)

1°*, 3314; 2°*, 3435; in Com., and 3°*, 3953 (ii).

Bill (No. 167) Respecting Government Telephone Systems in the Province of Manitoba.—(Mr. Roche, Marquette.)

1°, 3315 (ii).

Bill (No. 168) For the relief of Mary Emeline Preston.—(Mr. Campbell.)

1°*, 3403; 2°*, 3739 (ii); in Com., 4950; 3°*, 4950 (iii).

Bill (No. 169, from the Senate) For the relief of John Albert Peer.—(Mr. Campbell.)

1°*, 3403; 2°*, 3739 (ii); in Com., 4950, 5447; 3°, 5460 (iii).

Bill (No. 170) Respecting Immigrants and Immigration.—(Mr. Oliver.)

1°, 3712 (ii); 2°, and in Com., 5195, 5227, 5406; 3° m., 5533, 5563; 3°*, 5570 (iii); Sen. Amts., 7116 (iv).

Bill (No. 171) To amend the Interpretation Act.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick.)

1°, 3904 (ii); 2°, 5556; in Com. and 3°*, 5556 (iii).

Bill (No. 172, from the Senate) Respecting the St. Mary's River Bridge Company. —(Mr. Stewart.)

1°*, 3952 (ii); 2°*, 5402; 3°*, 6075 (iii).

Bill (No. 173, from the Senate) Respecting the Pacific and Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Stewart.)

1°*, 3952 (ii); 2°*, 5402; in Com., 6056 (iii); 3°m., 6323; on Order for 3°, 6678; 3°*, 6706 (iv).

Bill (No. 174) Respecting the Quebec Harbour Commissioners.—(Mr. Brodeur.)

Res. prop., 3503; in Com. on Res., 3926; 1°* of B., 3933; 2°*, 3933; in Com., 3933 (ii), 4807; 3°*, 4816 (iii).

Bill (No. 175) To amend the Customs Tariff, 1897.—(Mr. Fielding).

1°, 4029; 2°, and in Com., 5102; 3°*, 5103 (iii).

Bill (No. 176) Respecting Penitentiaries.—(Mr. Fitzpatrick).

Res. prop., 3907 (ii); in Com. on Res., 4077; 1°*, of B., 4084; 2°, and in Com., 5387, 5402; 3°*, 5406 (iii); Sen. Amts., 6818 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 177) To make further provision respecting grants of land to members of the Militia Force on active service in the Northwest.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°*, 4154; 2° m., 4805; in Com., 4806; 3° m., 4897 (iii).

Bill (No. 178) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service for the Financial year ending June 30, 1906.—(Mr. Fielding.)

In Com. of Ways and Means, 4352; 1°, 4353; 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 4354 (iii).

Bill (No. 179, from the Senate), For the Relief of Harriette Wesley Baker.—(Mr. Stewart).

1°*, 4450; 2°*, 4951; in Com., and 3°*, 5499 (iii).

Bill (No. 180, from the Senate), For the Relief of William Napoleon Vaughan. —(Mr. Stewart).

1°*, 4451; 2°*, 4951; in Com., 6035; 3°*, 6035 (iii).

Bill (No. 181, from the Senate), For the Relief of Charles William Holmes.—(Mr. Stewart).

1°*, 4451; 2°*, 4951; in Com., and 3°*, 5499 (iii).

Bill (No. 182, from the Senate) For the Relief of Minnie Florence Irvine.—(Mr. Stewart.)

1°*, 4451; 2°*, 4951; in Com., and 3°*, 5499 (iii).

Bill (No. 183) To incorporate the Twelve Mile Power Company, Limited.—(Mr. Thompson).

1°*, 4451; 2°*, 5227; 3°*, 6075 (iii); Sen. Amts., 7271 (iv).

Bill (No. 184, from the Senate), Respecting the James Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Calvert).

1°*, 4759; 2°*, 5227; in Com., and 3°*, 5499 (iii).

Bill (No. 185, from the Senate) For the relief of Eileen Mary Mackintosh Mr. Campbell).

1°*, 4759; 2°*, 4951; in Com., 6036; 3°*, 6053 (iii).

Bill (No. 186, from the Senate) Respecting the Monarch Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Parmelee).

1°*, 4801; 2°*, 5400; in Com., and 3°*, 6056 (iii).

Bill (No. 187, from the Senate) Respecting the Citizens' Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Guthrie).

1°*, 4897; 2°*, 5227; in Com., and 3°*, 5499 (iii).

Bill (No. 188, from the Senate) To incorporate the Colonial Bank of Canada.—(Mr. Calvert.)

1°*, 4801; 2°*, 5227; in Com. and 3°*, 5499 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 189) To amend the Copyright Act. —(Mr. Macdonell).
1°, 4791 (iii).

Bill (No. 190, from the Senate) For the relief of Asenath Ramsay.—(Mr. Ross).
1°*, 5081; 2°*, 5227; in Com., and 3°*, 6034 (iii).

Bill (No. 191, from the Senate) For the relief of Jane Frances Field.—(Mr. McCarthy.
1°*, 5081; 2°*, 5227; in Com., and 3°*, 6034 (iii).

Bill (No. 192, from the Senate) For the relief of James Allen.—(Mr. Calvert).
1°*, 5081; 2°*, 5227; in Com., and 3°*, 6034 (iii).

Bill (No. 193, from the Senate) For the relief of Frederick William Wight.—(Mr. Parmelee.)
1°*, 5081; 2°*, 5227; in Com., and 3°*, 6034 (iii).

Bill (No. 194) To amend the Indian Act.—(Mr. Oliver.)
1°*, 4991; 2°, and in Com., 5422; 3°*, 5533 (iii).

Bill (No 195) Respecting the Court of Appeal for Manitoba.—(Mr. Aylesworth.)
Res. prop., 4157; in Com. on Res., 5007; 1°*, 5082; 2°, and in Com., 5556; 3°*, 5556 (iii).

Bill (No. 196) To amend the Act respecting the Currency.—(Mr. Fielding.)
1° m., 5082; 2°, and in Com., 5557; 3°*, 5559 (iii).

Bill (No. 197, from the Senate) To incorporate the Fording Valley Railway Company.—(Mr Galliher.)
1°*, 5180; 2°*, 5400; in Com., 6035; 3°*, 6035 (iii).

Bill (No. 198) Respecting the British America Assurance Company.—(Mr. McCarthy, Simcoe.)
M. to present Pet., 4991; 1°*, 5180; 2°, 5180; in Com., 5500; 3°*, 5501 (iii).

Bill (No. 199) Respecting the Western Assurance Company.—(Mr. McCarthy, Simcoe.)
M. to present Pet., 4991; 1°*, 2°*, 5181; in Com., 5501; 3°*, 5502 iii).

Bill (No. 200) To amend the Militia Pension Act, 1901.—(Sir Frederick Borden.)
Res. prop., 4156; in Com. on Res., 5186; 1°*, of B., 5190; 2°, and in Com., 5533; 3°*, 5536 (iii).

Bill (No. 201) To amend the Militia Act.—(Sir Frederick Borden.)
Res. prop., 4157; in Com. on Res., 5190; 1°* of B., 5191; 2°, and in Com., 5536; 3°*, 5537 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 202) Respecting roads and road allowances in the Provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta.—(Mr. Oliver.)
1°, 5363; 2°, and in Com., 5560; 3°*, 5563

Bill (No. 203, from the Senate) To incorporate the General Accident Assurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Campbell)
1°*, 5529; 2°*, 5751 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6706 (iv).

Bill (No. 204, from the Senate) To incorporate the Chartered Bank of London and Canada.—(Mr. Campbell.)
1°*, 5529; 2°*, 5751 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6706 (i).

Bill (No. 205, from the Senate) To incorporate the Pacific and Eastern Railway Company.—(Mr. Belcourt.)
1°*, 5556; 2°*, 6075 (iii).

Bill (No. 206) To amend the Manitoba Grain Act, 1900.—(Mr. Fisher.)
1°, 5615; 2°, and in Com., 5904 (iii); 3° m., 6127 (iv).

Bill (No. 207) To amend the Grain Inspection Act.—(Mr Fisher.)
1°*, 5615; 2° m., 5886; in Com., 5896; 3°*, 5903 (iii).

Bill (No. 208, from the Senate) For the relief of Muriel Violet Spencer.—(Mr. Stewart.)
1°*, 5751; in Com., and 3°*, 6075 (iii).

Bill (No. 209, from the Senate) To amend the Criminal Code, 1892, as respects Lotteries.—(Mr. Garvell.)
1°*, 5992 (iii); 2°, and in Com, 7660; 3°*, 7664 (iv).

Bill (No. 210, from the Senate) For the relief of William Ogden,—(Mr. Derbyshire.)
1°*, 5992; 2°, 6075 (iii); in Com. and 3°*, 6706 iv).

Bill (No. 211, from the Senate) Respecting the Sale and Manufactures of Gold and Silver.—(Mr. Fielding.)
1°*, 5992 (iii); 2°, 6248; in Com., 7565; 3°*, 7569 (iv).

Bill (No. 212, from the Senate) Respecting the North-west Commercial Travellers' Association.—(Mr. Bole).
1°*, 5992 (iii); 2°*, 6707; in Com., and 3°*, 7270 (iv).

Bill (No. 213, from the Senate) Respecting the Manitoba and Keewatin Railway Company.—(Mr. Bole.)
1°*, 6075 (iii); 2°*, 6707; in Com., and 3°*, 7270 (iv).

Bill (No. 214) To authorize the granting of Subsidies in aid of the construction of the lines of railway therein mentioned. —(Mr. Emmerson.)
Res. prop., 6119; in Com. on Res., 6129, 6167; 1°* of B., 6182; 2°, and in Com., 6829; 3°*, 6845 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 215) To amend the National Transcontinental Railway Act.—(Mr. Fielding.)
1°, 6244; 2°, and in Com., 6857; 3°*, 6862 (iv).

Bill (No. 216, from the Senate) To incorporate the Grand River and Western Power Company.—(Mr. Crawford.)
1°*, 6371; 2°*, 6707; in Com., 6997, 7260 (iv).

Bill (No. 217) To incorporate the Temagami, Cobalt and Temiscamingue Railway Company.—(Mr. McCool.)
1°*, 6543; 2°*, 6707; in Com., and 3°*, 7270 (iv).

Bill (No. 218, from the Senate) For the relief of Nettie M. Bulmer.—(Mr. Calvert.)
1°*, 2°*, 6677; in Com., and 3°*, 6997 (iv).

Bill (No. 219) To amend the Pilotage Act.—(Mr. Brodeur.)
1°, 6537 (iv).

Bill (No. 220) To repeal the Act respecting Annuities for certain Privy Councillors.—(Mr. Fielding.)
1°, 6541; 2° m., 7569; in Com., 7619; 3° m., 7649 (iv).

Bill (No. 221) To incorporate the Prince Albert and North Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Crawford.)
1°*, 6677; 2°*, 6707; in Com., and 3°*, 7270 (iv).

Bill (No. 222) To provide for further advances to the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal.—(Mr. Brodeur.)
Res. prop., 5616 (iii); in Com. on Res., 6707; 1°* of B., 6708; 2°, and in Com., 6845; 3°*, 6854 (iv).

Bill (No. 223) To amend the Fisheries Act.—(Mr. Brodeur.)
In Com. on Res., 6707; 1°* of B., 6709; 2°, and in Com., 6854; 3°*, 6856 (iv).

Bill (No. 224) Relating to the Supreme Court of Judicature of the Province of New Brunswick.—(Mr. Aylesworth.)
1°, 6790; 2°, and in Com., 7143; 3°, 7188 (iv).

Bill (No. 225) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the Financial Year ending the 30th of June, 1906, and the period of nine months ending the 31st of March, 1907.—(Mr. Fielding.)
In Com. of Ways and Means, 7636; 1°*, 2°*, and in Com., 7636; 3°*, 7649 (iv).

Binder Twine manufactured in Kingston, Quantity on hand, Price, &c., Ques. (Mr. Elson) 3027 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 7529 (iv).

Binder Twine: *See* 'General Inspection Act.'

Birnie Postal Facilities, Pet. *re* Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5006 (iii).

Birthday Honours, Responsibility for Recommending: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 7459 (iv).

Blanche River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6985 (iv).

——— Wharf Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 6977 (iv).

'Blanketing System': *See* 'Homesteads.'

Blood Indian Reserve, Lease to McEwan Cattle Co., Cor. &c., M. for copies* (Mr. Sproule) 2274 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Taylor) 3713, 3796 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 955 (i).

Blooming Point Post Office, P. E. I., Pet. *re* Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. A. McLean) 332 (i).

Books, English and French Editions, Customs Duties *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 4248 (iii).

Borings, Experimental in Alberta, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5982, 5984 (iii).

Boulanger, Lt. Col., O.Cs., Reps. &c., *re* Dismissal: M. for copies* (Mr. Worthington) 345 (i).

Boundary and Demarcation Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 5858, 5876 (iii).

Boundary, Kamloops and Cariboo Central Ry. Co.'s B. No. 73 (Mr. D. Ross) 1°*, 969; 2°*, 1298; in Com., and 3°*, 1792 (i).

Bounties on Iron, Steel and Binder Twine, Total Amounts paid since 1896: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 7371 (iv).

'Boynton,' Tug, of Sault Ste. Marie Tug Co., Payments to: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 4093 (iii).

Brandon Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 6743 (iv).

Brandon Transfer Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 43 (Mr. Sifton) 1°*, 485; 2°*, 781 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2066 (ii).

Brantford, Customs Revenue, Duty collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 339 (i).

——— Excise Duty collected from 1900 to 1905: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 571 (i).

——— Postal Revenue, Value, Postal Notes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 339 (i).

——— Post Office, Total Amount of Wages, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 340 (i).

——— Public Building, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6734 (iv).

Bridge Strengthening, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 7502 (iv).

——— Cost of Steel Superstructures, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Haggart) in Com. of Sup., 7481 (iv).

——— General Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 5016 (iii).

British America Assurance Co.'s B. No. 198 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) M. to present Pet., 4991; 1°*, 5180; 2° m., 5180; in Com., 5500; 3°*, 5501 (iii).

British Canadian Loan and Investment Co., Limited B. No. 70 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) 1°*, 890; 2°*, 1298 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3434 (ii).

B. C. Land Sales, Conditions, Reps., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3971 (ii).

B. C. Shipping Interests, Govt. Aid to: Remarks (Mr. R. G. Macpherson) 1469 (i).
See 'Pacific Coast.'

British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 33 (Mr. Galliher) 1°*, 350; 2°*, 525 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2066 (ii).

British Medical Association Grant: in Com. of Sup., 7577 (iv).

Brockville Cheese Curing Room, Total Expenditure and Revenue: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 585 (i).

——— Correction of Answer to Mr. Taylor (Mr. Fisher) 969 (i).

——— Further Reference to Answer of Question (Mr. Taylor) 1005 (i).

——— Discrepancy in Answer: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 1572 (i).
See 'Cheese,' &c.

Brockville, Westport and Sault Ste. Marie, Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 6163 (iv).

Bronte Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6986 (iv).

Bronte Lighthouse: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 4788 (iii).

Brooks & Co., Banking Arrangements and Marine Deptl. Accounts: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 4840 (iii).

——— Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1103 (i).

Brothier, Desiré, Convict in B.C. Penitentiary, Release of: Ques. (Mr. Macpherson) 5183 (iii).

——— Questions *re*: Remarks (Mr. Macpherson) 5322 (iii).

——— Par. in B. C. Papers, Read (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4992 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Macpherson) in Com. of Sup., 7526 (iv).

Brown, H. P., Transfer of Grazing Lease to Galway Cattle Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 5182 (iii).
See 'Grazing.'

Budget, The: Financial Statement (Mr. Fielding) 3819 (ii).

——— Reply (Mr. Foster) 3839 (ii).

Budget, The, Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 2018 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 3411 (ii).

Buffalo, Niagara and Toronto Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 42 (Mr. German) 1°*, 485; 2°*, 781 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3953 (ii).

Buildings, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 6755 (iv).

Buildings, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 6743 (iv).

——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 6726 (iv).

——— Ont.: In Com. of Sup., 6733, 7037, 7701 (iv).

——— Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 7036 (iv).

Bulmer, Nettie M., Relief B. No. 218 (Mr. Calvert) 1°*, 2°*, 6677; in Com., and 3°*, 6997 (iv).

Buoys, Foreign-made, purchased by Canadian Govt. for Canada: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3407

Burk's Falls and French River Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 158 (Mr. McKenzie) 1°*, 3064; 2°*, 3243 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5400 (iii).

Burk's Falls and South River Ry. Co.'s Bill: M. to introduce: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) *re* Expiration of Time, 2811 (ii).

Business of the House: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 742, 889 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 1742 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Paterson) 713 (i).

——— Motion of Mr. R. L. Borden *re* Crown Lands: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4034 (iii).
See 'Govt. Business.'

Butter and Cheese Public Weigher, Apptmnt. at Montreal: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4704 (iii).
See 'Cheese,' &c.

Butter manufactured at N. S. Experimental Farms, Quantity, Cost, &c., Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5181 (iii).

By-Elections, Issue of Writs: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7696 (iv).

Cabinet Changes, ref. to in deb. on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 36 (i).
See 'Ministerial Changes.'

Caldwell, C. F., Applications *re* Coal Mining Lands: M. for Cor.* (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1741 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 2545 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1000, 1465 (i).
See 'Interior,' &c.

Calgary and Edmonton Ry. Co.'s B. No. 77 (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 1°*, 999; 2°*, 1298; in Com., and 3°*, 1792 (i).

Calgary and Edmonton Ry., Payments *re* Mining Rights: in Com. of Sup., 5862 (iii).

Calgary and Fernie Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 71 (Mr. Galliher) 1°*, 890; 2°*, 1298; in Com., and 3°*, 1792 (i).

Calgary Land Titles Land Offices, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 1676 (i).

——— Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 6752 (iv).

Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 24 (Mr. McColl) 1°*, 349; 2°*, 524; in Com., and 3°*, 1140 (i).

Campbell Milling Co., Flour furnished Penitentiaries: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) in Com. of Sup., 4135 (iii).

Campbellton Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 6935 (iv).
Campeau, Michael, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 835, 1374 (i).
Camp Grounds, Militia: in Com. of Sup., 7183 (iv).
See 'Militia.'
Canada Atlantic Ry. Co.'s. B. No. 39 (Mr. Macdonald) 1°*, 444; 2°* 569 (i); in Com., 2668, 2721 (ii).
Canada-Australian Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7556 (iv).
Canada Eastern Ry., Purchase of: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 5033 (iii).
Canadian Economic Lubricant Co., Amounts paid to, Contracts *re* &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 987 (i).
Canada Evidence Act Amt. B. No. 68 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1°*, 890; 2°, and in Com., 1265, 1751 (i); 3°*, 2161 (ii).
Canadian Fisheries Exhibition: in Com. of Sup., 3706 (ii).
Canadian Fog Signal Co., Amounts paid to: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 767 (i).
Canadian Life Insurance: *See* 'Insurance Cos.'
Canada and Mexico Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7554 (iv).
——— Contracts *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. A McLean, 2038 (ii).
Canada and Newfoundland Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7557 (iv).
Canada and S. Africa, Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7553 (iv).
Canadian Art International Catalogue of Scientific Literature, Grant: in Com. of Sup., 7578 (iv).
Canadian Bible Society, Auxiliary incorp. B. 20 (Mr. Cockshutt) 1°*, 349; 2°*, 524 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2666 (ii).
Canadian Handicrafts Guild incorp. B. No. 166 (Mr. Ames) 1°*, 3314; 2°*, 3435; in Com., and 3°*, 3953 (ii).
Canadian Labour Bureau, Action of Govt. *re* Leopold's Immigration Work: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 3407 (ii).
Canadian Lloyds, Limited incorp. B. No. 114 (Mr. Bickerdike) 1°*, 1576; 2°*, 1792 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5227 (iii).
Canadian-Minnesota Bridge Company B. No. 91 (Mr. Dyment) 1°*, 1252; 2°*, 1570 (i); Order for Com., 2067; in Com., 2499; in Com., and 3°*, 3187 (ii).
Canadian Niagara Power Co's. B. No. 36 (Mr. German) 1°*, 444; 2°*, 569 (i).
Canadian Northern Ry. Lands, Authority *re* Selection: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3739 (ii).
——— Extension of Area, Transfer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1858 (i).
——— Land Subsidy, Deptl. Letter, Sept. 16th, 1904: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3970 (ii).
Can. Northern Ry. Lands, Patents of Land Grants, Transfer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy 2075 (ii).
——— Man. and Southeastern Ry. Co. and Qu'Appelle, &c., Co. Cor., *re* Transference of, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ames) 208 (i).
——— Selection, Patents *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2725 (ii).
——— Selection of, O. C. *re* Aug. 1903: M. for Ret.* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 3277 (ii).
——— Selected and Patented, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2951 (ii).
Canadian Oil and Mines Co., and Western Oil Co., Names, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 3914 (ii).
Canadian Pacific Ry. Co's. B. No. 22 (Mr. Calvert) 1°*, 349; 2°* 524; in Com., and 3°*, 1140 (i).
C.P.R. Land Grant, Patents issued *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 331 (i).
——— Time Limit for Selection: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 765 (i).
Canadian Press Association, Annual Payments to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 1369 (i).
Canal Lockmasters, Regulations, &c., *re* Salaries: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4705 (iii).
CANALS:
Beauharnois, Regulation Weir: in Com. of Sup., 7512 (iv).
Canals: in Com. of Sup., 5079, 5343 (iii).
Canal Lockmasters, Regulations, &c., *re* Salaries: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 4705 (iii).
Carillon and Grenville Canals, Dams and Slides: in Com. of Sup., 5079 (iii).
Chambly, Godin, Dr. A., Payment to, for Damages *re* Overflow: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6087 (iii).
Cornwall Canal, Davis Contract: in Com. of Sup., 5344 (iii).
——— Electric Power, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 764 (i).
——— Delay in Hauling Vessels, Memorial *re*: M. for Copy* (Mr. Ames) 3277 (iii).
——— Locks, Rip-Rap Work &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5358 (iii).
——— St. Lawrence Power Co., Amounts paid *re* electric Lighting: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 5345 (iii).
Floyd, Messrs. C. and S., Compassionate Allowance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7484 (iv).
Galops Canal, Channel Completion: in Com. of Sup., 5158 (iii).
——— Leaks in Bank: in Com. of Sup., 5080 (iii).
——— North Channel: in Com. of Sup., 5158 (iii).
——— North Channel Dam: in Com. of Sup., 5357 (iii).
——— Original Estimate, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 989 (i).

CANALS—*Con.*

Lachine Canal, Electric Installation : in Com. of Sup., 7511 (iv).

——— Gratuity *re* Medical Attendance, for W. Mitchell : in Com. of Sup., 7500 (iv).

——— Lock Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 5358 (iii).

——— Rebuilding Slope Walls : in Com. of Sup., 5079 (iii).

——— Tolls on Coal : Remarks (Mr. Monk) 7063 (iv).

——— Staff : in Com. of Sup., 7483 (iv).

Murray Canal, Wooden Piers at Entrance, &c., Tenders *re* Construction : Ques. (Mr. Walsh) 6930 (iv).

Quebec Canals, Re-marking Boundaries, Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5079 (iii).

Rideau Canal, Reservation, Notice to Tenants *re* Warehouses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 4703

——— Swing Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 5174 (iii).

——— Water Power, Applications *re* Leases, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3742 (ii).

Sault Ste. Marie Canal, Construction : in Com. of Sup., 5165, 5357 (iii).

——— Shelter for Lockmen : in Com. of Sup., 7506 (iv).

Soulanges Canal, Construction : in Com. of Sup., 5357 (iii).

——— Lighting : in Com. of Sup., 7511 (iv).

Trent Canal, Arrangements *re* Control of Tributary Waters : Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 834 (i).

——— Balsam Lake Route : Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com of Sup., 5343 (iii).

——— Construction: in Com. of Sup., 5166 (iii).

——— Eastern Section, Depth of : Ques. (Mr. McCool) 836 (i).

——— Expenditure *re* Construction : M. for Ret. * (Mr. S. Hughes) 1379 (i).

——— inquiry for ret. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1581 (i).

——— Harbour Improvements : Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 7014 (iv).

——— Holland River : in Com. of Sup., 5167 (iii).

——— Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 5172 (iii).

——— Investigation *re* Route, Damage to Lift Locks, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 202 (i).

——— Kirkfield Lift Lock, Cor. &c.: M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Copy, 3253 (ii).

——— McLaren's Creek, Completion of Roadway : Ques. (Mr. S Hughes) 589 (i).

——— McLaughlin, R. J. and O'Connell, D., Amounts paid *re* Trent Canal Inquiry : Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 590 (i).

——— Newmarket and Holland River Canal Survey, Estimate *re* : Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1565 (i).

CANALS—*Con.*

Trent Canal, Official Inquiry *re* Faulty Construction, Remuneration, &c: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 189 (i).

——— Peterborough Lift Lock, Reps., Documents, &c. *re* Defects: M. for Copies * (Mr. Barker) 1871 (i).

——— Precautions taken *re* Levels, Date of Break in Lift Lock, &c. : Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 588 (i).

——— Staff : in Com. of Sup., 7499 (iv).

——— Supt., Instructions to Mr. Pearson, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1860 (i).

——— Surveys from Rice Lake, Damages *re* Break in Lock: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 449 (i).

——— Tugs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5360 (iii).

——— Water Power, Lease or Sale of: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1379 (i).

Waterways from Balsam Lake, &c., Cost of Opening: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 588 (i).

Welland Canal, Allanburg and Marlatt's Crossing Bridge, Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 580 (i).

——— Bridge and Locks, Amount spent in Repairs: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 580 (i).

——— Electric Power and Plant: in Com. of Sup., 5161 (iii).

——— Gratuity to D. W. Parr: in Com. of Sup., 7500 (iv).

——— Port Colborne Deepening: in Com. of Sup., 5357 (iii).

——— Port Colborne Elevators: in Com. of Sup., 5165 (iii).

——— Port Colborne Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 5165 (iii).

Williamsburg Canal, Gate Lifter: in Com. of Sup., 5358 (iii).

——— Staff, and Repairs, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 982 (i).

Canned Meats imported from U.S. for 1903-4-5: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 5005 (iii).

Cannington Postmaster, Amount of Salary for 1903-4-5: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 453 (i).

——— Complaints *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 190 (i).

——— Incomplete Answer to Question : Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 225 (i).

——— Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 421 (i).

——— Dismissal of Mr. H. D. Talbot: M. for Cor. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2469; Ques. of Order (Mr. Zimmerman): Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 2460; Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker), Irrelevancy of debate *re* quoting articles: Ruling 2467 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 540 (i).

Canning Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6787 (iv).

Canso Port, Medical Attendant for Sick Fishermen, Appnmt. as: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 426 (i).
Canton Fabre, Lake Temiskaming Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6943 (iv).
Cape Breton Electoral District: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 889 (i).
Cape Spencer Fog Signal: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 4957 (iii).
Cape Tormentine Harbour Works: in Com. of Sup., 6935 (iv).
Cape Tourmente and Murray Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 6148 (iv).
Carbide Supplies: in Com. of Sup., 4879, 4965 (iii).
Carillon and Grenville Canals, Dams and Slides: in Com. of Sup., 5079 (iii).
Cascumpec Sand Hills Channel, Amount expended *re* Closing: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1562 (i).
Castings purchased in Sorel by Marine Dept., Total Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 5007 (iii).
Cattle Diseases in Victoria County, Amounts paid for Losses: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 421
See 'Agriculture'.
Cattle Embargo in G. B.: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Jackson) in Com. of Sup., 7433 (iv).
Caves in B. C. Explorations, Payments *re*: in Com. of Sup., 5858 (iii).
Cement purchased from Charles Strubbe: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 4922 (iii).
Cement purchased by Marine Dept. from Merwin & Brooks & Co.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 3366 (ii).
Census and Statistics: in Com. of Sup., 7379 (iv).
See 'Quinquennial.'
Central Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 98 (Mr. Northrup) 1°*, 1364; 2°*, 1570 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3187 (ii).
Central Ry. Co. of Canada B. 149 (Mr. German) 1°*, 2321; 2°*, 2721 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5400 (iii).
Chamber Acoustics, Complaints *re* (Mr. Bole) 3154 (ii).
See 'House of Commons.'
Chamberlain, Dr. T. F., Apptmnt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Broder) 5004 (iii).
Champlain Monument: *See* 'Monument.'
Chance Harbour Breakwater, N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 6940 (iv).
Charges of Management: in Com. of Sup., 7451 (iv).
Charlottetown, P.E.I., Exhibition Grant: in Com. of Sup., 7440 (iv).
——— Ry. Station, Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2271 (ii).
See 'P.E.I.' &c.: 'Railways'.
Chartered Bank of London and Canada incorp. B. No. 204 (Mr. Campbell): 1°*, 5529; 2°*, 5751 (iii); in Com. and 3°*, 6706 (iv).
Châteauguay and Beauharnois Channel, Buoying of: Ques. (Mr Piché) 2724 (ii)
Châteauguay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6943 (iv).
Château-Richer Breakwater, Reconstruction &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3969 (ii).
——— Wharf Dues, Amount collected: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 4708 (iii).
Chatham Street Mail Delivery: Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Clements) 551 (i).
Chaudiere Falls Water Power, Leases, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 3997 (ii).
Cheese Curing Rooms, Total Expenditure and Revenue: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 586 (i).
——— Explanation *re* Statement (Mr. Fisher) 2240 (ii).
——— Payments *re* Boxes, &c., Statement *re* Answer to Questions (Mr Taylor) 2321 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Fisher) 2323 (ii).
See 'Brockville', &c.
Chicoutimi Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6728 (iv).
Chicoutimi Pulp Co., Contract *re* Piers and Booms: M. for copy* (Mr. Perley) 1379 (i).
Chicoutimi-Saguenay Dredging, Cor. &c.: M. for copy* (Mr. Girard) 3997 (ii).
Chicoutimi, Saguenay River Piers and Booms, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley 993 (i).
See 'Saguenay,' &c.
Children's Protection Act, B.C.; Cor. *re* Sale and Slavery of Young Girls: M. for copy* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1741 (i).
Chinese Immigration Act, Remuneration to Officials: in Com. of Sup., 7539 (iv).
Chockfish River Outlet Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6941 (iv).
Cigarettes, Prohibition, Legislation *re* Resolution passed by Hse.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 215 (i).
Cinq-Mars Before Bar of House for Further Examination: M. to read Article (Mr. Foster) 5266; Amt. (Mr. Aylesworth) 5269, Agreed to (Y. 82; N. 47) 5288; Rights of Press to Criticise (Mr. D. Ross) 5301 (iii); Denial of Statement read *re* Speech at Renfrew (Mr. Foster) 5301 (iii); Res. Censuring Mr. Cinq-Mars (Sir W. Laurier) 5310 (iii).
Cinq-Mars Before Bar of Hse.: M. (Mr. Foster) to read Article from Journals of Hse., at a former Sitting, 4792 (iii).
——— M. (Mr. Jackson) for translation of Article, 4794 (iii).
——— Questions asked (Mr. Foster) 4796 (iii).
——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to Adjourn for one week, 4797 (iii).
——— Charges *re* Speech at London, &c.: Denial (Mr. Foster) 5438 (iii).

Cinq-Mars, &c., Criticism in La Presse: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Foster) 4030 (iii).
——— Criticism in La Presse *re* Members: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Foster) M. to Summon before Bar of Hse., 4708-11 (iii).
——— Constitutionality of Procedure: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Foster) Case of Mr. Redmond in Imperial House of Commons quoted, 5085 (iii)
——— on Res. of Censure (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5314 (iii).
Citizens' Bank of Canada B. No. 187 (Mr. Guthrie) 1°*, 4897; 2°*, 5227; in Com., and 3°*, 5499 (iii).
Civil Govt.: in Com. of Sup. 7444 (iv).
——— Interior, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5509 (iii).
——— Militia, Deptl. Promotions: in Com. of Sup., 7182 (iv).
——— Public Works, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7021 (iv).
Civil Servants, Emplmt. from 1896 to 1905: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Sproule) 715 (i), 2160, 2699 (ii), 7358 (iv).
——— Outside Emplmt., Dismissals *re*: Ques. (Mr. Walsh) 455 (i).
——— Policy of Govt. *re* Extra Work, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Walsh) 327 (i).
Civil Service, Board of Examiners: in Com. of Sup., 416 (i).
——— List: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 485 (i).
Clinton Post Office, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gunn 1567 (i).
Coal Bituminous, Bonding in Canada, Refund of Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 1860 (i).
Coal Carriage for I.C.R., Surveys *re* Channel at River du Loup: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 454 (i).
Coal Lands in N. W. T., Applications by Mr. C. F. Caldwell: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1000 (i).
See 'Caldwell'.
Coal Lands leased, sold, &c., from 1896 to 1905, Areas, Names of Purchasers, &c.: M. for ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1741 (i).
Coal purchased from Allan SS. Co.: Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 4247 (iii).
Coal purchased by Marine and Fisheries Dept., Prices paid: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 2910, 3594 (ii).
Coal Rights, in Man., Cor. with Jos. Rirm, &c.: M. for copy* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 3997 (ii).
Coal Strike at Lethbridge, Stmnt. by Lt. Col. Fred. White: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 573 (i).
Coasting Trade of Canada Act Amts., Legislation *re*: prop. Res. (Mr. Clarke) 590 (i).
See 'Merchant Marine.'
Cobalt Range Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 159 (Mr. McCool) 1°*, 3064; 2°*, 3243 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5499 (iii).
Cobourg Piers, Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 6986 (iv).
Cochrane, Fred., Taken Prisoner by Russia: Remarks (Mr. Ward) 841 (i).
Coffin, David D., Dismissal as Postmaster, P. E. I.: M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor.*, 3997 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 3065 (ii).
Cold Storage and Atlantic Steamers: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 7412 (iv).
Coldwater and Lawson Mail Service, Amount paid *re* Contract: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 330 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 529 (i).
Collingwood Dry Dock, Cor. *re* Bonus: M. for copies* (Mr. Bennett) 774 (i).
——— Amount paid as Bounty: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 419, 574 (i).
——— Dredging Contracts: Inquiry for Rets. (Mr. Bennett) 1367 (i).
Collingwood Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6986 (iv).
Colonial Bank of Canada incorp. B. No. 188 (Mr. Calvert) 1°*, 4801; 2°*, 5227; in Com., and 3°*, 5499 (iii).
Colonization and Land Companies, Purchase of Land from Govt. since 1898: M. for ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1869 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1863 (i).
——— Inquiry for ret. (Mr. Foster) 3952 (ii).
——— O. C., Quoted by Mr. D. Ross in Debate: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 2080 (ii).
——— Rep. of Mr. Stevenson: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 4029 (iii).
Colonization Roads and Bridges: Man.: in Com. of Sup., 6997 (iv).
Columbia River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6995 (iv).
Columbia and Kootenay Ry. and Nav. Co.'s B. No. 34 (Mr. Galliher) 1°*, 350; 2°*, 525 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2066 (ii).
Commercial Agencies: in Com. of Sup., 7556 (iv).
——— Treaties, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7539 (iv).
Commercial Travellers: *See* 'Northwest Commercial, &c.'
Committees: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to add Names, 1668 (i), 5082 (iii).
——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 11 (i).
——— Lists Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 163 (i).
——— Sel. Standing: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7 (i).
Committees of House, Power to Recommend Expenditure: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 'May' quoted, 7460 (iv).
See 'House of Commons.'
Conmee and Bowman: *See* 'Great Lakes Dredging Co.'
Consular Agents and Trade Commissioners, Apptmnt. by Imp. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Kemp) 2084 (ii).

Controverted Elections, Judges' Certificates: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).

Co-operative Bill; *See* 'Industrial.'

Copper Cliff Postal Facilities: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 7693 (iv).

Copyright Act Amt. B. No. 189 (Mr. Macdonell) 1° m., 4791 (iii).

Cornwall Canal, Davis Contracts: in Com. of Sup., 5344 (iii).

——— Electric Power, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 764 (i).

——— Electrical Power, Delay in Hauling Vessels, Memorial *re*: M. for copy* (Mr. Ames) 3277 (ii).

——— Locks, Rip-rap Work &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5358 (iii).

Coughlin, B. J., Payments to for Supplies, Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 981 (i).

County Court Judges, Date of Commission, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2036 (ii).

——— Division of Districts, Population &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1153 (i).

——— Ont. Regulations *re* Number, Chap. 54, ss. 5 and 6, Amendments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1747 (i).

Crapaud Harbour Channel Dredging: Ques. (Mr. A. McLean) 329 (i).

Crawford Bay and St. Mary's Ry. Co.'s B. No. 53 (Mr. Galliher) 1°*, 656; 2°*, 928; in Com., and 3°*, 1569 (i).

Criminal Code, 1892 (payments to members) Amt. B. No. 4 (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1° m., 16; 2° m., 437; ref. to Sel. Com., 443 (i); in Com., 7648; 3°*, 7648 (iv).

——— B. No. 155 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1° m., 2452; 2° m., 3099; in Com., and 3°*, 3101 (ii).

——— (lotteries) Amt. B. No. 209 (Mr Carvell) 1°*, 5992 (iii); 2° m., and in Com., 7660; 3°*, 7664 (iv).

Criminal Statistics Report: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 1667 (i).

Crooked Lake Indian Reserve, Surrender of: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 946 (i).

Crown Lands, Administration of by Dept. of Interior: Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 4157; Amt. (read) 4187 (iii).

Debate:

(Mr. Oliver) 4188; (Mr. Bristol) 4219; (Mr. Bole) 4235; (Mr. Lake) 4251; (Mr. Sifton) 4267; (Mr. Foster) 4325; (Mr. Turriff) 4354; (Mr. Bennett) 4384, 4399; (Mr. Adamson) 4418; (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 4438; (Mr. Crawford) 4573: (Mr. Ames) 4595; (Mr. Burrows) 4607; (Mr. W. J. Roche) 4616; (Mr. Guthrie) 4651; (Mr. Bennett) 4654; (Mr. Sam. Hughes) 4673; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4679; (Mr. Osler) 4690; (Mr. Bourassa) 4692.

Amt. (Mr. Borden) Neg. (Y. 52; N. 99) 4698.

Crown Lands, &c.: Notice of Motion (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4028, 4034 (ii).

See 'Interior'.

Culling Timber, Supervisor's Office: in Com. of Sup., 7542 (iv).

Cumberland, B. C. Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6755 (iv).

Currency Act Amt. B No 196 (Mr. Fielding) 1° m., 5082; 2° m., and in Com., 5557; 3°*, 5559 (iii).

Customs Tariff Act Amt., B No. 175 (Mr. Fielding) 1° m., 4029; 2° m., and in Com., 5102; 3°*, 5103 (iii).

CUSTOMS:

Apples, Dried and Green, German Duties, Changes *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 978 (i).

Baker, I. G., & Co. Refund of Customs Duties: in Com. of Sup., 7515 (iv).

Books, English and French Editions, Customs Duties *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 4248 (iii).

Brantford Customs Revenue, Duty collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 339 (i).

——— Excise Duty collected for 1900 to 1905: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 571 (i).

Canned Meats imported from U.S. for 1903-4-5: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 5005 (iii).

Coal Bituminous, Bonding in Canada, Refund of Duties, &c.: Ques (Mr Taylor) 1860 (i).

Customs Dept., Criticisms *re* Entries for Dredges: Remarks (Mr. Paterson) in Com. of Sup., 4846 (iii).

——— Deptl. Ret.: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6802 (iv).

——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 360 (i), 7514 (iv).

——— Duties collected on English and French Books: Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 4248 (ii).

——— Inspectors Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 510 (i).

——— Miscellaneous Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 7515 (iv).

——— Outside Ports, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 491 (i).

——— Statistics, Compilation of: in Com. of Sup., 510 (i).

——— Yukon Ter.: in Com. of Sup., 516 (i).

Emerson Customs Collector, Re-instatement of: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5995 (iii).

Emerson Customs-House, Irregularities, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1582 (i).

Emerson Customs Officials, Charges against Reps., Evidence, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2038 (ii).

German Discriminatory Duties on Green Dried Apples, Changes *re* Rates: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 978 (i).

German Tariff on Canadian Goods and American Goods: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 989 (i).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*
German Tariff, &c.: Changes (remarks) 3713 (ii).
——— Cor., &c.: Inquiry (Mr. Armstrong) for Ret. 7359 (iv).
——— Information regarding: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1258 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 1202 (i).
——— Surtax, Restriction Rates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 325 (i).
——— Tariffs in Relation to Canada: M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 1871 (i).
——— Translation of: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 4994 (iii).
Hogs imported into Canada and Slaughtered for Export, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 176 (i).
Japanese Treaty, Reduced Tariff Arrangements: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5754 (iii).
Marble Workers of Toronto, Complaints *re* American Importation at Undervaluation at Customs: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 5321 (iii).
Patrol Boats *re* Customs: in Com. of Sup., 4896 (iii).
Piping, Butt, and Lap Welded, Duty, Quantity imported from U.S., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 175 (i).
St. Thomas, Collector of Customs, Removal of Mr. Darroch: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Ingram) 205 (i).
Tariff Commission Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 7455 (iv).
Theatrical Advertising Matter, Application *re* Removal of Duty: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 5507 (iii).
Tobacco, Raw Leaf, Increase of Duty, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 176 (i).
Woodstock Collector of Customs, Charges *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 3251 (ii).
Cyclone Woven Wire Fence Co.'s Patent Relief B. No. 136 (Mr. Macdonell) 1°*, 1743; 2°*, 1857 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3187 (ii).
Dalhousie Harbour Improvements in Com. of Sup., 6941 (iv).
Daly & Hanman, Emplymt. of Dredges, 1905, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 572, 761 (i).
Dams in Ontario, Govt. Control of, Papers laid on Table, 1575 (i).
D'Arcy Island Lazaretto, B.C., Supervision by Dom. Govt. (remarks) in Com. on Leprosy Bill (Mr. Macpherson) 2186 (ii).
Davis Contract *re* Electric Power, Cornwall Canal: in Com. of Sup., 5344 (iii).
See 'Canals,' &c.
Debates, Official: M. for Com. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 126 (i).
——— 1st Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. Gervais) 162 (i).
——— 2nd Rep. of Com.: M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 2021 (ii).
Debates, Official, 3rd Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. Gervais) 6244; M. (Mr. Gervais) to ref. back to Com., 6677 (iv).
Debates, Official: in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
Decorum in Debate, Interruptions and Confusion: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3072 (ii)
Demers, Jos., Claims *re* Damage to Property: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 762 (i).
Deptl. Buildings (New) Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 6724 (iv).
See 'Public Works, Ottawa.'
Deptl. Cleaning, Caretaker, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 416 (i).
Deptl. Files, Access to by Members of Parlt. *re* Returns: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2927 (ii).
Deputy Ministers, Length of Service, Salaries, Official Dress, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson 342 (i).
Descente des Femmes Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Sup., 7020 (iv).
D'Escousse Wharf, Expenditure *re* Construction, 1903-5: Ques. (Mr. W. Wright) 990 (i).
Deutschman, C. H., Payments for Services in Cave Explorations, B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 5858 (iii).
Dickenson's Landing Lighthouse, Cost *re* Change to Acetylene Gas &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 981 (i).
Dionne, Louis, Harbour Master at Montmagny, Salary, Revenues, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 4707 (iii).
Dipper Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6941 (iv).
D'Israeli Wharf, Completion, Estimated Cost, &c., Ques. (Mr. Blain) 2268 (ii).
——— Construction, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1377 (i).
——— Expenditure *re* Authority for, &c.: (remarks) in debate on Public Works Expenditure, 3425 (ii).
D'Israeli Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6943 (iv).
Divorce: *See* 'Allen, James,' 'Barker, Harriette Wesley,' 'Bulmer, Nettie M.' 'Field, Jane Frances,' 'Holmes, Charles Wm.', 'Irvine, Minnie Florence,' 'Mackintosh, Eileen Mary,' 'Ogden, Wm. Edward,' 'Peer, John Edward,' 'Preston, Mary Emeline,' 'Spencer, Muriel Violet,' 'Vaughan, Wm. Napoleon,' 'Wight, Frederick Wm.'
Dog-Fish Experiments, Expenditure *re*: remarks (Mr. Wm. Wright) in Com. of Sup., 4938 (iii).
Dog-Fish Extermination: in Com. of Sup., 3707 (ii).
Dom. Buildings, Heating, and Coal, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6764 (iv).
——— Water Service: in Com. of Sup., 6765 (iv).
——— Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6759, 7013 (iv).
See 'Public Works, Ottawa.'

Dom. Coal Co., Inquiry for ret.: (Mr. A. Martin) 1581 (i).
See 'Glace Bay,' &c.
Dom. Controverted Elections Act (corrupt practices) Amt. B. No. 5 (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1° m., 16; 2° m., 443 (i).
Dom. Day Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to sit on Saturday, 6537 (iv)
——— Flying of flag: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 7459 (iv).
See 'Flag.'
Dominion Elections Act (By-elections) Amt. B. No. 2 (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1° m., 15; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 437 (i).
Dominion Fire Insurance Co.'s B. No. 148 (Mr. Macpherson) 1°*, 2321 (ii).
Dominion Lands, Administration of by Govt.: Amt. (Mr. Ames) on M. for Sup., 3101, 3155
Dom. Lands Branch, and Surveyor General Reps.: Inquiry for (Mr. Ames) 716 (i).
Dom. Lands Commissioner for 1902, 1903, 1904 and 1905: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2268 (ii).
Dom. Lands, Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 5939 (iii).
See 'Interior.'
Dom. Lands, Exceeding 160 acres, Sale of, &c. Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5502 (iii).
Dominion Lands and Homestead Laws, Abuses *re*: Notice of Motion (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3064 (ii).
Dom. Lands: in Com. of Sup., 5614, 5934 (iii).
Dom. Lands Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 5881, 5977 (iii).
See 'Surveys.'
Dominion Police Commissioner's Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 269 (i).
Dom. Police, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 490 (i).
Dom. and Provincial Litigated Matters: in Com. of Sup., 7577 (iv).
Dominion Statistician, Superannuation of Mr. Johnston: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 3971 (ii).
Dom. Trust Co.: *See* 'Empire Trust Co.'
Doncaster Indians, Complaints *re* Cutting of Timber: Remarks (Mr. Walsh) in Com. of Sup., 1248 (i).
Dorion and McAfee, Dismissal and Re-instatements: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 526 (i).
Dorset Wharf, Construction of: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 419 (i).
Doull, Capt., Apptmnt. to Royal Canadian Regiment: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4799 (iii).
Dredging in Prov. of Ont., Amounts paid and unpaid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 417 (i).
Dredging in Ont., Amounts paid, Work performed, &c.: M. for Ret. * (Mr. Bennett) 773 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2721 (ii).
Dredging Plant, New, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 6996 (iv).
——— Ont. and Que.: in Com. of Sup., 6995 (iv).
Dredging, Que. and Ont.: in Com. of Sup.. 7014 (iv).
Dredge. New, St. Lawrence Ship Channel: in Com. of Sup., 7560 (iv).
Dredges under Charge of Mr. Cowie: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4154 (iii).
Dredges under charge of Mr. Lafleur: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4154 (iii).
Drug and Proprietary Medicine Trade, Mr. A. E. DuBerger's Rep.: M. for Copy * (Mr. Parmelee) 1871 (i).
See 'Medicines.'
Dugas, Judge, Yukon Ter., Litigation *re* Expenditure: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iv).
Duncan, A. G., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 424 (i).
Duryea, Chester Burnell, Patent Relief B. No. 79 (Mr. Belcourt) 1°*, 999; 2°*, 1298 (i); in Com., 2194 (ii).
Duval, Mr. J. E., Resignation from Ry. Commission, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 2728 (ii).
Eagle Creek Homestead Rights: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 1358 (i).
Easter Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1253 (i).
Eastern Block, Deptl. Building, Additions: in Com. of Sup., 6713 (iv).
Eastern Ry. Supply Co., Contracts with Govt. Tenders, Cor., &c., M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barker) 207 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Barker) 173 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Barker) 716 (i).
——— Ret. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 840 (i).
Echo Bay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 7049 (iv).
——— Contract Price *re* Construction, Specifications, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 2032 (ii).
Edmonton and Athabaska Landing Telegraph Extension, in Com. of Sup., 7012 (iv).
Edmonton, Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 6753, 7042 (iv).
——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6753 (iv).
Edmunds, Henry, Patent Relief B. No. 69 (Mr Campbell) 1°*, 890; 2°*, 1298 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 2205 (ii).
Election Appeals, Supreme Court Judgments: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
Election Committee, Reps. *re* Amendments to Election Laws: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4801 (iii).
Election of Members, Prevention of Corrupt Practices, &c., on Order being called for Sel. Com.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 211, 883 (i).
Elections of Members to H. of C. (corrupt practices): M. for Sel. Com., (Mr. R. L. Borden) 235; M. for Com. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 252 (i).
Election Petitions, Dismissed, Judges' Reps.: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).

Election Petitions, Supreme Court Judgments: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
See 'Dom. Election Bills', &c.

Electoral and Independance of Parlt. Bills: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Rep. of Committees, 7064 (iv).

Electoral Districts, Vacancies, Issue of Writs: Notifications (Mr. Speaker) 3 (i).
See 'Renfrew', &c.

Electoral Lists for N. S. Printing by Dom. Govt., Distribution of Copies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2454 (ii).

Electric Light and Gas Inspections, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2608 (ii).
See 'Inland Revenue'.

Electric Lighting Parliament Buildings, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1567 i).
See 'Public Works, Ottawa'.

Electric Power and Gas Exportation Regulation B. No. 145 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1° m., 2159; 2° m., 3077; in Com., 3078 (ii), 4035 (iii).

Elgin County Mail Contracts, Location, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ingram) 3997 (ii).

Elgin East Electoral District, Issue of Writ: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 6165 (iv).

Elgin Road Station, I.C.R., Piling Grounds, Purchase of Land by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 583 i).

Embargo on Canadian Cattle, Repeal of, Representations *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 183 (i).

Emerson Customs Officials, Charges against. Reps., Evidence, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2038 (ii).

——— Irregularities, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1582 (i).

——— Collector, Re-instatement of: Remarks (Mr. Fisher) 5995 (iii).

Empire Trust Co.'s B. No. 135 (Mr. Worthington) 1°*, 1743; 2°*, 1857 (i); on Order for Com., 4945; in Com., 5221, 5446, 5682; 3°*, 5683 (iii).

Erie, London and Tillsonburg Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 117 (Mr. M. S. Schell) 1°*, 1667; 2°*, 1792 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 4197 (iii).

Erie, Ontario Power Co.'s B. No. 107 (Mr. German) 1°*, 1465; 2°*, 1710 (i); in Com., 2668; 3°*, 2668 (ii).

Esquimalt Defences, Permanent Force, Annual Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 184 (i).

Esquimalt and Nanaimo Ry. Co.'s B. No. 28 (Mr. Sloan) 1°*, 350; 2°*, 525; in Com., and 3°*, 1140 (i).

Essex Terminal Ry. Co.'s B. No. 92 (Mr. Clarke) 1°*, 1252; 2°*, 1570 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2066 (ii).

Estimates, 1906-7: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 125 (i).

——— Suppl. (1906): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 2016 (ii).

Estimates, Suppl.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 5697 (iii).

Exchequer Court Act Amt. B. No. 156 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 2°*, 3523; in Com., 3524; 3°*, 3528 (ii).

Exchequer Court, Administration of Justice: in Com. of Sup., 488 (i).

Excise, Duty Pay at Distilleries: in Com. of Sup., 7513 (iv).

Excise Examinations, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1548 (i).

Experimental Farms, Additional Branch Stations: in Com. of Sup., 7411 (iv).

——— Number maintained by Govt. in Can., &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 974 (i).

Experimental Farm Report: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 1561 (i).

Experimental Stations at P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 574 (i).

Experimental (Central) Farm, Total Expenditure from 1890 to 1905: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 761 (i).

——— Total Expenditure for 1904-5: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 2264 (ii).
See 'Agriculture'.

Experimental Farms: in Com. of Sup., 7386 (iv).

Exports to Germany of Farm Produce from 1896 to 1905: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 773 (i).
See 'German'.

Express Companies B. No. 82 (Mr. Alcorn) 1° m., 999 (i); 2°, and ref. to Sel. Com., 4734 (iii).
See 'Ry. B. 62.'

Express Companies Bill: Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2976 (ii).

——— Ref. to Committees: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4537 (iii).

Facilities, Increased, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7503 (iv).

Fairford River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6994 (iv).

Farmers Bank of Canada B. No. 127 (Mr. Calvert) 1°*, 1743, 2°*, 1857 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3236 (ii).

Farm Bulletins, Printing and Distribution: in Com. of Sup., 7411 (iv).

Farm Implements and Seed Grain to Indians, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 1079 (i).

Farran's Point Acetylene Gas Plant, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1677 (i).

Fernie Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6757 (iv).

Field, Jane Frances Relief B. No. 191 (Mr. McCarthy) 1°*, 5081; 2°*, 5227; in Com., and 3°*, 6034 (iii).

'Fielding,' Dredge, Estimated and Total Cost of: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4700 (iii).

Files of Depts.: *See* Deptl. Files.

Financial Statement : *See* 'Budget.'
FINANCE :
American Silver, Amount collected: Ques. Mr. Blain) 1565 (i).
See 'Coins'.
Assay Office Vancouver, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 5944 (iii).
Bounties on Iron, Steel and Binder Twine, Total Amounts paid since 1896 : Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 7371 (iv).
Charges of Management : in Com. of Sup., 7451 (iv).
Dom. and Provincial Litigated Matters : in Com. of Sup., 7577 (iv).
Estimates, 1906-7 : Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 125 (i).
See 'Estimates'.
Finance, Deptl. Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 366 (i), 7452 (iv).
Loans, Temporary Govt., Outstanding and Rate of Interest : Ques. (Mr R L. Borden) 171 (i).
Money Lenders Bill, Legislation *re* ; Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6125 (iv).
Pacific Cable, Deficit, Payments *re* : in Com. of Sup., 7577 (iv).
——— Statement read (Mr. Fielding) 7692 (iv).
Preferential Trade with G.B., False Declarations *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2548 (ii).
P.E.I. Provincial Subsidies, Cor. *re* Basis of Agreement : M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 774 (i).
Provincial Subsidies, Conference *re* Readjustment: Ques. (Mr. Parmelee) 195 (i).
Receiver General's Office : in Com. of Sup., 7451 (iv).
See 'Budget', 'Ways and Means'.
Fire Extinguishers for Lighthouse Service : in Com. of Sup., 4959 (iii).
Fiscal Year, Change of, B. No. 162 (Mr. Fielding) 1° m., 3065 (ii); 2° m. and in Com., 5093, 5559 ; 3°*, 5560 (iii).
Fiscal Year, Changes re : Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 10 (i).
Fisher, Hon. Mr., Ref. to Speech in deb. on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 37 (i).
Fisheries Act Amt. B. No. 223 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 6707 ; 1°*, of B., 6709 ; 2°, and in Com., 6854 ; 3°*, 6856 (iv).
FISHERIES :
Bag-net and Trap-net Licenses, Queens Co., N.S.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 4156 (iii).
Bounty Distribution : in Com. of Sup., 3706 (ii).
Canadian Fisheries Exhibition : in Com. of Sup.,3706 (ii).
Cowie's Dam, N.S., Fish Dam, Cost *re* Construction : Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1867 (i).
——— M. for Copies* (Mr. Crocket) 1871 (i).

FISHERIES—*Con.*
Customs Collection from U.S. Vessels on Great Lakes : in Com. of Sup., 3710 (ii).
Dog Fish Extermination: in Com. of Sup., 3707 (ii).
——— Expenditure *re* Remarks, (Mr Wm. Wright) in Com. of Sup., 4938 iii).
Fish Curing Establishments: in Com. of Sup., 3707 (ii).
Fish entered for Export Duty at Port Arthur, &c., Classification, &c. from 1890 to 1905, Value, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 996 (i).
Fishery Conditions on Great Lakes, Board of Investigation: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 575 (i).
Fisheries on Great Lakes, Protection, Rep. *re* Spawn Taking by Americans: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 762 (i).
Fisheries, Sea and Inland, Proprietary Rights Vested in Govt., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 773 (i).
Fish Hatcheries : in Com. of Sup., 3700, 3709 (ii).
——— Establishment of on Great Lakes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 190 (i).
Goodall, Mr. J. A., Compensation *re* Loss of Fishery Rights : Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 6088 (iii).
Jurisdiction over In Shore, Speech of Lt. Governor of P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 767 (i).
Lake Winnipeg Fisheries, Steamer: in Com. of Sup., 7563 (iv).
Overseers and Inspectors: in Com. of Sup., 3692, 3707 (ii).
Pickerel Fishing on Lake Huron, Date of Close Season : Ques. (Mr. Gunn) 2034 (ii).
P.E.I. Fisheries, Cor. *re* Control by Govt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lefurgey) 997 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lefurgey) 3076 (ii).
——— Protection Service: in Com. of Sup., 3703, 3709 (ii).
——— Protection along Manitoulin Island and White Fish Island: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 3710 (ii).
Robertson, Andrew C., Fishery Inspector, Aptmnt. and Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 4155 (iii).
Souris Fish Drier, Construction, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1373 (i).
Weir Licenses, Charlotte County, N.B., Number granted, 1906: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 1565 (i).
Flags at Half-mast, Occasions and Authority for Raising: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 3906 (ii).
Flag on Parlt. Buildings on Dom. Day: Remarks (Mr. Elson) 7184 (iv).
See 'Dom. Day'.
Flour for Penitentiaries, Tenders *re*: Remarks (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com. of Sup., 940 (i).
See 'Justice.'

Floyd, Messrs C. and S., Compassionate Allowance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7484 (iv).
Fog Alarms: in Com. of Sup., 3691 (ii).
See 'Marine', &c.
Fog Signals, Amount for Canadian Fog Signal Co.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 767 (i).
Fording Valley Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 197 (Mr. Galliher) 1°*, 5180; 2°*, 5400; in Com., 6035; 3°*, 6035 (iii).
Forest Reserves B. No. 47 (Mr. Oliver) 1° m., 559 (i); 2° m., and in Com., 2832, 3318, 3412, 3528 (ii), 5416, 5537; 3°*, 5556 (iii); on Sen. Amts., 6829 (iv).
——— List of Reserves: Read (Mr. Oliver) 3319 (ii).
Fort William and Port Arthur Terminal Ry. and Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 120 (Mr. Macpherson) 1°*, 1667; 2°*, 1792 (i); in Com., 5400; 3° m., 5446 (iii).
Fox River Breakwater, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1151 (i).
Fredericton Cavalry Depot, N.B., Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 186 (i).
'Free Press,' Man. and 'Der Nordwester Publishing Co.', Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 991 (i).
Freight Charges, I.C.R., on Steel and Fish Products: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 449 (i).
French River Lighthouse, Construction. Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 3601 (ii).
French River Lighthouse for Ontario Lumber Co., Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 1867 (i).
French River Water Power Privileges, Pending Applications, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5003 (iii).
French Village Post Office, P.E.I., Change of Location: M. for Pets.* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 345 (i).
Fruit Conference at Ottawa, Printing of Rep.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5503 (iii).
Fruit Marks Act (apples) Amt. B. No. 101 (Mr. Fisher) 1° m., 1364 (i); 2° m., and in Com., 2162; in Com., 2550; 3°*, 2566 (ii).
Gagne's, Judge, Sons employed in legal firm of Price & Co.: Ques. (Mr. W. McIntyre) 7371 (iv).
Gallant, W. A., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 1104 (i).
Galliher, L. L., Dismissal from Wilton Post office, Apptmnt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 835 (i).
Galops Canal, Channel Completion: in Com. of Sup., 5158 (iii).
——— Leaks in Bank: in Com. of Sup., 5080 (iii).
——— North Channel Dam: in Com. of Sup., 5357 (iii).
——— Original Estimate, Payments *re*: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 989 (i).
'Galveston' Dredge, Purchase by Dom. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 2456 (ii).
——— Purchase of by Marine Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 2921 (ii).
Game Preservation Act (unorganized ter.) Amt. B. No. 154 (Mr. Oliver) 1°*, 2451; 2°, and in Com., 2825; 3°*, 2826 (ii).
Gas Buoys *re* Lighthouse Service: in Com. of Sup., 4872, 4951 (iii).
Gas Explosions *re* Lighthouses, Compensation for Damages: in Com. of Sup., 4868 (iii).
Gas and Light Inspectors, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7513 (iv).
Gelinas, Mr., Sec. Pub. Works, Travelling Expenses: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 398 (i).
General Accident Assurance Co. of Canada incorp. B. No. 203 (Mr. Campbell) 1°*, 5529; 2°*, 5751 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6706 (iv).
General Expenses *re* Indians: in Com. of Sup., 960 (i).
General Inspection Act Amt. B. No. 165 (Mr. Hall) 1°m., 3234 (ii).
Geological Report, Translation of: in Com. of Sup., 5983 (iii).
Geological Survey, Apptmnt. of Director: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 712 (i).
——— Director's Salary: in Com. of Sup., 5978 (iii).
——— Launch purchased for Coast Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 5979 (iii).
Geological Specimens for Victoria Museum, Purchase of: in Com. of Sup., 5983 (iii).
Geological Survey, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 405 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 5879 (iii).
See 'Victoria Museum.'
Georgeville Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 6777 (iv).
Georgian Bay Ship Canal, Instructions issued to Engineers, Names of Employees, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Taylor) 2951 (ii).
Georgian Bay Canal Surveys, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 335 (i).
Georgian Bay, Survey of French River, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6772 (iv).
Georgian Bay Islands, Indian Reserves, Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 724 i).
See 'Indians,' 'Interior,' 'Giant's Tomb.'
——— Timber Lands, Leases to P. Ryan: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 932 (i).
Georgian Bay Laboratory: in Com. of Sup., 3707 (ii).
German Surtax, Restriction Rates, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 325 (i).
German Tariff on Canadian Goods and American Goods: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 989 (i).
See 'Exports,' &c.

German Tariff, duty on Green and Dried Apples, Changes *re* Rates: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 978 (i).

German Tariffs in Relation to Canada: M. (Mr. Armstrong) for Cor., 1871 (i).

German Tariff, Changes (remarks) 3713 (ii).

——— Information regarding: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1258 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 1202 (i).

——— Inquiry (Mr. Armstrong) for Ret., 7359 (iv).

——— Translation of: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 4994 (iii).

Giant's Tomb Island, Sale of Timber, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bennett) 1380 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 932, 1228 (i).

——— Mis-statements by Supt. General of Indian Affairs: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5333 (iii).

See 'Pedley,' 'Georgian Bay,' 'Stafford,' &c.

Glace Bay Harbour Improvements, Cor., Specifications, Plans, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 428 (i).

See 'Dom. Coal Co.'

Glace Bay Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6774 (iv).

Glace Bay Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6727 (iv).

Glanders, Compensation *re* Slaughtered Animals: Remarks (Mr. Barr) in Com. of Sup., 2683 (ii).

——— Number of Horses tested with Mallein in Man. and Sask., Result, Compensation paid, &c.: M. for ret.* (Mr. Staples) 428 (i).

——— Number of Horses tested with Mallein in Man. and N.W. Ters.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 336 (i).

——— Number of Mallein Tests during 1905: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 179 (i).

——— Slaughtering of Horses: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 7442 (iv).

Gobeil, Mr., Dep. Min. of Public Works, Additional Pay as arbitrator: Remark in Com. of Sup., 371 (i).

Goderich Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6989 (iv).

Godin, Dr. A., Payment to for Damages *re* Chambly Canal Overflow: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 6087 (iii).

Goldie & McCullough, Purchases of Steel Boilers, &c. by Marine and Fisheries Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 3379 (ii).

Gold and Silver Marks Act Amt. B. No. 211 (Mr. Fielding) 1°*, 5992 (iii); 2° m., 6248; in Com., 7565; 3°*, 7569 (iv).

Goodall, Mr. J. A., Compensation *re* Loss of Fishery Rights: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 6088 (iii).

Gooderham Post Office, Charges against Postmistress, &c.: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 1583 (i).

Goose Harbour Buoys, Contractor *re* Setting out: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 3742 (ii).

Govt. Business: M. to take Precedence on Mondays (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4568 (iii).

——— Precedence on Thursdays: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1253 (i).

——— Precedence on Wednesdays: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2811; Remarks *re* Motion, (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2809 (ii).

——— Precedence on Wednesdays, Correction *re* Votes and Proceedings: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3063 (ii).

———Procedure, &c.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7184 (iv).

See 'Business of the House.'

Govt. Legislation, Further, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5532 (iii).

Govt. of N. W. T., Registry Offices: in Com. of Sup., 5528 (iii).

Govt. Property destroyed by Fire, Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 581 (i).

Govt. Steamers carrying passengers: Remarks (Mr. Brodeur) 1009 (i).

Govt. Steamers, Maintenance and Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 3200 (ii), 4089 (iii).

Govt. Steamers, Supplies and Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 3350, 3803, 3934, (ii).

Govt. Steamers, Supplies and Expenditure: Explanation read (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. of Sup., 4786, 4816 (iii).

Govt. Vessels, Number of Officers, Crews, Emplymt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 994, 1100 (i).

See 'Marine.'

Gov. Gen.'s Cars, Purchase of: in Com. of Sup., 7511 (iv).

Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office: in Com. of Sup., 7579

——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 357 (i).

——— Explanation *re* Salaries: (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. of Sup., 416 (i).

'Graft' by Members of Parliament, and Ministers, Charges *re* (Mr. Bennett) ref. to in debate on Tower of West Block Collapse (Mr. Bennett) 1292 (i).

Grain Elevator at St. John. N. B., Cost, Capacity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stockton) 2272 (ii).

Grain Inspection Act Amt. B. No. 207 (Mr. Fisher) 1°*, 5615; 2° m., 5886; in Com., 5896; 3°*, 5903 (iii).

Grain Inspection Act, Memorials from Man. &c. *re* Changes: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 976 (i).

Grain Inspection, *re* Man. Grain Act, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7541 (iv).

Grain Trade of the N.W.: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 7425 (iv).

Grand Forks Cattle Co., Information *re*, Land Sales to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 2036 (ii).

Grand River and Western Power Co.'s incorp. B. No. 216 (Mr. Crawford) 1°*, 6371; 2°*, 6707; in Com., 6997, 7260 (iv).

Grand River, Dunnville, Amount spent for dredging: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 579 (i).

Grande Rivière du Beaupré Wharf: in Com., of Sup., 6973 (iv).

G. T. Ry. and I.C.R. Arbitration: Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 224 (i).

G. T. Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 58 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) 1° m., 743; on Order for 2°, 1147 (i).

——— Telegraph Co.'s incorp. B. No. 61 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) 1°*, 744; 2°*, 1298 (i); in Com., 2712 (ii); 4539, 4746; 3° m., 4758, 4995 (iii).

——— Branch Lines incorp. B. No. 75 (Mr. Crawford) 1° m., 999; 2°* 1298 (i); in Com., 5460, 5683, 5950, 6023, 6075 (iii); 3° m., 6609; 3°*, 6706 (iv).

Grand Trunk Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 84 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) 1°*, 1149; 2°*, 1369 (i); in Com., 2244, 2702; 3°*, 2703 (ii).

——— (securities) Amt. B. No. 215 (Mr. Fielding) 1° m., 6244; 2° m., and in Com., 6857; 3°*, 6862 (iv).

G. T. Pacific Ry., Award of Tenders: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 655, 973, 1464, 1466 (i).

——— Amount of Construction Contract from Quebec Westward: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 1745 (i).

——— Construction, Emplymt. of Chinese Labour: Remarks (Mr. Smith) 1000 (i).

——— Construction, Mountain Division, Letter from Mr. Chas. M. Hays, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Chisholm) 3905 (ii).

——— Construction, Protection of Labourers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Smith) 336 (i).

——— Food Supplies for Exploration Parties, Purchase of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1152 (i).

——— Mining Rights in Lands, O.C., Memorandum, &c.: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3713 (ii).

——— Mining Rights: Inquiry for Cor. (Mr. Foster) 3909 (ii).

——— Surveys, Cor. with G. T. Construction Co., &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Crocket) 203 (i).

——— Surveys, Cor. with Transcontinental Ry. Commission, on M. (Mr. Crocket) 203 (i).

——— Surveys between Quebec and Moncton, Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. Crocket) for Copies, 1419, 1711 (i).

——— Surveys between Winnipeg and Moncton, Completion of: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 766 (i).

——— Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5115 (iii).

——— Tenders, Details *re* Two Sections of N. T. Ry.: Remarks (Mr. J. T. Schell) 4034 (iii).

See 'National Transcontinental.'

Grande Vallée des Monts Wharf, Date of Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1370 (i).

——— Par. in 'Le Canada': Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Monk) 3796 (ii).

——— Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1150 (i).

——— Total Cost, Income, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 341 (i).

Grand Valley Ry. Co.'s B. No. 130 (Mr. Calvert) 1°*, 1743 (i); 2°*, 2066 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 6034 (iii).

Gray, Franklin Montgomery Patent Relief B. No. 122 (Mr. Campbell) 1°*, 1667; 2°*, 1793 (i); in Com., 4945; 3°*, 4950 (iii).

Grazing Leases in Alberta and Sask., Names of Persons, &c., Area, Location, Rental, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 208 (i).

See 'Brown,' 'Interior,' &c.

G. B. and Canada Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7543 (iv).

Great Lakes Dredging Co., Charges *re* Contracts of Conmee and Bowman: Mr. Bennett) 1303 (i).

——— Payments for Tugs in Thunder Bay, &c. Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 3583 (ii).

See 'Conmee,' &c.

Great Northern Ry. of Canada B. No. 113 (Mr. Dubeau) 1°*, 1576; 2°*, 1792 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2666 (ii).

Great Northern Railway, Application *re* Subsidies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 2078 (ii).

——— M. for Copies* (Mr. Boyce) 2274 (ii).

Great Northern Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 6167 (iv).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Boyce) 2700 (ii).

Great Northwest Central Ry. Co.'s B. No. 78 (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1°*, 999; 2°*, 1298; in Com., and 3°*, 1792 (i).

Great West Land Co., Purchase of C. P. R. Lands, Litigation *re*, Ref. to in debate on North Atlantic Co.'s Contract (Mr. D. Ross) 1963 (i).

Greenwood, Hamar, Payments to by Govt. *re* Literature: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 1646 (i).

Griffiths, Mr., and Mr. Preston, High Commissioner: Inquiry for Cor. (Mr. U. Wilson) 1854 (i).

See 'Interior,' 'North Atlantic,' 'Preston,' &c.

Griffith Island, Sale of: Remarks (Mr. Telford) in Com. of Sup., 938 (i).

Grimsby Park, Collection of Fees, &c.: Remarks, Cor. read, &c. (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. on Lord's Day Bill, 6664 (iv).

Grosse Isle, Que., Marconi Telegraph System: in Com. of Sup., 7011 (iv).

Grosse Isle Quarantine Inspector, Expenditure *re* Yacht 'Montmorency', Cottage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2269 (ii).

Grosse Isle, Str. for Quarantine Service : in Com. of Sup., 2697.
Guelph Armoury, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6734 (iv).
Gun Boats sunk in Thames River, Removal by U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 333 (i).
Habitant River, Canning Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 6787 (iv).
Half-Breed Allotments from 1896 to 1905 in Man., Land Scrip, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 210 (i).
Half-Breed Allotments in Man. and N. W. Ters., Land Scrip, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 210 (i).
Half-Breed Scrip Claims, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lake) on M. for Sup., 7371, 7571 (iv).
See 'Indians,' 'Interior.'
Halifax Arsenal, Offer by Imp. Authorities : Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 1009 (i).
Halifax Defences, Permanent Force, Annual Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 184 (i).
Halifax Old Drill Shed Property, Disposal of, Cor., O.Cs., &c. : M. for Copies * (Mr. Fowler) 774 (i).
Halifax Drill Shed Property, Disposition by Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 833 (i).
Halifax Garrison, Contract for Supplies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 1862 (i).
Halifax Trachoma Hospital, Acquisition by Govt., Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 1746 (i).
——— M. for Copies (Mr. U. Wilson) 1870 (i).
Halifax Wharf Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5071 (iii) ; 7483 (iv).
Hamilton Drill Hall : in Com. of Sup., 6735 (iv).
Hamilton, P. J., Apptmnt. as Indian Farm Instructor : Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 1241 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1674 (i).
Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 104 (Mr. Zimmerman) 1°*, 1465 ; 2°*, 1710 (i) ; in Com., and 3°*, 3672 (ii).
Handbook of Townships in Man., Sask. and Alberta, Compiling of : Ques. (Mr. Ames) 583 (i).
Harbours and Rivers, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 6995, 7052 (iv).
——— General Repairs : in Com. of Sup., 6989 (iv).
——— Man.: in Com. of Sup., 6994 (iv).
——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 6935, 7043 (iv).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 6772, 7042 (iv).
——— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 6772, 6985, 7048 (iv).
——— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 6931 (iv).
——— Que.: in Com. of Sup., 2894 (ii), 6771, 6943, 7043 (iv).
——— Sask.: in Com. of Sup., 7052 (iv).
Harwood Estate, Building Wharf, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 1099 (i).
Hatfield, Mr., Expenditure *re* Rainmaking : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 5934 (iii).
See 'Rainmaking,' &c.
Haultain, Mr., Ignoring of as Premier of N. W. Ters.: Ref. to in deb. on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 42 (i).
Hay Trade Regulation B. No. 116 (Mr. Beauparlant) 1° m., 1576 (i) ; 2° m., and ref. to Agricultural Com., 4023 (ii).
Hay Trade Regulations, Penalties *re* Violation: Prop. Res. (Mr. Beauparlant) 3997 (ii).
Head Tax collected by U. S. Officials on Canadians : Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 323 (i).
——— M. for Copies* (Mr. Ingram) 205 (i).
Heffernan, Supt. of N. W. M. Police, and Political Interference : Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 4978 (iii).
Hetherington, Mr. Thos. P., Emplymt. as Immigration Agent, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 5502 (iii).
Higgin's Shore, P.E.I., Pet. *re* Wharf : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 572 (i).
High Commissioner's Office, Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 404 (i).
Hillcrest Ry. Coal and Coke Co.'s incorp. B. No. 157 (Mr. Galliher) 1°*, 2926 ; 2°*, 3243 (ii) ; in Com., 4398 ; 3°*, 4399 (iii).
Hog Cholera, Cure of : Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 2692 (ii).
Hogs imported into Canada and slaughtered for Export, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 176 (i).
Hog Plague in Kent County, Protest *re* Quarantine: M. for Copies (Mr. Clements) 647 (i).
Hog Plague, Quarantine in East and West Kent, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 173 (i).
Holland River, Trent Canal : in Com. of Sup., 5167 (iii).
Holmes, Charles Wm., Relief B No. 181 (Mr. Stewart) 1°*, 4451 ; 2°*, 4951 ; in Com., and 3°*, 5499 (iii).
Homesteads in N.W.T., Blanketing System : Remarks (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 1356 (i).
Homestead Entries and Land Sales, 1905, Total Acreage, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 210 (i).
Homestead Entries, Authorization Grants from 1901 to 1905, Number issued, Number cancelled, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lake) 209 (i).
See 'Interior' ; &c.
Homestead Entries, Changes in Form of Application : Remarks (Mr W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 1359 (i).
Homestead Entries since 1890, Forms of Application &c.: M for copies* (Mr. Ingram) 207 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Ingram) 1854, 2326, (ii).

Homestead Entries, recorded from 1872 to 1905 in Man., Sask. and Alberta, Percentage of Patents issued, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lake) 209 (i).

Homestead Entries, 1904-5, Rep. of non-compliance, Cancellation, &c. received by Dom. Lands Office, Action taken, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 208 (i).

Homestead Entries, Original Names, Applicants *re* Cancellations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 5003 (iii).

Homesteaders *re* Entry in Provs. of Man., Sask. and Alberta, Nationality, &c., M. for Ret.* (Mr. Wilson) 207 (i).

Homestead Entries 1905, Provs. of Man., Sask. and Alberta, Extension of Time for Entry, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 208 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 2235 (ii).

Homestead Inspections Applications for, Number of, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lake) 428 (i).

Homestead Inspectors, &c., Dom. Lands Branch, New Appointments : List read in Com. of Sup., 5936 (iii).

Homestead Inspectors in Man. and N. W. Ter., Days Absent, Expenses, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. M S. McCarthy) 210 (i).

Hope Island Timber Reserve, Removal of Timber by Mr. Chew, Amounts paid: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 419 (i).

See 'Georgian Bay Islands', 'Giant's Tomb', &c.

Houk, Henry Luther Patent Relief B. No. 51 (Mr. Campbell) 1°*, 655; 2°*, 928 (i); in Com., and 3°* 3186 (ii).

House of Commons Act Amt. B. No. 3 (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1° m., 16; 2° m. and ref. to Sel. Com., 437 (i).

House of Commons Rules Revision: Rep. Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7054 (iv)

HOUSE OF COMMONS REVISED RULES :

Adjournments of Hse., Motions, &c., 7607 (iv).

Attendance of Members, 7616 (iv).

——— Leave of Absence during Sittings of Hse, 7473 (iv).

Closing of Debate, 7470 (iv).

Internal Economy Reps., 7465 (iv).

Metings of Hse., Sittings, &c., 7463 (iv).

Members rising to speak, 7465 (iv).

——— Speaking to a Motion, Reply, &c., 7467 (iv).

——— Voting on Questions *re* Pecuniary Interests, 7470 (iv).

Motions, Notice of, &c., 7602 (iv).

Orders of the Day, 7475 (iv).

——— Precedence, &c., 7477 (iv).

Order, Ques. of, 7465 (iv).

Parliamentary Agents, 7606 (iv).

Petitions for Private Bills, Maps, Plans, &c. 7618 (iv).

HOUSE OF COMMONS REVISED RULES—*Con.*

Private Bills, Deposit of Fees, 7604 (iv).

——— Expiry of Hour, 7605 (iv).

——— Petitions, 7603 (iv).

——— Publication of Notices, 7605 (iv).

——— Reported together, 7605 (iv).

Privileged Motions, 7480 (iv).

Questions put by Members, 7479 (iv).

——— put to Ministers, 7602 (iv).

Routine Proceedings, Daily, 7475 (iv).

Rules and Orders, Changes of, 7463.

Sel. Standing Committees, Special Reps., 7465 (iv).

Senate Amts. to Bills, Conference *re*, 7603 (iv).

Sittings of Hse., Wednesday Adjournments, 7611 (iv).

HOUSE OF COMMONS :

Acoustics of Chamber : Remarks (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 7360 (iv).

——— Complaints *re* (Mr. Bole) 3154 (ii).

See 'Ventilation'.

Adjournment of Hse., Confusion by Members leaving Chamber before Speaker and Mace: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2017 (ii).

By-Elections, Issue of Writs : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7696 (iv).

Controverted Elections, Judges' Certificates: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).

Decorum in Debate, Interruptions and Confusion : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3072

Election Appeals, Supreme Court Judgments: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).

Elections of Members to H. of C. (corrupt practices): M. for Sel. Com., (Mr. R. L. Borden) 235; M. for Com. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 252 (i).

——— on Order for Rsmd. Deb.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 883 (i).

Elections Petitions Dismissed, Judges' Reps.: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).

——— Supreme Court Judgments : Presented (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).

Electoral Districts, Vacancies, Issue of Writs: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 3 (i).

Elgin, East, Electoral District, Issue of Writ : Notification (Mr. Speaker) 6165 (iv).

House of Commons, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7572 (iv).

Internal Economy Com., Mess. from His Ex.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 125 (i).

Internal Economy Committee and Salaries of House of Commons Officials : Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7054 (iv).

Members appoined to Govt. Offices : Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 5752; Ret. laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5752 (iii).

——— Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 4798, 5181, 6085 (iii).

——— Imperfect Answer to Question : Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 350 (i).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*
Members appointed to Govt. Offices, Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) *re* Answer to former Question, 6543 (iv).
Members of Parlt. and Newspaper Criticisms: *See* 'Cinq-Mars'.
Members introduced, 4, 889 (i).
Newspaper Criticisms from Press Gallery: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Foster) 4030 (iii).
——— Report *re* Members' Conduct in House: Remarks (Mr. Bourassa) 3069 (ii).
Nicolet and Gaspé Representation: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 1865 (i).
Private Bills, Expiration of Time: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 2811 (ii).
——— Irregularity of Procedure: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 2325 (ii).
Officials of House of Commons, Salaries, &c.: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7054 (iv).
Renfrew, N., Electoral District, Vacancy; Notification (Mr. Taylor) 6125 (iv).
——— Issue of Writ: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 6165 (iv).
Rules and Procedure of the House, Revision of: M. for Special Com. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 252 (i).
——— Rep. Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7054 (iv).
Senate and House of Commons Employees, Number and Names: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 1672 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Sproule) 1869 (i).
——— Mess. to Senate: M. * (Mr. Sproule) 2273 (ii).
Sessional Clerks, H. of C.: in Com. of Sup., 7572 (iv).
Speaker's Apartments, H. of C., Goods supplied, Inventory, &c.: M. for Stmnt. * (Mr. Lancaster) 2274 (ii).
——— Stmnt. of Goods supplied from 1886 to 1906: M. for Ret. * (Mr. Belcourt) 2950 (ii).
——— Apartments, Inventory of Furnishings, &c.: Inquiry (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 7358 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lancaster) 5533 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Taylor) 4035, 5185 (iii).
Strathcona Electoral District: Certificate of Election (Mr. Speaker) 1840 (i).
Ventilation of Chamber: Remarks (Mr. Bristol) 7359 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 5616 (iii).
Hudson Bay Co.'s Employees, Claims, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bourassa) 7188 (iv).
——— Policy *re* Retirement Claims: Ques. (Mr. Alcorn) 1568 (i).
——— M. for Copies (Mr. McCraney) 3742 (ii).
Hudson Bay and Northwest Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 6177 (iv).
Hudson Bay Whale Fisheries: *See* 'Fisheries Amt. B.'
Humboldt Telegraph Station: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 7012 (iv).
Huntsville, Baysville and Bracebridge Wharfs, Names of Govt. Officials: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Wright) 1868 (i), 2453 (i).
Huron, Erie Loan and Savings Co.'s B. No. 21 (Mr. Calvert) 1°*, 349; 2°*, 524 (i) in Com., and 3°*, 3739 (ii).
Huron and Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. No. 112 (Mr. Ratz) 1°*, 1576; 2°*, 1792 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3435 (ii).
Hydrographic Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 3685 (ii).
Ice-breakers, Govt. Steamers: in Com. of Sup., 3803 (ii).
——— Maintenance and Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 4760 (iii).
——— Northumberland Straits, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7558 (iv).
Ice-breakers: *See* 'Govt. Steamers,' 'Marine,' &c.
Immigration Act Amt. B. No. 170 (Mr. Oliver) 1° m., 3712 (ii); 2° m., and in Com., 5195, 5227, 5406; 3° m., 5533, 5563; 3°*, 5570 (iii); Sen. Amts., 7116 (iv).
IMMIGRATION:
Agents in G.B. and Ireland, Charges *re* Irregular Payments, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barker) 1870 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Barker) 1672 (i).
——— charges by Mr. Preston *re* irregular payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 1864
Agents, G.B. and Foreign Countries, in Com. of Sup., 1342, 1635 (i); 5862 (iii); List of Agents: Read (Mr. Oliver) 1343 (i); 5967 (iii); Statement *re* Expenditure (Mr. Oliver) 5509 (iii).
Agents in Ont., Conflict with Dom. Agents: Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 1345 (i).
Agents in Winnipeg, Supplying Miners, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 995 (i).
Belgian Immigrants: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1637 (i).
Canadian Labour Bureau, Action of Govt. *re* Leopold's Immigration Work: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 1746 (i).
Halifax Trachoma Hospital, Acquisition by Govt., Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 1746 (i).
——— M. for Com. (Mr. U. Wilson) 1870 (i).
Hetherington, Mr. Thos. P., Emplymt. as Immigration Agent, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 5502 (iii).
Immigrants to Canada, Bonus paid, Regulations *re* Payment: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 196 (i).
Immigrants deported during last five years, Number settled, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 180 (i).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*
Immigrants from Europe, Investigation *re* Destination, Names of Officials, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5184 (iii).
Immigrants at Quebec, Letter of Rev. Mr. Williams *re* Treatment of: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 5504 (iii).
Immigrants Returning, Dissatisfied with Canada: Par. in Toronto 'News' (Mr. Sproule) 3075 (ii).
Immigration, Amount spent in promoting, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 177 (i).
Immigration to Canada, False Representations *re* Labour Market: Prop. Res. (Mr. R. Smith) 2952 (ii).
——— Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7694 (iv).
Immigration, Cor. between Mr. Preston and Mr. Griffiths, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. U. Wilson) 206 (i).
——— Cor. between High Commissioner, and W.T.R. Preston, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. U. Wilson) 206 (i).
Immigration Officials, Special Payments for Services: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 5871 (iii).
Immigration Pamphlets, Literature, Newspaper Editions, &c., Distribution of: in Com. of Sup., 5874 (iii).
Immigration, Uniforms: Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) in Com. of Sup., 5873 (iii).
——— Medical Inspection at Halifax: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 5872 (iii).
——— North Atlantic Trading Co. Contract, Investigation *re* SS. Tickets, Destination, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4703 (iii).
See 'North Atlantic,' &c.
Preston, W. T. R., Immigration Commissioner, Rental of House in London: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 3906 (ii).
——— Visit to Canada *re* High Commissioner's Office: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 172 (i).
See 'North Atlantic.'
Printing, Contracts with Arundel Co., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5512 (iii).
Printing in England: in Com. of Sup., 5863 (iii).
Quebec Immigration Hospital for Trachoma Treatment, Amount expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 334 (i).
Immigration Regulations *re* Skilled Labour and Organized Labour: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 3406 (ii).
Salvation Army Immigrants, Number, Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 185 (i).
Salvation Army Immigrants and S. America: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 6801 (iv).
Skilled Labour and Organized Labour *re* Regulations: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 3406 (ii).
IMMIGRATION—*Con.*
Wilson, Mr. Alex., Apptmnt. as Special Immigration Agent: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 1864 (i).
Imperial Institute, London, Canadian Exhibit: in Com. of Sup., 315(i).
——— Explanation of Vote on M. for 1° of Supply B. 56: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 658 (i).
Imperial Intelligence Office, Establishment of, Cor. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Belcourt) 427 (i).
Imperial Officers and R.M.C., Status *re*: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 4247 (iii).
Imperial Pulp Mill Co.'s Water Power, Sale, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 943 (i).
Implements and Tools for Indians, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 735 (i).
Indemnity to Members, B. 18, Decorum in Debate: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) *re* Member's Remarks, 3067 (ii).
——— Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Ingram) *re* Par. in Toronto 'World' *re* Whips, 2621 (ii).
Indemnity to Members: *See* 'Senate and Hse. of Commons Bill,' &c.
Independence of Parlt.: *See* 'Elections,' &c., 'Sen. and H. of C. Bill,' &c.
Indian Act (intoxicants) Amt. B. No. 66 (Mr. Monk) 1°*, 829 (i); 2° m., 2069; Amt. (Mr. Oliver) 6 m. h., agreed to, on Division, 2075 (ii).
——— B. No. 194 (Mr. Oliver) 1°*, 4991; 2°, and in Com., 5422; 3°*, 5553 (ii).
INDIANS:
Agencies, Inspectors of Reserves: in Com. of Sup., 1228 (i).
Agents, N.B., Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 734 (i).
Agents, Yukon Indians, Indian Reserve Land disposed of, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 2949 (ii).
Alberni Industrial School, B.C.: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 1091 (i).
Blood Indian Reserve, Lease to McEwan Cattle Co., Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Sproule) 2274 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Taylor) 3713, 3796 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 955 (i).
B.C., Miscellaneous Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 1094 (i).
——— Relief to the Destitute: in Com. of Sup., 1078 (i).
Crooked Lake Indian Reserve, Surrender of: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 946 (i).
Doncaster Indians, Complaints *re* Cutting of Timber: Remarks (Mr. Walsh) in Com. of Sup., 1248 (i).

INDIANS—*Con.*
Farm Implements and Seed Grain to Indians, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 1079 (i).
Garden Reserve, Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 1249 (i).
General Expenses *re* Indians: in Com. of Sup., 960 (i).
Georgian Bay Island, Indian Reserves, Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 724 (i).
Giant's Tomb, Sale of, &c., Mis-statements by Supt. General of Indian Affairs: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 5333 (iii).
See main heading.
Hamilton, Mr. J. P., Qualifications as Farm Instructor at Touchwood Hills Indian Reserve: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1674 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 1241 (i).
Implements and Tools for Indians, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 735 (i).
Indian Affairs, Civil Govt. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 365 (i), 5985 (iii).
——— Number of Employees, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1097 (i).
Indian Trust Fund, Amount collected: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 1250 (i).
——— Insane Asylums, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 5990 (iii).
Lafferty, Dr., Payments to *re* Indians: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 961 (i).
Lands in East and West Algoma, Agents, Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 2079 (ii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 2273 (ii).
Lands, Sales, Transactions, Cancellation, Rep. of Agents, &c. from 1896 to 1906: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Boyce) 2273 (ii).
Legal Expenses for Indians: in Com. of Sup., 726 (i).
Live Stock for Indians, Man. and N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 735 (i).
Lytton School for Indians, B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 1089 (i).
Man. Indians, Annuities, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 734 (i).
——— Provisions, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 932 (i).
Medical Attendance for Indians, Payments to: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 962 (i).
Medical Attendance for Indians: in Com. of Sup., 717 (i).
Medical Attendance to Indians, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 1079 (i).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 734 (i).
Non Treaty, Indians, Expenditure, 1904-05: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5006 (iii).
Oka Reserve, Claims of Indians: in Com. of Sup., 728 (i).

INDIANS—*Con.*
Ont. and Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 717 (i).
Pasquah's Indian Band, Surrender of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5503 (iii).
Peigan and Blood Indian Agencies, Cattle purchased, Number, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 4702 (iii).
Reserves, B. C., Surrender of: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 952 (i).
Reserves, Ownership of Timber, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Walsh) in Com. of Sup., 1248 (i).
Reserves, Portions for Settlement: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 331 (i).
Riding Mountain Timber Reserve, Prohibition of Settlers by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 996 (i).
——— M. for Copy* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1740 (i).
Robinson Treaty Annuities for Indians: in Com. of Sup., 722 (i).
——— Salaries at B. C. Office: in Com. of Sup., 1078 (i).
Sarcee Indian Reserves, Negotiations *re* Surrender: Remarks (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) in Com. of Sup., 959 (i).
Schools, B. C., Industrial and Boarding: in Com. of Sup., 1087; list read, 1088 (i).
Schools, Complains *re* Curriculum, Qualifications of Teachers: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 3249 (ii).
——— Man. and N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 947 (i), 5990 (iii).
——— Mar. Provinces: in Com. of Sup., 718 (i).
——— Ont. and Quebec.: in Com. of Sup., 717 (i), 5985 (iii).
Seeds, &c., for Indians, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 735 (i).
——— N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 734 (i).
Seven Islands Indians Surveys &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5987 (iii).
Sioux Indians, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 960 (i).
Steamer, Northwest Coast Agency for Indians: in Com. of Sup., 1094-5 (i).
Surveys for Indians, Man. and Que.: in Com. of Sup., 947 (i).
——— Ont. and Que.: in Com. of Sup., 723 (i).
Swan Lake Indian Reserve, Settlement *re* Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 1246 (i).
Travelling Expenses *re* Indians, B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 1094 (i).
Treaty No. 9, Indian Payments, Agents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 734 (i), 5988 (iii).
Triennial Clothing for Indians, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 943 (i).
Tyerman, Dr., Medical Officer for Twatt's Band of Indians: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 1245 (i).

INDIANS—*Con.*
Victoria County, Indians, Number, Medical Attendance, Payments *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 2455 (ii).
Whitefish Indian Reserve, Sale of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2454, 2724 (ii).
Yukon Indians, Medical Attendance and Relief: in Com. of Sup., 1206 (i).
——— Schools: in Com. of Sup., 1228 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2271 (ii).
Indiantown and Blackville Branch Lines: in Com. of Sup., 7503 (iv).
Industrial and Co-operative Societies B. No. 144 (Mr. Monk) 1° m., 1841 (i).
Industrial and Boarding Schools, B.C. Indians: in Com. of Sup., 1087; List read, 1088 (i).
See 'Indians.'
Information Bureau Concord, Advertisement in British Press: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 574 (i).
Ingram, A. B., M.P., Resignation: Notice (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 5184 (iii).
INLAND REVENUE:
Adulteration of Food, Penalties, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2617 (ii).
Culling Timber, Supervisors Office: in Com. of Sup., 7542 (iv).
Electric Light and Gas Inspections, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2608 (ii).
Excise, Duty Pay at Distilleries: in Com. of Sup., 7513 (iv).
Gas and Light Inspectors, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7513 (iv).
Inland Revenue, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Brodeur) 225 (i).
——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 367 (i), 7513 (iv).
Maple Syrup Adulteration, on prop. Res. (Mr. Boyer) 1397 (i).
Medicines, Fraudulent and Deleterious, Sale of: M. for Com. (Mr. Stockton) to Investigate, 2951, 3065 (ii).
——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to add Name, 3150 (ii).
Methyl. Alcohol, Import and Excise Duty, Quantity imported, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 5507 (iii).
Methylated Spirits: in Com. of Sup., 1561 (i).
Metric System: in Com. of Sup., 2607 (ii).
——— Salaries for Lectures, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2611 (ii).
Montmagny Cigar Factory, Suspension of Excise Officer Michon: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2269 (ii).
Quebec Culler's Office, Apptmnt. of Supervisor: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 3245 (ii).
Tobacco Stamps: in Com. of Sup., 1558 (i).
Insurance Act Amts., Cor. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 997 (i).
Insurance Cos., Bonds, Accepted by Inland Rev. Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Macdonnell) 1467 (i).
Insurance Cos. Bonds: Remarks *re* Answer to Question (Mr. A. C. Macdonell) and Answer (Mr. Templeman) 2067 (ii).
Insurance Commission, Apptmnt. of Mr. Langmuir: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 836 (i).
——— Copies of all Communications, &c., relating to, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Ingram) 202 (i).
——— Completion of Investigation: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5445 (iii).
——— Daily Report to be Submitted: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 315, 655 (i).
——— Delay in Proceedings, &c., Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Kemp) 3800 (ii).
——— Emplymt. of Counsel: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 10 (i).
——— Expenditure and Remuneration: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. for 1° of Supply Bill, 695 (i).
Insurance Investigation Committee: in Com. of Sup., 305, 758 (i).
——— Inquiry for Rep. of Proceedings (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1940 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Ingram) 2068, 2326 (ii).
——— Instruction to Commissioners, ref. to in deb. on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 47 (i).
Insurance Commission issued to Commissioner: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8 (i).
Insurance Commission, O. C. presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 12 (i).
——— Investigation: ref. to in deb. on Address (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 88 (i).
——— Notice of Motion: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 3742 (ii).
——— Retirement of Directors of Manufacturers' Co.: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 2233 (ii).
——— Right of Parlt., Protest *re* (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 10 (i).
——— Special Rep., 9th Nov., 1905, respecting Regulations of Life Insurance in Can.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 204 (i).
Insurance Commission, Inquiry *re* Assessment Plans: Ques. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 5321 (iii).
Insurance Investigation Com. and Fraternal Societies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 189 (i).
Insurance, Companies, Reserve Fund, Govt. Standard, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 985 (i).
Insurance Legislation and Investigation Commission: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 3235 (ii).
Insurance Life: M. for Special Com. of Investigation: M. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 3971 (ii).
Insurance Statements, Reps. and Documents: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 1840 (i).
Insurance, Supt's Office, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7578 (iv).

I.C.R. and C.P.R., Comparison *re* Account-Keeping : Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 5031 (iii).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY :

Annual Statement: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Emmerson) 127 (i).

——— Reply (Mr. Haggart) 157, 269 (i).

Air Brakes on Freight Cars : in Com. of Sup., 5074 (iii).

Belmont Disaster, Investigation *re*, Claims, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Laurence) 992 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Laurence) in Com. of Sup., 7506 (iv).

Bridge Strengthening : in Com. of Sup., 5016 (iii), 7502 (iv).

——— Cost of Steel Superstructures, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Haggart) in Com. of Sup., 7481 (iv).

Campbellton Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 5070 (iii).

Canada Eastern Branch, Removal of Train Despatcher : Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 991 (i).

Canadian Express Co.'s Service, Dissatisfaction *re* : Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 5182 (iii).

Capital Expenditure, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Haggart) in Com. of Sup., 7481 (iv).

Coal Carriage for I.C.R., Survey *re* Channel at River du Loup: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 554 (i).

Coal Depots, Establishment *re*, Purchase of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 1863 (i).

Coal Handling Machinery : in Com. of Sup., 5357 (iii).

Denning's Siding at Pugwash, Expenditure *re*, Total Receipts : Ques. (Mr. Barker) 2077 (ii).

Double-tracking, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5079, 5356 (iii).

Drummondville Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 5070 (iii).

Elgin Road Station, I.C.R. Piling Grounds, Purchase of Land by Govt. : Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 583 (i).

Engine Houses, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5070 (iii).

Facilities, Increased : in Com. of Sup., 7503 (iv).

Freight Rates, Control of by Ry. Commission, Ref. to in Com. on Ry. Bill, 2568 (ii).

Freight Charges, on Steel and Fish Products : Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 449 (i).

Fundy Coal Co., Quantity of Coal purchased: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3244 (i).

G.T. Ry. and I.C.R. Arbitration: Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 224 (i).
See main heading.

Halifax, Increased Accommodation : in Com. of Sup, 7483 (iv)

——— Property purchased by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1746 (i).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

Halifax to Guysborough Ry. Subsidy : in Com. on Res., Amt. (Mr. Fielding) 6180 (iv).

Halifax Wharf Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 5071 (iii).

I.C.R. and C.P.R. Comparison *re* Account-Keeping : Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 5031 (iii).

Indiantown and Blackville Branch Lines : in Com. of Sup., 7503 (iv).

Joughins Car Truck, Patentee, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 2729 (ii).

Langile's Platform, Pugwash Branch, Expenditure, Accommodation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 2078 (ii).

Lévis Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 5355 (iii)

——— Amount expended on Asphalt Pavement : Ques (Mr. Paquet) 4708 (iii).

Location of New Shops at Moncton : Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 1375 (i).

Lodge, Mr. M., Purchase of Property at Moncton : Remarks (Mr. Barker) in Com. of Sup., 7484 (iv).

Lozo, J. F., Instructions *re* Dismissal of Employees on I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 2547 (ii).

Mitchell, Diversion of Line: in Com. of Sup., 5070 (iii).

Moncton Land Purchase from Mr. Hewson on Amt. (Mr. Ames) to Com. of Sup., 5818; Neg. (Y. 46; N. 89) 5856 (iii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 5061 (iii).

Moncton Locomotive and Car Shops Property: in Com. of Sup., 7501 (iv).
See 'Location.'

Newcastle Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 5070 (iii).

Number of Employees, Charged to Different Accounts : Ques. (Mr. Barker) 976 (i).

Number of Employees from 1899 to 1905 : Ques. (Mr. Morin) 216 (i).

Oil for Illuminating Purposes, Quantity bought, Tenders for, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 448 (i).

Oil supplied by New Brunswick Petroleum Co., Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 172 (i).

Passes issued by Conservative Govt: Remarks *re* Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 351 (i).

Pension System, Inauguration of: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 764 (i).

Pictou Landing Wharf : in Com of Sup., 5073 (iii).

Pictou Station Accommodation : in Com. of Sup., 5075 (iii).

Private and Official Cars, Ret. ordered by Mr. Tolton: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 839 (i).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*
Private Cars, &c., Number, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 984 (i).
Property, Thefts of by Employees, Charges *re*: Ques. (Mr Fowler) 995 (i).
Public Accounts, Investigations, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Barker) in Com. of Sup., 7484 (iv).
Rolling Stock: in Com. of Sup., 5076 (iii), 7501 (iv).
Rothesay Freight Shed: in Com, of Sup., 7501 (iv).
St. Philippe Station, Accommodation *re* Cars, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 993 (i).
Side Ladders, in Com. of Sup., 7501 (iv).
Skeffington, Detective, Dismissal, Charges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 183 (i).
——— Dismissal, &c.: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7493 (iv).
Spur Lines and Sidings: in Com of Sup., 7502 (iv).
Stamps at Moncton, Investigation *re* Loss: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 1376 (i).
Stellarton, Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5074 (iii).
Strathcona Coal Co., Quantity of Coal purchased: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3244 (ii).
Supplies, Tenders *re*: Remarks (Mr. Haggart) in Com. of Sup., 4931 (iii).
Sussex Station, N.B.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 5074 (iii).
Sydney Mines, Extension: in Com. of Sup., 5075 (iii).
Ties delivered at Rogersville, by Messrs. Buckey, Galland and Mahoney, Inspection of: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 2723 (ii).
Ties, purchased from John Mahoney and J. & D. Buckley, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 2270 (ii).
——— M. for Ret. * (Mr. Ames) 2950 (ii).
Transportation for Passengers and Freight, Increase in Rates, St. Jean Port Joli, Lévis: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 583 (ii).
Truro Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5073 (iii).
Water Service: in Com. of Sup., 7481 (iv).
——— Tenders for, Names, &c. Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 763 (i).

INTERIOR:
Alaska-Yukon Boundary Line: Remarks (Mr. Thompson) 5185 (iii).
Alberta and Athabasca Lands, O.C. *re* Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lefurgey) 1741 (i).
Alberta Land Co., Par. in Toronto Globe *re* Signatories: (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2017 (ii).
Alberta Minerals, Gas and Oil Borings, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 1674 (i).
See 'Borings.'
Banff Park Roads and Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 5942 (iii).

INTERIOR—*Con.*
Borings, Experimental in Alberta, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5982, 5984 (iii).
See 'Alberta.'
Boundary and Demarcation Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 5858, 5876 (iii).
B.C. Land Sales, Conditions, Reps., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3971 (ii).
Brown, H. P., Transfer of Grazing Lease to Galway Cattle Co., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 5182 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, Deptl. Letter Sept. 16, 1904: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3970 (ii).
——— Extension of Area, Transfer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1858 (i).
Canadian Northern Ry. Lands, selected and patented &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2951 (ii).
——— Lands, Selection of, O.C. *re* Aug. 1903: M. for Ret. * (Mr. W. J. Roche) 3277 (ii).
C.P.R. Land Grants, Patents issued *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 331 (i).
——— Time Limit for Selection: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 765 (i).
Caves in B.C. Explorations, Payments *re*: in Com. of Sup., 5858 (iii).
Coal Lands in N.W.T., Applications by Mr. C. F. Caldwell: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1000 (i).
Colonization or Land Companies, &c., Purchase of Land from Govt. since 1898: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1863 (i).
Colonization Lands, O.C., Quoted by Mr. D. Ross in Debate: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 2080 (ii).
Colonization Lands, Rep. of Mr. Stevenson, &c.: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 3952 (ii), 4029 (iii).
Colonization Roads and Bridges, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 6997 (iv).
Crown Lands, Administration of by Dept. of Interior: Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 4157; Amt. (read) 4187 (iii).
——— Notice of Motion (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4028 (ii).
Dom. Lands: in Com. of Sup., 5934 (iii).
——— Administration of by Govt.: Amt. (Mr. Ames) on M. for Sup., 3101, 3155 (ii).
——— Branch and Surveyor General Reps.: Inquiry for (Mr. Ames) 716 (i).
——— Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 5939 (iii).
——— Lands exceeding 160 Acres, Sale of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5502 (iii).
——— and Homestead Laws, Abuses *re*: Notice of Motion (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3064 (ii).
——— Litigation, Expenses *re*: in Com. of Sup., 5944 (iii).
——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5614 (iii).

INTERIOR—*Con.*
Dominion Lands, Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 5881, 5977 (iii).
Eagle Creek Homestead Rights: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 1358 (i).
Geological Specimens, for Victoria Museum, Purchase of; in Com. of Sup., 5983 (iii).
Govt. of N.W.T., Registry Offices: in Com. of Sup., 5528 (iii).
G.T.P.Ry., Mining Rights in Lands, O.C., Memorandum, &c.: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3713 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Cor. (Mr. Foster) 3909 (ii).
Grazing Leases in Alberta and Sask., Names of Persons, &c., Area, Location, Rental, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 208 (i).
——— Conditions of Sale, &c.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 324 (i).
Half-Breed Allotments in Man. and N.W. Ters., Land Scrip., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 210 (i).
Half-Breed Allotments from 1896 to 1905 in Man., Land Scrip, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 210 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lake) on M. for Sup., 7371, 7571 (iv).
Homesteaders *re* Entry in Provs. of Man., Sask. and Alberta, Nationality, &c., M. for Ret.* (Mr. Wilson) 207 (i).
Homestead Entries: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Ingram) 1854 (i).
See main heading.
Homestead Inspections, Applications for, Number of, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lake) 428 (i).
Homestead Inspectors in Man. and N.W.Ter., Days Absent, Expenses, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 210 (i).
——— New Appointments: List read in Com. of Sup., 5936 (iii).
Interior, Deptl. Rep.: Inquiry for (Mr. Barker) 715 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 485, 568 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 484 (i).
——— Rep.: Presented (Mr. Oliver) 781 (i).
Interior, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 362, 404 (i), 5975 (iii).
Labrador Boundary Survey: Remarks (Mr. Morin) in Com. of Sup., 5861 (iii).
Lake St. Francis Islands, Number and Owners: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7636, 7638 (iv).
Land Grants to Rys. in N.W., Location, Mileage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 2075 (ii).
Land Grants or Sale in Alberta to Syndicate or Company from Iowa, O.Cs., *re* &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 1871 (i).

INTERIOR—*Con.*
Land Grants Patents, Total Number issued in Man., Sask. and Alberta, from 1872 to 1905, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 209 (i).
Land Grants to Rys., &c., Inquiry for Papers referred to in Speech of Min. of Int. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 973 (i).
Land Patents issued in Man., Sask. and Alberta from 1901 to 1905, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 2275 (ii).
Land Sales in Blocks in Man., N.W.T. and B.C., 1903-4-5, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 569 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sproule) 774 (i).
Land Sales in B.C., Conditions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 5752 (iii).
Lands Sale by Govt. and Ry. Cos. to Private Corporations, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 194 (i).
Lands sold in Alberta and Sask. for Irrigation Projects, Area, Location, &c., Prices, &c: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 208 (i).
McLeod, Roderick A., Homestead Entry Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 5503 (iii).
McRae, Hector, Original Purchaser of Lands in B.C., Terms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 6245 (iv).
Maps of Dom. and N.W.T., Lithographing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5946, 5977 (iii).
Milk River Cattle Co., Sale of Land and Valuation, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 2035 (ii).
Milk River Cattle Co. and Grand Forks Cattle, Purchase of Interests: Denial of (Mr. Sifton) 4606 (iii).
Mines Branch, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5941 (iii).
——— Supt.'s Salary: in Com. of Sup., 5934 (iii).
Moberley, J. H., Emplymt. by Govt.: Par. in 'Standard' Read (Mr. Lake) 6793 (iv).
——— Explanation *re* Emplymt. by Govt. (Mr. Fisher) 6930 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 7435 (iv).
Money Scrip redeemed and Land purchased from 1875 to 1905: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 210 (i).
Nicolas, F., Payments to *re* Indexing Geological Reps.: in Com. of Sup., 5980 (iii).
Northwest Lands, Allotments of, Denial of Statement made by Mr. Bole: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Bergeron) 4249 (iii).
Northwest Land Patents: M. for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 2927 (ii).
See 'Interior.'
N.W.T. Govtl. Schools: in Com. of Sup., 5880 (iii).
Parke, Mr. Philip, Sale of Land to, Location, Conditions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1865 (i).

INTERIOR—*Con.*

Personal Explanation *re* Statement with ref. to Senator J. H. Ross and Homestead Regulation (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 3235 (ii).

Porcupine Mountain Dom. Reserve, ref. to in debate (Mr. Ames) 3548 (ii).

P.E.I. Coal Borings, Rep. of Mr. Ellis: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 5983 (iii).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. Land Grant, O.C., Notice to Co. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 425 (i).

——— Land Grant, Answer to Question inaccurate: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 346 (i).

——— Explanation (Mr. Oliver) *re* Cor., 3504 (ii).

Ry. Lands, Policy of Govt. *re* Selection by Ry. Cos.: Ques. (Mr. Alcorn) 570 (i).

——— Notice of Motion (Mr. Lancaster) 889; on M. for Sup. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 890 (i).

Registry Offices, Salaries in N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 5978 (iii).

Riding Mountain Reserve, Ref. to in Com. on B. 47: (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2847, 3506 (ii).

St. George, Mr. E. C. S., Sale of Land to, Conditions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1866 (i).

Saskatchewan Public Lands, Transfer to Private Corporations: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 324 (i).

Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Date of Contract, Condition *re* Settlement, &c.: Ques. Mr. Foster) 2027 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R L. Borden) 1854 (i), 2234 (ii).

——— Omissions in Ret., O.C.s, Cor., &c., Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2623 (ii).

——— Purchase from Can. Northern Ry. Co., Date of, Transfer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1745 (i).

——— Purchase of Homestead Lands, Selection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 420 (i).

——— Sale to A. D. Davidson, Papers *re*: Ques. (Mr. Alcorn) 1569; Proposals, Acceptance, &c.: M. (Mr. Alcorn) for Copies*, 1570 (i).

——— Valuation of Lands sold, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 425 (i).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lake) 428 (i).

School Lands sold by Govt. in Man. and N. W.T., 1905, Amounts paid to Provs., Quantity yet unsold, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 191 (i).

——— Average Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 192 (i).

Speers, C. W., Reps. *re* Sale of Lands to Col. Davidson: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Barker) 1855 (i), 2700, 2890 (ii).

INTERIOR—*Con.*

Stafford, Mr. J. A., Offer to Purchase Islands in Georgian Bay: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5007 (iii).

Steel and Iron Ores, Electrical Smelting Process: in Com. of Sup., 5934 (iii).

Stone. E. B., Lease of Land in Bow River District: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 3740 (ii).

Swamp Lands, System of Classification: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 446 (i).

——— Cor. with Dom. Govt., O.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Staples) 345 (i).

Timber or Hay Lands granted for Homestead Entries in Man., Description, Names of Applicants, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lake) 427 (i).

Timber Lands sold or leased by Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 345 (i).

——— Ret. Incomplete: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 212 (i).

Timber Berth Leases, Original Tenders not produced: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. on B. 47, 3579 (ii).

Timber Leases in Man. and N.W.T., Applications for, between 1880 and 1896: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 5502, 5753 (iii).

Tree Culture and Timber Preservation: in Com. of Sup., 5939 (iii).

Whitefish Reserve Timber Sales, Number of Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3405 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 5429 (iii).

Yoho Park Roads, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5944

Yukon, Charges *re* Wood Contract: Inquiry for ret. (Mr. Foster) 6801 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7639 (iv).

——— Charges by Mr. Graham Campbell *re* Judiciary: Letter to Gov. Gen. read (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 5915 (iii).

——— Citizens' Meeting, Res. *re* Hydraulic Concessions, and Elective Council: Read (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6546 (iv).

——— Council, Govt. Policy *re* Election of, Res. from Citizens of Yukon: read (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2886 (ii).

——— Gold Gravels, Estimated Value: in Com. of Sup., 5981, 5985 (iii).

——— Gold Output and Royalties, Comparison, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 5927 (iii), 7638 (iv).

——— Gold Royalty, Amount collected from 1897 to 1902: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5004 (iii).

——— Govtl. Expenditure, Living Allowances, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5906 (iii).

——— Local Council, Maintenance of Roads, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5934 (iii).

——— Martin, Sugrue, and Sylvestre, Messrs. Charges *re* Irregularities in Wood Contracts Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 5932 (iii).

INTERIOR—*Con.*
Yukon Map, Preparation of: in Com. of Sup., 5980 (iii).
International Postal Congress, Canadian Representative at, Instructions *re* : Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 2728 (ii).
Internal Economy Committee and Salaries of House of Commons officials: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7054 (iv).
——— Mess from His Ex.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 125 (i).
See Printing Com.'
Inter-Ocean Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. 60 (Mr. Bole) 1°*, 744; 2°*, 974 (i); in Com., 3952; 3°*, 3953 (ii).
Interpretation Act Amt. B. No. 171 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1° m., 3904 (ii); 2° m., 5556; in Com., and 3°*, 5556 (iii).
Inverness (Broad Cove) Mines Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6788 (iv).
Inverness Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 6727 (iv).
Iona Postmaster, Dismissal of Mr. Jos. McCabe, Cor. &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 345 (i).
Iron and Steel Bounties on Canadian Ores, &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Conmee) 3748; prop. res. withdrawn, 3787 (ii).
See 'Steel.'
Irvine, Minnie Florence, Relief B. No. 182 (Mr. Stewart) 1°*, 4451; 2°*, 4951; in Com., and 3°*, 5499 (iii).
Isle Bizard and Ste. Geneviève Bridge: Remarks (Mr. Hyman) in Com. of Sup., 6962 (iv).
Italian Labourers, imported into Montreal, 1904 Rep. from Dep. Min. of Labour: M. for Copy* (Mr. Verville) 1871 (i).
Jacks imported for breeding, Duty *re* : Ques. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 836 (i).
Jack Straw and Red Horse Lights, Cost *re* Change to Acetylene Gas: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 584 (i).
James Bay Ry. Co.'s B. No. 184 (Mr. Calvert) 1°*, 4759; 2°*, 5227; in Com., and 3°*, 5499 (iii).
Japanese Deportation from B. C., Par. in Vancouver Paper: read (Mr. Sproule) 3152 (ii).
Japanese Famine Fund: in Com. of Sup., 315 (i).
Japanese Treaty, O.C. and Cor.: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 712 (i).
——— Inquiry for Copy (Mr. R. L. Borden) 126, 1367, (i), 3350 (ii).
——— Papers laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1940 (i).
——— Reduced Tariff Arrangements : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5754 (iii).
——— ref. to in deb. on Address (Mr. Foster) 56 (i).
Jews : *See* 'Russian', 'Lord's Day Bill'.
Judges acting as Directors in outside Businesses : Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 183 (i).
Judges, Circular Letter sent by Min. of Justice, Replies, &c.: Remarks (Mr Leonard) 1573 (i)
Judges for Court of Appeal (Man.) : M. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) to withdr. Res., 3907 (ii).
Judges of Provincial Courts, Amounts paid, to &c. since July 1905: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 207 (i).
Judges of the Provincial Courts B. No 13 (Mr. Lennox) 1° m., 20 ; 2° m., 859 (i) ; in Com., 5364 (iii)
——— Remarks *re* Discussion (Mr. Lennox), 5083, 5185, 5531 (iii).
Judges of Provincial Courts B. No. 83 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1° m., 1095 ; 2°, and in Com., 1764 ; 3°*, 1777 (i).
Judges of Provincial Courts, Legislation *re* Salaries : Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 4538 (iii).
Judges' Salaries, Amount of Work performed, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 770 (i).
JUSTICE :
Association for Comparative Legislation : in Com. of Sup., 7529 (iv).
Binder Twine, Kingston Penitentiary : Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 7529 (iv).
Brothier, Convict, Release of in B.C., Par. in B. C. Papers : Read (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4992 (iii).
——— Deportation from Seattle : Remarks (Mr. Macpherson) in Com. of Sup., 7526 (iv).
——— Questions *re* : Remarks (Mr. Macpherson) 5322 (iii).
——— Release of : Ques. (Mr. Macpherson) 5183 (iii).
Campbell Milling Co., Flour furnished Penitentiaries : Remarks (Mr. Campbell) in Com. of Sup., 4135 (iii).
County Court Judges, Date of Commissions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2036 (ii).
——— Division of Districts, Population &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1153 (i).
——— Regulations *re* Number, chap. 54, ss 5 and 6, Amendments *re* : Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1747 (i).
Dugas, Judge, Yukon Ter., Litigation *re* Expenditure : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iv).
Exchequer Court, Administration of Justice : in Com. of Sup., 488 (i).
Flour for Penitentiaries, Tenders *re* : Remarks (Mr. Fitzpatrick) in Com of Sup., 940 (i).
See 'Penitentiaries'.
Gagné's, Judge, Sons employed in legal Firm of Price & Co.: Ques. (Mr. W. McIntyre) 7371 (i).
Judges acting as Directors in outside Businesses : Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 183 (i).

JUSTICE—*Con.*

Judges, Circular Letter sent by Min. of Justice, Replies &c.: Remarks (Mr. Léonard) 1573 (i).

Judges of Provincial Courts, Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 5083 (iii).

——— Legislation *re* Salaries: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 4538 (iii).

——— Remarks *re* Discussion (Mr. Lennox) 5185, 5531 (iii).

Judges' Salaries, Amount of Work performed, &c: M. for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 770 (i).

Justice, B.C., Administration of, Judges Living Allowances: in Com. of Sup., 488 (i).

Justice, Administration of in N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 487 (i).

Justice, Deptl. Promotions: in Com. of Sup., 7538 (iv).

Justice, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 359 (i), 7529 (iv).

Justice Supply, Objection to, *re* Aud. Gen.'s Rep. (Mr. Foster) 485 (i).

Kingston Penitentiary: in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iv).

Litigated Matters, Justice Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 7528 (iv).

MacTavish, O'Meara, &c., Judges of County Courts, Dat[illegible]f Commissions, Population of District: Ques (Mr. Lennox) 2036 (ii).

Penitentiaries, Contract *re* Flour Supplies: Ques (Mr. Staples) 341 (i).

——— Deptl. Rep. Presented (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 484 (i).

Penitentiaries, Flour supplied, Advertisements *re*: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 450 (i).

——— M. for Copy* (Mr. Taylor) 774 (i).

See 'Flour'.

St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary Employees, Increase of Salaries, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Léonard) 454 (i), 2268 (ii).

Shortis Case: Personal Explanation (Mr. Bergeron) 5531 (iii).

Statutes, Consolidation and Revision of: in Com. of Sup., 7527, 7537 (iv).

Statutes, Revised, Completion of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6678 (iv).

Supreme Court, Ad Hoc Judges, Apptmnt of: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 3068 (ii).

———Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1103 (i).

Supreme Court of Canada, Vacancy, Apptmnt. *re* Quebec Cases: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 3075, 3910 (ii).

Supreme Court, Administration of: in Com. of Sup., 488 (i).

Supreme Court Building, Library: in Com. of Sup., 7034 (iv).

Ticket-of-Leave Prisoners Liberated, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 4154 (iii).

Toronto Street Ry. Litigation, Retainers of Hon. Mr. Aylesworth: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 3252 (ii).

JUSTICE—*Con.*

Yukon Ter. Judges, Living Allowances: in Com. of Sup., 489 (i), 7518 (iv).

Kamloops and Yellow Head Pass Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 27 (Mr. Galliher) 1°*, 350; 2°*, 525 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2066 (ii).

Keech, Hiram, Emplymnt. by Govt. as Sales Agent, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 197 (i).

Keewatin District, Proclamation *re* N. W. Ters. Act: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 325 (i).

——— Change of Jurisdiction: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 4981 (iii).

Keewatin Ter., Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 5880 (iii).

Kentville Rifle Ranges, Payments *re* Purchase, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1103 (i).

——— Ref. to Courts and Awards, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 195 (i).

'Kestrel,' Str., Expenditure *re* Supplies: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3635 (ii).

——— Officers and Crew, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 986 (i).

Kettlebey Postmaster, Place of Residence of J. M. Walton: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3405 (ii).

Kettle River Valley Ry. Co.'s B. No. 108 (Mr. D. Ross) 1°*, 1562; 2°*, 1710 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2666 (ii).

'King Edward' Str., Explanation *re* Expenditure: Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 4790 (iii).

King's Most Gracious Majesty, Invitation to Visit Canada, Address from House of Parliament and Senate: M. (Mr. Belcourt) 1679; Seconded (Mr. Northrup) 1684 (i).

——— Reply from Senate, Mess. *re*: Read (Mr. Speaker) 2244 (ii).

——— Mess. to the Senate: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2321 (ii).

Kingston and Pembroke Ry. Co.'s B. No. 44 (Mr. Hall) 1°*, 485; 2°*, 781; in Com., and 3°*, 1569 (i).

Kingston Penitentiary: in Com. of Sup., 7520 (iv).

Kingston, R.M.C. Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 6735 (iv).

Kingston, Smith's Falls and Ottawa Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 6161 (iv).

Kootenay and Arrowhead Ry. Co.'s B. No. 30 (Mr. Galliher) 1°*, 350; 2°*, 525; in Com., 1145; 3°*, 1147 (i).

La Banque Provinciale du Canada B. No. 49 (Mr. Bergeron) 1°*, 655; 2°*, 928 (i); in Com., 3236; 3°*, 3236 (ii).

Labour, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7444 (iv).

'Labour Gazette', Printing &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7444 (iv).

Labour Organizations, False Representations *re*: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) on M. to take in Mondays, 4571 (iii).

Labour Statistics Collection Repeal B. No. 109 (Mr. Fisher) 1° m., 1562 (i) ; 2°*, 2161 ; in Com., 2161 ; 3°*, 2162 (ii).

Labrador Boundary Survey : Remarks (Mr. Morin) in Com. of Sup., 5861 (iii).
See 'Newfoundland,' &c.

Lac Bouchette to St. André Ry. Co.'s Subsidy : in Com. on Res., Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6182 (iv).

Lachine Canal, Electric Installation: in Com. of Sup., 7511 (iv).

——— Gratuity *re* Medical Attendance, for W. Mitchell: in Com. of Sup., 7500 (iv).

——— Rebuilding Slope Walls: in Com. of Sup., 5079 (iii).

——— Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 5358 (iii).

——— Staff: in Com. of Sup., 7483 (iv).

——— Tolls on Coal: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 7063 (iv).

La Compagnie d'Asssurance Mutuelle B. No. 88 (Mr. J. A. Ross) 1°*, 1252; 2°*, 1570 (i); in Com., 4942; 3° m., 4942 (iii).

'Ladies Home Journal,' Reduction of Postage Rates, U. S. Publications, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 5620 (iii).
See 'Post Office.'

Ladysmith Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6757 (iv).

Lafferty, Dr., Payments to *re* Indians: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 961 (i).

Lake Megantic Piers: in Com. of Sup., 6974 (iv).

Lake Nominingue and La Lièvre Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 6143 (iv).

Lake Ocebe Lighthouse, Construction of, Payments to Employees, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bennett) 997 (i).

Lake St. Francis Islands, Number and Owners: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 7636, 7638 (iv).

Lake St. John Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 6164 (iv).

Lake St. Louis, Hydrographic Surveys, Completon of Maps, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Piché) 330 (i).

Lake St. Peter Piers : in Com. of Sup., 7560 (iv).

Lake of Two Mountains, Hydrographic Surveys, Completion of Maps, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Piché) 330 (i).

Lake Winnipeg Fisheries, Steamer: in Com. of Sup., 7563 (iv).

Lake of the Woods and Keewatin Milling Co.'s B. No. 111 (Mr. Adamson) 1°*, 1576; 2°*, 1792 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3186 (ii).

Lamont, J. H., Payments to as Crown Prosecutor: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Wright) 979 (i).

Land Grants Patents, Total Number issued in Man., Sask. and Alberta, from 1872 to 1905, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 209 (i).

Land Grants to Rys., Inaccuracy of Votes and Proceedings, *re* adjnd. deb.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 972 (i).

——— Selection by Ry. Cos., on Amt. (Mr. W. J. Roche) to Com. of Sup., Rsmd. adjnd. deb., 1015 (i).

Land Grants to Rys., &c., Inquiry for Papers referred to in Speech of Min. of Int. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 973 (i).

——— Location, Mileage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 2075 (ii).

Land Grants or Sale in Alberta to Syndicate or Company from Iowa, O. C.s, *re*, &c. : M. for Copies* (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 1871 (i).
See 'Homesteads,' &c., 'Saskn. Valley Land Co.'

Land Patents issued in Man., Sask. and Alberta from 1901 to 1905, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 2275 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 1855 (i).

Lands purchased by Companies, Associations, &c.: M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3276 (ii).

Land Sales in Alberta and Sas. for Irrigation Projects, Area, Location, &c., Prices, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 208 (i).

Land Sales in Blocks or Areas in Man., Sask. and Alberta: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sproule) 774 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 569 (i).

Land Sales in B. C., Conditions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 5752 (iii).

Lands, Sale by Govt. and Ry. Cos. to Private Corporations, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 194 (i).

Langevin, Sir Hector, Decease of : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5084 (iii).

Laprairie Ice Pier, Contract to Messrs. Amiot & Lemay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 763 (i).

Laprairie Camp: *See* 'Militia,' &c.

Last Mountain Lake Outlet, Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7052 (iv).

'Laurier Tower,' Investigation *re* Collapse, Mr. Curry, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6714 (iv).
See 'Public Works, Ottawa,' &c., 'Tower.'

Leamington Postmaster, and Outside Business: Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 533 (i).

——— Ownership of Post Office : Ques. (Mr. Clements) 588 (i).

Legal Expenses for Indians: in Com. of Sup., 726 (i).

Leonardville Deer Island Wharf Location, Estimated Cost : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 3251 (ii).

Leprosy B. No. 115 (Mr. Fisher) 1°*, 1576 (i) ; 2° m. and in Com., 2185 ; 3°*, 2189 (ii).

Lethbridge Coal Miners Strike, Cor. *re* Calling out of N.W.M. Police : M. for Copies * (Mr. R. Smith) 998 (i).

Letter Carriers, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 527 (i).
——— Uniforms, Names of Contractors, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 1747 (i).
Lévis Dry Dock, Resolution *re* Enlargement: Ques. (Mr. Carrier) 4705 (iii).
Lévis Quarantine, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 4707 (iii).
Lewis, Jamieson Webster (Indian) Enfranchisement B. No. 85 (Mr. Oliver) 1°*, 1149 (i); 2° m., and in Com., 2827; 3°*, 2832 (ii).
Library of Parlt., Joint Rep.: Presented (Mr. Speaker) 7 (i).
——— Com.: List Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 169 (i).
——— Sunday Attendance: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 2233 (ii).
Liddle, David, Apptmnt. as Ass't. Inspector of Weights and Measures at Windsor: M. for Cor. * (Mr. Ingram) 204 (i).
Lt. Governorship: *See* 'N.S.'
Light and Fog Alarms, Ontario Ports, Contracts and Supplies: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 4706 (iii).
Lighthouses Agencies, Rents &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3591 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 4788, 4867 (iii), 7561 (iv).
——— Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4938 (iii).
——— Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 4117 (iii).
——— Lightkeepers Salaries: in Com of Sup., 3583 (ii).
See 'Marine.'
Lighthouses, Construction of, Amount expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 988 (i).
Lighthouse Keepers' Salaries, Increase of: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 455 (i).
Lighting System *re* St. Lawrence Route: Inquiry (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 6545 (iv).
See 'Acetylene.'
L'Ile aux Grues Channel, Deepening, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 200 (i).
Lindsay Rifle Range, Construction of: Ques. (Mr S. Hughes) 589 (i).
Litigation Expenses *re* Dom. Lands: in Com. of Sup., 5944 (iii).
Litigated Matters, Justice Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 7528 (iv).
Little Current Postmaster, B. H Turner, Dismissal, Charges *re*: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 2727 (ii).
Live Stock, and Dairying Industries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7412 (iv).
Live Stock for Indians, Man. and N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 735 (i).
Lytton School for Indians, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 1089 (i).
Loan Companies B. No. 40 (Mr. Zimmerman) 1° m., 444; 2°, and ref. to Sel. Com., 889 (i); in Com., 3277 (ii); 3°*, 6997 (iv).
Loan Companies B. No. 40: M. (Mr. Fielding) to place on Govt. Orders, 6856 (iv).
Loans, Temporary Govt., Outstanding and Rate of Interest: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 171 (i).
Lodge, Mr. M., Purchase of Property at Moncton: Remarks (Mr. Barker) in Com. of Sup., 7484 (iv).
London Armoury, Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 2037 (ii).
London Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 6735 (iv).
London Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 6736 (iv).
——— Improvements, Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 2037 (ii).
London Ry. Mail Service, Apptmnt. of Supt. &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 3405 (ii).
Lord's Day B. No. 12 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1° m., 19; 2° m., 1010; ref. to Sel. Com., 1014, 1203 (i); in Com., 5622, 5696, 5697, 5755 (iii); 6249, 6327, 6555, 6619; 3° m., 7193; ref. back to Com., 7206, 7272; Bill reported, 7277; M. (Mr. Aylesworth) to recom., 7277, agreed to (Y. 79; N. 42) 7286; in Com., 7287; Bill reported and 2° of Amts., 7295; 3° m., 7300; Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) 7333, neg. (Y. 15, N. 104) 7349; Amt. (Mr. Monk) 7350, Neg. (Y. 15; N. 102) 7352; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7353, Neg. (Y. 39; N. 77) 7357; 3°*, 7358; Sen. Amts., 7664, 7697 (iv).
Lord's Day B. 12, in Com:
Baker's Work, 5748 (iii).
Ball Games, &c., Amt. (Mr. T. Martin) 7233 agreed to (Y. 52; N. 42) 7246; M. (Mr. Aylesworth) to strike out, agreed to (Y. 79; N. 42) 7286 (iv).
Bill Coming into Force, 6674 (iv).
Business Sales, 5645 (iv).
Corporation Liability, 6365 (iv).
Definition of Lord's Day, 5643 (iii).
Destination of Trains, 7258, 7272 (iv): *See* 'Trains.'
Electric Rys., Operation of, 5755 (iii), 6643, 7246 (iv).
Employees, Liability, 24 hours' rest, 5758 (iii), 6365, 6660 (iv).
Excusions, Fees charged, 6810 (iii): *See* 'Sunday.'
Ferry boats, Amt. (Mr. Porter) 7296 (iv).
Fishermen, 6652 (iv).
Forest Fires, 6657 (iv).
Fourth Commandment, 6659 (iv).
Furnace Fires *re* Industrial Establishments, 5670 (iii).
Games and Public Performances, 5786 (iii).
Govt., Deptl. Work, 5748 (iii).
Hiring of Horses and Rigs, 5738 (iii), 6641 (iv).
His Majesty's Mails, 5748 (iii).
Industrial Plants, 6602 (iv): *See* 'Mining.'
Jews and Adventists, 6280, 6327 (iv).
Live Stock arriving on Trains, 5734 (iii).

Lord's Day B. 12, in Com.—*Con*
Loading of Grain, &c., 5726 (iii), 6644 (iv).
Loading and unloading Vessels, 6633 (iv).
Logs and Timber Towing, Amt. (Mr. Bourassa) 5755 (iii), 6655 (iv).
Maple Sugar, 6657 (iv).
Milk and Cheese, 5734 (iii).
Milk and Ice Delivery, 5750 (iii).
Mining Industries, 7252; saving property (Mr. Galliher) 7206 (iv).
Newspapers, Foreign, Sale of, 6273 (iv).
——— Sunday Edition, 5740 (iii).
Pleasure Grounds, 6664 (iv).
Principle of Bill, 5622 (iii).
Provincial Acts *re* Rys., 6366, 7250 (iv).
Provincial Legislatures, 6556; Amt. (Mr. Piché) 6559 (iv).
Provincial Lord's Day Acts, 6370, 6555 (iv).
Sunday Excursions, Selling Liquor, 7257 (iv).
Target Shooting, 6249; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6268 (iv).
Trains in Transit, 5700 (iii).
Twenty-four Hours Rest, 5758 (iii), 6365, 6660 (iv).
Works of Mercy, &c., 5661 (iii).
Yard Crews, Handling Cars, 5727 (iv).

Lord's Day Bill, Further Consideration: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 7061 (iv).
——— Vote *re*: Personal Explanation (Mr. Proux) 7565 (iv).

Lotbinière and Lake Megantic Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 6142, 6162 (iv).

Lotteries: *See* 'Criminal Code.'

Lozo, J. F., Instructions *re* Dismissal of Employees on I. C. R.: Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 2547 (ii).

Lumb, Capt. H. W., Retirement of, Charges *re*: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1149 (i).

Mackintosh, Eileen Mary, Relief B. No. 185 (Mr. Campbell) 1°*, 4759; 2°*, 4951; in Com., 6036; 3°*, 6053 (iii).

Macleod Court House, Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 2035 (ii).

Macpherson, Overseer at Georgeville Wharf, Dismissal, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6777 (iv).

McDonald Iron Co., Yukon Ter., Payments to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 7059 (iv).

McLaren's Creek, Completion of Roadway: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 589 (i).
——— Work by Municipality: Remarks *re* Question (Mr. S. Hughes) 657 (i).

McLaughlin, R. J., and D. O'Connell, Amounts paid *re* Trent Canal Inquiry, Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 590 (i).

McLeod, Roderick A., Homestead Entry Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 5503 (iii).

McRea, Mr. E., Loss of Letter to Bank of New Brunswick, P. E. I., Ques. (Mr. A. A. Maclean) 6930 (iv).

McRea, Hector, Original Purchaser of Lands in B. C., Terms, &c.: Ques (Mr. Sproule) 6245 (iv).

MacTavish, O'Meara, &c., Judges of County Courts, Date of Commission, Population of District: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2036 (ii).
See 'Judges,' &c.

Machinery *re* Marine Dept., Purchase from Brooks & Co.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4099 (iii).
See 'Marine,' &c.

Magazine, Canadian-American, Advance *re* Postal Rates: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 2270 (ii).

Magdalen Island Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7553 (iv).

Maganetawan Lighthouse, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr Bennett) 1677 (i).
——— Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 422 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 4118 (iii).
——— Lighthouse Supplies, Charges against member for Parry Sound, Investigation *re*: Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Bennett) 6793 (ii).

Magnetic Observatory, Construction: in Com. of Sup., 3683 (ii).
See 'Toronto,' &c.

Magog Post Office, Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 341 (i).

Magog Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 6729 (iv.)

Mail Contracts and Service: in Com. of Sup., 525 (i).
See 'Trade and Commerce.'

Mallein Test *re* Glanders, Res. from B.C.: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 2691 (ii).

Mallein Tests: *See* 'Glanders.'

Mail Shipments from American Ports, Canadian Ports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 198 (i).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions: in Com. of Sup., 7543 (iv).

Mail Transportation across Atlantic, Contracts *re*, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 204 (i).

'Maisonneuve' Str., Answers to Questions *re*: Remarks (Mr. Northrup) in Com. of Sup., 2918 (ii).

Manitoba Boundaries Extension, Conference with Ont., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 198 (i).

Manitoba Court of Appeal B. No. 195 (Mr. Aylesworth) Prop. res., 4157; in Com. on Res., 5007; 1°*, 5082; 2° m., and in Com., 5556; 3°*, 5556 (iii).

Manitoba Govt. Telephone System Bill, Consideration of: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) on M. to take in Mondays, 4572 (iii).

Man. Govt. Telephone System, &c., Expropriation, Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. W. J. Roche) 6247 (iv).
See 'Telephone Systems B. 167.'
Manitoba Grain Act (1900) Amt. B. No. 206 (Mr. Fisher) 1° m., 5615; 2°, and in Com., 5904 (iii); 3° m., 6127 (iv).
Manitoba Harbours: in Com. of Sup., 7036 (iv).
Man. Indians, Annuities, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 734 (i).
Manitoba and Keewatin Ry. Co.'s B. No. 213 (Mr. Bole) 1°*, 6075 (iii); 2°*, 6707; in Com., and 3°*, 7270 (iv).
Manitoba and Southeastern Ry., &c., Land Grants to, Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 2075 (ii).
Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s B. No. 121 (Mr. Watson) 1°*, 1667; 2°*, 1792 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3435 (ii).
Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 6140 (iv).
Maple Syrup Adulteration, on prop. Res. (Mr. Boyer) 1397 (i).
Maps of Dom. and N.W.T., Lithographing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5946, 5977 (iii).
Marble Workers of Toronto, Complaints *re* American Importations, Undervaluation at Customs: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 5321
Marconi Stations: in Com. of Sup., 7561 (iv).
——— Stations, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 766 (i).
——— System across Atlantic: Ques. (Mr. W. Maclean) 323 (i).
Marconi Telegraph System: in Com. of Sup., 6771 (iv).
MARINE:
Acetylene Gas Buoys between Lachine and Kingston, Cost of Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 982 (i).
Acetylene Gas Buoys in St. Lawrence Channel, Rep. of Transportation Commission *re*: (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 2898 (ii).
See 'Carbide,' 'Gas Buoys,' 'St. Lawrence Route,' 'Windmill,' &c.
Aids to Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 4788 (iii), 7584 (iv).
'Alert' Str., Expenditure *re*: Remarks (Mr. Pringle) in Com. of Sup., 4836 (iii).
'Arctic' Str., Amounts expended for Supplies, Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 980 (i).
——— Boiler and Machinery, Payments to Brooks & Co.: in Com. of Sup., 4100; Letter from Robt. Scott: Read (Mr. Taylor) 4101; Letter from Goldie & McCullough: Read (Mr. Taylor) 4106 (iii).
——— Expedition, Charges *re* Expenditure: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com. of Investigation, 3620; Agreed to (Y. 132; N. 0) 3671; Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3622, Neg (Y. 45; N. 88) 3669 (iii).
MARINE—*Con.*
'Arctic,' Str., Investigation *re* Expenditure: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Special Com., 3903 (ii).
——— Rep. of Special Com.: M. (Mr. A. K. Maclean to conc., 6372; Amt. (Mr. Northrup) 6498, Neg. (Y. 37; N. 93) 6535 (iv).
——— Notice of Motion: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3503 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Notice for Committee, 3582 (ii).
'Arctic,' Supplies: in Com. of Sup., 4089 (iii).
'Bavarian' Str., Cause of Wreck: Remarks (Mr. Monk) in Com. of Sup., 2898 (ii).
'Boynton,' Tug, of Sault Ste. Marie Tug Co., Payments to: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 4093 (iii).
B. C. Shipping Interests, Govt. Aid to: Remarks (Mr. R. G. Macpherson) 1469 (i).
Brooks & Co., Banking Arrangements and Marine Deptl. Accounts: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 4840 (iii).
See 'Arctic,' 'Machinery,' &c.
Buoys, Foreign made, purchased by Canadian Govt. for Canada: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3407 (ii).
Canadian Fog Signal Co., Amounts paid to: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 767 (i).
Cape Spencer Fog Signal: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 4957 (iii).
Carbide Supplies for Lighthouse Service: in Com. of Sup., 4879 (iii).
Casting purchased in Sorel by Marine Dept., total expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 5007 iii).
Cement purchased by Marine Dept. from Merwin & Brooks &Co.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 3366 (ii).
Cement purchased from Charles Strubbe: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 4922 (iii).
Chateauguay and Beauharnois Channel, Buoying of: Ques. (Mr. Piché) 2724 (ii).
Coal purchased by Marine Dept., Prices paid: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 2910, 3594 (ii).
Dickenson's Landing Lighthouse, Cost *re* Change to Acetylene Gas &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 981 (i).
Dionne, Louis, Harbour Master at Montmagny, Salary, Revenues, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 4707 (iii).
Farran's Point Acetylene Gas Plant, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1677 (i).
Fire Extinguishers for Lighthouse Service: in Com. of Sup., 4959 (iii).
Fog Alarms: in Com. of Sup., 3691 (ii).
Fog Signals, Amount for Canadian Fog Signal Co.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 767 (i).
See 'Light,' &c.

MARINE—*Con.*
French River Lighthouse, Construction: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 3601 (ii).
See 'Maganetawan,' 'Public Works,' &c.
'Galveston,' Dredge, purchase of by Marine Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 2921 (ii).
Gas Buoys *re* Lighthouse Service: in Com. of Sup., 4872 (iii).
Gas Explosions *re* Lighthouses, Compensation for Damages: in Com. of Sup., 4868 (iii).
Giant's Tomb Island, Georgian Bay, Sale of Timber Lands to P. Ryan: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 332 (i).
See 'Georgian Bay Islands.'
Goldie & McCullough, Purchase of Steel Boilers, &c. by Marine Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 3379 (ii).
Goose Harbour Buoys, Contractor *re* Setting out: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 3742 (ii).
Govt. Steamers, Maintenance and Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 3200, 3350, 3803, 3934 (ii), 4089, 4816 (iii).
——— Supplies and Expenditure: Explanation read (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. of Sup., 4786 (iii).
Hospital at Louisburg, Completion and Appointments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1861 (i).
Hydrographic Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 3685 (ii).
Ice breakers, Govt. Steamers: in Com. of Sup., 3803 (ii).
——— Maintenance and Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 4760 (iii).
——— Northumberland Straits, &c: in Com. of Sup., 7558 (iv).
——— P. E. I. Winter Service: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 4817 (iii).
See 'Govt. Steamers,' 'P.E.I.,' &c.
Jack Straw and Red Horse Lights, Cost *re* Change to Acetylene Gas: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 584 (i).
'Kestrel' Str., Tonnage, officers and Crew, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 986 (i).
——— Expenditure *re* Supplies: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 3635.
Lake Ocebe Lighthouse, Construction of, Payments to Employees, Cor. &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bennett) 997 (i).
Lake St. Louis, Hydrographic Surveys, Completion of Maps, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Piché) 330 (i).
Lighthouse Agencies, Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3591 (ii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 4788, 4867 (iii), 7561 (iv).
——— Lightkeepers Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 3583 (ii).
——— Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 4938 (iii).
——— Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 4117 (iii).
Light and Fog Alarms, Ontario Ports, Contracts and Supplies: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 4706 (iii).
See 'Fog,' &c.
Lighthouses, Construction of, Amount expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 988 (i).
Lighthouse Keepers Salaries, Increase of: Ques. (Mr. Gauvreau) 455 (i).
Lighting System *re* St. Lawrence Route: Inquiry (Mr. Sproule) for Ret., 6545 (iv).
Machinery *re* Marine Dept., Purchased from Brooks & Co.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4099 (iii).
See 'Brooks,' &c.
Maganetawan River Lighthouse, Supplies, Charges against member for Parry Sound, Investigation *re*: Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Bennett) 6793 (iv).
——— Contract *re* Construction: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 3601 (ii), 4118 (iii).
——— Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 1677 (i).
Magnetic Observatory, Construction: in Com. of Sup., 3683 (ii).
'Maisonneuve,' Str., Answers to Questions *re*: Remarks (Mr. Northrup) in Com. of Sup., 2918 (ii).
Marconi Wireless Stations, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 766 (i).
Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Brodeur) 485 (i).
——— Rep.: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1005, 1258 (i).
Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 370 (i), 7558 (iv).
——— Private Sec.: in Com. of Sup., 4896 (iii).
Marine Hospital, Louisbourg, Completion, Appointment of Officials, Rep. *re* Investigation as to Condition of Foundation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 2029 (ii).
Marine Hospitals, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3686 (ii).
Marine Supplies, Purchases from Monopolists: Remarks (Mr. Northrup) in Com. of Sup., 4141 (iii).
Masters and Mates Examination: in Com. of Sup., 3399 (ii).
'Matilda,' Schr., Rescue of Crew, Reward *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2549 (ii).
Merchant Marine for Canada, Decrease of: M. (Mr. Lewis) to Adjn. 1160 (i).
Merwin, Geo. T., Amounts paid to: Ques (Mr. Foster) 767 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 3411 (ii).
Meteorological Service: in Com. of Sup., 3684 (ii).

MARINE—*Con.*
'Minto,' Str., Expenditure *re* Supplies, Letter from Aud. Gen. *re* Prices: Read (Mr. Brodeur) 4915 (iii).
'Montcalm,' Govt. Str., Expenditure: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4832 (iii).
——— Supplies furnished: Remarks (Mr. Northrup in Com. of Sup., 3376 (ii).
Montreal Harbour, Revenue, Total Expenditure, Bonded Debt, for 1905: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 2729 (ii).
Montreal Marine Agency, Rental, Furnishings, &c.: in Com. of Sup. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3591 (ii).
——— Number of Employees: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1101 (i).
Naval School of Instruction: Ques. (Mr. Piché) 2726 (ii).
See 'Schools of Navigation,' &c.
Norwegian Shipping Competition: Par. in Sydney 'Record' (Mr. Black) 4084 (iii).
Ocean and River Service: in Com. of Sup., 3200, 3350, 3803, 3934 (ii), 4089, 4760, 4816 (iii).
Oil Supplies *re* Lighthouses: in Com. of Sup., 4140 (iii).
Ottawa River, Buoys in Channel: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 1371 (i).
Pacific Coast, Aids to Navigation, Pets., Reps., Cor. *re* Necessity of: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1741 (i).
Palmer's Point Lighthouse, Claims for Damages: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 6087 (iii)
Paquet, Jos., Reinstatement as Pilot: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3970 (ii).
Patrol Boat for Hudson Bay: in Com. of Sup., 4867 (iii).
Pilotage Fund, Defalcation of D. McLean, Sec. Treas., Investigation, &c., Telegrams, Cor., &.: Read (Mr. Boyce) 5435 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Boyce) 6803 (iv).
Port Arthur Harbour, Payment *re* Tugs: Remarks (Mr. Northrup) in Com. of Sup., 4094 (iii).
P.E.I., Steamer for Ice-breaking in Northumberland Straits: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) in Com. of Sup., 3934 (ii), 4760 (iii).
'Quadra' Str., Repairs, &c. Inquiry for Reps., &c. (Mr. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 4852 (iii).
——— Memos. *re* Expenditure, &c.: Read (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. of Sup., 4915 (iii).
Quebec Pilots, Examination and Reinstatement of Jos. Paquet: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3970 (ii).
Questions answered by Marine Deptl. Officers: Remarks (Mr. Northrup) in Com. of Sup., 2918 (ii).
Reid Wrecking Co., Emplymt. and Payments to: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 4089 (iii).

MARINE—*Con.*
Reid Wrecking Co., Contracts *re* Tugs for Marine Service: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 3588 (ii).
Rep. Deptl.: Presented (Mr. Brodeur) 485 (i).
Roberts, Mr. Orlando, Marine Engineer, Certificate &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) on Conc., 7585 (iv).
St. Lawrence Route, Accidents, Number of Sea-going Vessels, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 585, 974, 1096 (i).
——— number of vessels of 1,000 Tons, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 768 (i).
——— remarks *re* questions, 586 (i).
——— Depth of Water at Quebec and Montreal, Paragraph in Quebec Chronicle: Ques. (Mr. Gervais) 4797 (iii).
——— Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 2894 (ii).
——— Lighting Buoys, Acetylene Gas, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2897 (ii).
——— Lighthouses between Lachine and Bay of Quinté, Total Cost of Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 1150 (i).
——— Lighthouses, Number between Lachine and Bay of Quinté: Remarks *re* Question (Mr. Taylor), 1571; Answer (Mr. Brodeur) 1571 (i).
See 'Wrecks.'
Sand-Heads Lightship, B.C., Repts. and Cor.: Read (Mr. Brodeur) 4912 (iii).
Schools of Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 3399 (ii).
See 'Naval.'
Scientific Institutions: in Com. of Sup., 3683 (ii).
'Seguin', Str., Payments *re* Construction Work: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 4096 (iii).
Shipping List, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Brodeur) 4995 (iii).
Steamboat Inspection, Inspectors' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 3688 (ii).
Steamer, New, being Constructed in England, Plans, Specifications, &c.: M. for Copies * (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1871 (i).
Sub-marine and Fog Signals: in Com. of Sup., 4954 (iii).
Sydney Pilotage Commission and Pilots Retiring Fund, Amounts paid to, Cor. &c.: M. for Copies * (Mr. Boyce) 997 (i).
Toronto Observatory, Removal to Ottawa: Remarks (Mr. Kemp) 127 (i).
Tyner's Head Fog Alarm, N.B., Cost of, Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stockton) 2269 (ii).
Willson, Thos. L., Payments to for Gas Buoys: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 767 (i).
Windmill Lighthouse, Installation of Acetylene Gas, Cost &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 981 (i).

MARINE—*Con.*
Worthington Pump, Purchase by Govt., Charges *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 4108 (iii).
Wrecks on Pacific Coast, Loss of Life, Causes, &c.: M. for Ret. * (Mr. R. Smith) 428 (i).
Wrecks on Pacific Coast, Number, Financial Loss, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Smith) 338 (i).
Wrecking Plant, Davie & Sons: in Com. of Sup., 4867 (iii).
Wrecks on St. Lawrence, 1905, Total Loss, Cause, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 170 (i).
——— M. for Ret. * (Mr. R. L. Borden) 204 (i).
Martin, Sugrue, and Sylvestre, Messrs., Charges *re* Irregularities in Wood Contracts: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 5932 (iii).
Masters and Mates Certificates Act Amt. B. No. 7 (Mr. Lancaster) 1° m., 18; 2° m., 458; in Com., 841, 998 (i).
Masters and Mates Examination: in Com. of Sup., 3399 (ii).
Mather Bridge and Power Co.'s B. No. 99 (Mr. German) 1°*, 1364; 2°*, 1570 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2666 (ii).
'Matilda', Schr., Rescue of Crew, Reward *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2549 (ii).
Meats canned and Fluid Beef imported from U.S. for 1903-4-5: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 5005 (iii).
Medical Attendance for Sick Fishermen at Canso, Appnmt.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 426 (i).
Medical Attendance to Indians, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 1079 (i).
Medical Attendance for Indians, Payments to: Remarks (Mr R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 962 (i).
Medical Attendance for Indians, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 734 (i).
Medical Attendance for Indians, Ont. and Que.: in Com. of Sup., 717 (i).
See 'Indians'.
Medicine Hat Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6753 (iv).
Medicines, Fraudulent and Deleterious, Sale of: M. for Com. (Mr. Stockton) to Investigate, 2951 (ii).
——— List of Committee: M. (Mr. Stockton) 3065 (ii)
——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to add Mr. Bergeron's Name, 3150 (ii).
See 'Drug,' &c.
Members, Daily Attendance, Record of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 201 (i).
Members and Privy Councillors Indemnities B. No. 18 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. W F Maclean) 2067 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 2511 (ii).
Members Indemnity Repeal Bill: Personal Explanation (Mr. W F. Maclean) 1855 (i).
Members Sessional Allowance Repeal B. No. 143 (Mr. U. Wilson) 1°*, 1743 (i).
Members Indemnity, Ref. to in deb. on Address, 93 (i).
——— Remarks *re* Discussion (Mr. Ingram) 2810 (ii).
Members Indemnity: *See* 'Pensions,' 'Privy Councillors,' 'Senate and House of Commons,' &c.
Members Introduced, 4, 889, 1840 (i).
Members, New Certificates of Elections: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 3 (i).
Members, Payments of Fees for Govt. Service: *See* 'Criminal Code'.
Members of Parlt., &c., appointed to Office. Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 4798, 5181, 5752, 6085 (iii); Ret. laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5752 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) *re* Answer to former Question, 6543 (iv).
Members of Parlt., Apptmnt. to Positions of Emolument, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 214 (i).
——— Imperfect Answer to Question: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 350 (i).
Members of Parlt. and Newspaper Criticisms: *See* 'Cinq-Mars,' 'Privilege,' Cc.
Merchant Marine of Canada, Decrease of: M (Mr Lewis) to Adjn., 1160 (i).
Merwin, Geo. T. Amounts paid to: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 767 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 3411 (ii).
Mess. from His Ex., Estimates, 1906-7: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 125 (i).
——— Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1940 (i).
——— Suppl. Estimates, 1906: Read (Mr. Speaker) 2016 (ii).
Mess. from His Ex.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 5697 (iii).
Meteorological Service: in Com. of Sup., 3684 (ii).
Methyl. Alcohol, Import and Excise Duty, Quantity imported, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 5507 (iii).
Methylated Spirits: in Com. of Sup., 1561 (i).
Metric System: in Com of Sup., 2607 (ii).
——— Salaries for Lectures, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2611 (ii).
Mexican Light and Power Co., Limited B. No. 95 (Mr. Calvert) 1°*, 1252; 2°*, 1570 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2666 (ii).
Mexican Tramway and Electric Co.'s B. No. 96 (Mr. Calvert) 1°*, 1252; 2°*, 1570 (i); in Com., 2666; 3°*, 2667 (ii).
Midland Dredging, Number of Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr Bennett) 1868 (i)
Midland Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6990 (iv).
Midland and Vasey Mail Service, Tender *re* Contract: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 1376 (i).

Milan Exhibitions, Character, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 304 (i).
Militia (lands) Pension B. No. 177 (Mr. Oliver) 1°*, 4154; 2° m., 4805; in Com., 4806; 3° m., 4897 (iii).
Militia Act (pension) Amt. B. No. 200 (Sir Frederick Borden), Res. prop., 4156; in Com. on Res., 5186; 1°* of B., 5190; 2°, and in Com., 5533; 3°*, 5536 (iii).
Militia Act Amt. B. No. 201 (Sir Frederick Borden), Res. prop., 4157; in Com. on Res., 5190; 1°* of B., 5191; 2° m., and in Com., 5536; 3°*, 5537 (iii).
MILITIA :
Annual Drill: in Com. of Sup., 5012 (iii), 7178 (iv).
——— Claims for Injuries: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 7580 (iv).
——— Instruction, 3rd District, Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2034 (ii).
Arsenal, Ammunition, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7177 (iv).
Bands and Street Parades, Regulations *re* Flags: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1151 (i).
Camp Grounds: in Com. of Sup., 7183 (iv).
Clothing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7181 (iv).
Camp, Illegal Payments to Men, Delayed Transportation: Par. in Toronto Newspapers (Mr. S. Hughes) 5992 (iii).
Doull, Capt., Apptmnt. to Royal Canadian Regiment: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4799 (iii).
Esquimalt Defences, Permanent Force, Annual Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 184 (i).
Fredericton Cavalry Depot, N.B., Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 186 (i).
Halifax, Arsenal, Offer by Imp. Authorities: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 1009 (i).
——— Defences, Permanent Force, Annual Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 184 (i).
——— Drill Shed Property, Disposition by Govt., &c.: (Mr. Fowler) 833 (i).
——— Garrison, Contract for Supplies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 1862 (i).
——— Old Drill Shed Property, Disposal of, Cor., O.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Fowler) 774 (i).
Imperial Intelligence Office, Establishment of, Cor. *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Belcourt) 427 (i).
Imperial Officers and R.M.C., Status *re* Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 4247 (iii).
Kentville Rifle Range, Payments *re* Purchase, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1103 (i).
——— Ref. to Courts and Awards, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 195 (i).
Laprairie Military Camp, Removal from, to Sherbrooke: Ques. (Mr. Lanctot) 2726 (ii)
See 'Sherbrooke.'
MILITIA—*Con.*
Lethbridge Coal Miners Strike, Cor. *re* Calling out of N.W.M. Police: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. Smith) 998 (i).
Lindsay Rifle Range, Construction of: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 589 (i).
Militia Camp, Service, Rolls: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 1001 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Ward) 2624, 3318 (ii).
Military Camp in Simcoe County, Option *re* Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5508 (iii).
Militia Camp Supplies, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2033 (i).
Militia and Defence Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 359 (i), 5012 (iii), 7161 (iv).
——— Deptl. Promotions: in Com of Sup., 7182 (iv).
——— Deptl. Report : Presented (Mr. Borden, King's) 1667 (i).
'Military Gazette,' Expenditure *re* Issue: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 582 (i).
Militia Library: in Com. of Sup., 7182 (iv).
Militia Schools of Instruction, Commission *re* Investigation: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1104 (i).
Militia Supplies, &c., Contracts *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. E. D. Smith) 773 (i).
National Rifle Association, Use of Wind Gauges: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 3318 (ii).
Niagara Military Camp, Tenders *re* Forage Supplies: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 4800 (iii).
Ottawa Field Battery No. 2, Caretaker's Name, Qualifications, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2725 (ii).
Pay and Allowance: in Com. of Sup., 7177 (iv).
Pensions to Militiamen: in Com. of Sup., 7575 (iv).
Powell, Capt., Apptmnt. to Permanent Force: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4798 (iii).
Rifle Ranges in Mar. Provs., Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 5753 (iii).
Rifle Ranges, Ordnance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7161 (iv).
Ross Rifle, Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 7162 (iv).
——— Commission *re* Examination, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3408 (ii).
——— Contracts with Govt., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Worthington) 1380 (i).
——— Improvements: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 3411 (ii).
——— Incorporation, Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1372 (i).
——— Inspectorship, Apptnmt. of Imp. Officer: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 423 (i).
——— Number manufactured, distributed and Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3246 (ii).
See 'Sutherland.'

MILITIA—*Con.*
St. John's Barracks, Medical Supplies, 1904-5: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 4156 (iii).
St. John's Military School, Medical Officer, Name and Qualifications: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 4704 (iii).
——— Numerical Force: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 4155 (iii).
Saddlery and Harness for Militia, Contracts and Advertisements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 577 (i).
Sault Ste. Marie, Legal Proceedings *re* Calling out Militia: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 2271 (ii).
——— Cor., Telegrams *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Boyce) 2274 (ii).
Sherbrooke Military Camp, Purchase or Lease of Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Tobin) 328 (i). *See* 'Laprairie.'
Smart, Col., Resignation of: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 5363 (iii).
S. A. War, Contingent, Cost of Outfitting, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1564 (i).
——— Number of Canadians disabled, &c., pensioned by Imp. Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 1098 (i).
——— Volunteers, disabled, &c., Recognition as pensioners: prop. Res. (Mr. Brodeur) 429, Neg. (Y. 59, N. 97) 434 (i).
Sussex Camp Ground: in Com. of Sup., 7183
Sussex Rifle Range, Contract Price, Caretaker's Wages, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 577 (i).
Sutherland Combination Sight and Ross Rifles, Purchase of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4703 (iii).
Sydney Riots, Payments to Militia: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1104 (i).
Tents, Supplies, &c., in Com. of Sup., 7170 (iv).
Thirteenth Scottish Dragoons, Resignation of Col.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 7178 (iv).
Three Rivers, St. Hyacinthe and Sherbrooke Drill Sheds, Cost of Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3251 (ii).
Uniforms for 80th Regiment, Nicolet: Ques. (Mr. L. Lavergne) 7693 (iv).
Veterans of Fenian Raids, Claims for Compensation: prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 613; Neg. (Y. 40; N. 90) 646 (i).
Voyageurs of the Nile, Medals, Recognition for Services, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 420, 448 (i).
——— Remarks *re* Answer to Question (Mr. S. Hughes) 485 (i).
Winnipeg Militia Dept., Amounts paid for Coal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2080 (ii).
Milk Cans: *See* 'Weights and Measures B. 14.'
Milk River Cattle Co. and Grand Forks Cattle Purchase of Interest: Denial of (Mr. Sifton) 4606 (iii).
Milk River Cattle Co., Sale of Land and Valuation, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 2035 (ii).
Miminegash Breakwater Repairs, Pet. *re* Extension: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 201 (i).
——— M. for Copies* (Mr. Lefurgey) 2273 (ii).
Mines Branch, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 5941 iii).
——— Supt.'s Salary: in Com. of Sup., 5934 (iii).
Mining Institute, Aid to: in Com. of Sup., 5949, 6978 (iii).
Ministerial Changes, Announcement *re* Justice, Post Office and Supreme Court Vacancies (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4535 (iii).
Ministerial Changes: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 225 (i).
——— Explanation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 252 (i). *See* 'Cabinet Changes.'
Ministers acting as Counsel in Courts, on Order being called: Remarks (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1397 (i).
Ministers and Deputy Ministers, Practising in Courts: Prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 1694 (i), 2731; Amt. (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 2798, agreed to (Y. 89; N. 54) 2808 (ii).
——— on Order for consdn. of Res.: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 2069 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lennox) *re* Discussion, 2511 (ii).
Minnesota-Canadian Bridge Co.'s incorp. B. No. 91 (Mr. Dyment) 1°*, 1252; 2°*, 1570 (i); Order for Com., 2067; in Com., 2499; in Com., and 3°*, 3187 (ii).
——— on Order for Com.: Remarks (Mr. Conmee) 2067 (ii).
'Minto' Str., Expenditure *re* Supplies, Letter from Aud. Gen. *re* Prices: Read (Mr. Brodeur) 4915 (iii).
'Minto' Str. and Pictou Voters Lists: *See* 'Pictou.'
Miscouche Shoals, P. E. I., Placing of Buoys: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 582 (i).
Mission Road and North Sequin Mail Service, Auount paid to Contractor: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 422 (i).
Mitchell, Diversion of Line, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5070 (iii).
Moberley, J. H., Emplymt. as Guide to Enumerators *re* Census: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 7435 (iv).
——— Par. in 'Standard': Read (Mr. Lake) 6793 (iv).
——— Explanation *re* Emplymt. by Govt. (Mr. Fisher) 6930 (iv).
Monarch Bank of Canada B. No. 186 (Mr. Parmelee) 1°*, 4801; 2°*, 5400; in Com., and 3°*, 6056 (iii).
Moncton Land Purchase by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 5061 (iii).

Moncton Locomotive and Car Shops Property: in Com. of Sup., 7501 (iv).
See 'I.C.Ry.' &c.
Money Lenders B. No. 11 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1° m., 19; 2°, and in Com., 352; ref. to Sel. Com., 1259 (i); in Com., 6805; 3°*, 6818 (iv).
Money Lenders Bill, Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6125, 6677 (iv).
——— Remarks *re* (Mr. Foster) 4990 (iii).
Money Scrip redeemed and Land purchased from 1875 to 1905: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Roche, Marquette) 210 (i).
See 'Half-Breed,' &c .
Montague and Cardigan Branch P. E. I. Ry., Damages for Lands expropriated, Cor., Reps. &c. : M. for Copies* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1206 (i).
'Montcalm,' Str., Supplies furnished: Remarks (Mr. Northrup) in Com. of Sup., 3376 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4832 (iii).
See 'Marine,' &c.
Montfort and Gatineau Ry. Co.'s Subsidy in Com. on Res.: Amt. (Mr. Perley) 6167 iv).
Montmagny Cigar Factory, Suspension of Excise Officer Michon: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2269 (ii).
Montmagny Postmaster, Apptmnt. of, Complaints *re* other Occupation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 3404 (ii).
Montmagny Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6731 (iv).
Montmorency Falls Harbour Front: in Com. of Sup., 6975 (iv).
'Montmorency' Yacht, Cost of Maintenance, Service, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2269 (ii).
Montreal Barracks, Delay in Purchase of Site: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 334 (i).
See 'Montreal Militia Buildings.'
Montreal Harbour Commissioners, Amounts paid in fees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1673 (i).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners B. No. 55 (Mr. Brodeur) 1° m., 656 (i); 2° m., and in Com., 2189; 3°*, 2189 (ii).
——— B. No. 124 (Mr. Brodeur) 1° m., 1668 (i); 2°*, 2189; in Com., 2190, 2205, 2626 (ii).
——— (further advances, commissioners) B. No. 222 (Mr. Brodeur) Res. prop., 5616 (iii); in Com. on Res., 6707; 1°* of B., 6708; 2° m., and in Com., 6845; 3°*, 6854 (iv).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners' Board, Reorganization, Cor. Documents, &c. M. (Mr. Rivet) for Copies*, 1132, 1206 (i).
——— Reorganization and Exclusion of Press from Meetings : Remarks (Mr R. L. Borden) 656 (i).
Montreal Harbour, Revenue, Total Expenditure, Bonded Debt, for 1905: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 2729 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Improvements : in Com. of Sup., 7036 (iv).
Montreal and Havana Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 7556 (iv).
Montreal Marine Agency, Number of Employees: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1101 (i).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 3591 (ii).
Montreal Military Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 6732 (iv).
Montreal ,Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal Co.'s B. No. 57 (Mr. Belcourt) 1° m., 743; 2°*, 974 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 5400 (iii).
Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.'s B. No. 37 (Mr. Geoffrion) 1°*, 444; 2°*, 569 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3187 (ii).
Montreal Post Office Employees, Absence, Payments for Over-time, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 340 (i).
Montreal Post Office Improvements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 335 (i).
Montreal Turnpike Trust, Indebtedness to Dom. Govt.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 436 (i).
Monument to Champlain, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7578 (iv).
Moosejaw Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6753 (iv).
Mormons as Citizens: Remarks (Mr. Herron) in Com. of Sup., 7581 (iv).
Morning Sittings : M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5508 (iii).
See 'Govt. Business,' &c.
Mount Vernon, P.E.I., Mail Service, Pet. *re* : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1567 (i).
Mugford, J. C., Claim for Damages *re* Fire on P.E.I.Ry.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 585 (i).
Murray Canal, Wooden Piers at Entrance, &c., Tenders *re* Construction : Ques. (Mr. Walsh) 6930 (iv).
Murray River Branch, P.E.I. Ry., Claims for Expropriated Lands, Settlement of: Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5993 (iii).
Muscowequan School Property, Location, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 1245 (i).
Museum, Victoria Memorial, Change of Plans: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 1152 (i).
See 'Victoria,' &c.
Mutual Reserve Life Ins. Co., Charges for Larceny, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Martin) 419 (i).
Nakusp and Slocan Ry. Co.'s B. No. 32 (Mr. Galliher) 1°*, 350; 2°*, 525; in Com., 1297; 3°*, 1297 (i).
Napanee Postmaster, Dr. Lynch, and Outside Business (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 547 (i).
National Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. No. 62 (Mr. Zimmerman) 1°*, 829; 2°*, 974 (i).
National Rifle Association, Use of Wind Gauges: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 3318 (ii).
National Transcontinental Ry., Proposed Route from Winnipeg to Quebec and Moncton : Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 418 (i).

National Transcontinental Ry. Com.'s Rep.: Presented (Mr. Emmerson) 125 (i).

——— Printing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 126 (i).

National Transcontinental Ry.: *See* 'G.T.P. Ry.'

Naturalization Act, Rets., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7576 (iv).

Naturalization of Aliens, Uniformity of Laws relating to: M. for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 345 (i).

Naturalization Laws of the Empire, Available Copies: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1467 (i).

Naturalization Laws of U.S. Citizens in Can., Reps. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 417 (i).

See 'Head Tax,' &c.

Naval School of Instruction, Lectures *re*: Ques. (Mr. Piché) 2726 (ii).

See 'Marine', &c.

Neepawa Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 6743 (iv).

Negro Population, Apptmnt. to Govt. Positions: Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 7503 (iv).

Nelson, J., and Sutherland, C., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 188, 453 (i).

N. B. Petroleum Co., Members or Ministers of Crown as Officers of: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 978 (i).

——— Capital Stock, Directors, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 1670 (i).

——— Retirement of President: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 1377 (i).

Newcastle Improvements, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5070 (iii).

Newcastle, Neguac and Escuminac, Miramichi River Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7556 (iv).

Newfoundland, Claims for Ungava Bay: Ques. (Mr. Gervais) 7459 (iv).

See 'Labrador'.

Newfoundland and W. Indies, Steps *re* Confederation: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 333 (i).

New Harbour Breakwater, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7043 (iv).

Newmarket and Holland River Canal, Survey, Estimate *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1565 (i).

Newspaper Criticisms from Press Gallery: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Foster) 4030 (iii).

Newspaper Criticisms: *See* 'Cinq-Mars'.

Newspaper Reports *re* Members' Conduct in House: Remarks (Mr. Bourassa) 3069 (ii).

New Westminster Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6757 (iv).

Niagara Falls, Preservation of, Memorial Pets., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 1101 (i).

——— Representations to Imp. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 334 (i).

Niagara Military Camp, Tenders *re* Forage Supplies: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 4800 (iii).

Niagara, Queenston and St. Catharines Ry. Co.'s B. No. 25 (Mr. Clarke) 1°*, 349; 2°*, 524 (i); in Com. and 3°*, 3672 (ii).

Niagara, St. Catharines and Toronto Ry. Co.'s B. No. 133 (Mr. Calvert) 1°*, 1743 (i); 2°*, 2066; in Com., and 3°*, 3953 (iii).

Nicolas, F., Payments to *re* Indexing Geological Reps.: in Com. of Sup., 5980 (iii).

Nicolet and Gaspé Representations: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 1865 (i).

Nicolet Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6732 (iv).

Nipigon Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 6151 (iv).

Nixon, Jos., Claim of James Daley *re* Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1103 (i).

——— Claims of Mrs. Hodge *re* Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1102 (i).

——— Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 194 (i).

——— Further Report *re* Charges against: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 452 (i).

——— Land Agent at Macleod, Reps. *re*: M. for Copies * (Mr. Foster) 774 (i).

Noble, W. H., B. H. Fraser and J. F. Fraser, Emplymt. by Govt. &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 987 (i).

Norfolk Election, Pets. *re*: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 485 (i).

North Atlantic Trading Co.: Notice of Motion (Mr. Foster) 1742 (i).

——— Contracts, Charges *re*: Amt. (Mr. Foster) to Com of Sup., 1795 (i); Neg. (Y. 61; N. 115) 2449 (ii).

Debate:

Mr. Foster) 1795; (Mr. Oliver) 1816; (Mr. (Mr. Monk) 1941; (Mr. D. Ross) 1956; (Mr. Northrup) 1968; (Mr. Bole) 1994; (Mr. Perley) 2003; (Mr. Bureau) 2011 (i); (Mr. Crawford) 2084; (Mr. Gunn) 2103; (Mr. A. K. Maclean) 2111; (Mr. Fowler) 2146; (Mr. Miller) 2327; (Mr. Lake) 2357; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 2372; (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2391; (Mr. Fisher) 2412; (Mr. Barker) 2415; (Mr. Ingram) 2417; (Mr. S. Hughes) 2424; (Mr. Stockton) 2429; (Mr. Bourassa) 2440 (ii), Amt., Neg. (Y. 61; N. 115) 2449 (ii).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Adjournment of Debate: Personal Explanation (Mr. R. L. Borden) 243 (i).

——— Arrangements *re*: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3235 (ii).

——— Bonus, &c., Names of Directors, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Wilson) 206 (i).

——— Amounts claimed *re* Bonus: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 328, 830 (i).

——— Cancellation of: Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) in Com. of Sup., 5970 (iii).

——— Criticism *re* Vote of Mr. A. Lavergne in 'La Presse': Personal Explanation (Mr. Bourassa) 4351 (iii).

North Atlantic Trading Co., Documents quoted from by Min. of the Int. in former Speech: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1856 (i).

——— Instructions to Mr. W. D. Scott *re* Telegram to Lord Strathcona: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 1157 (i).

——— Investigation *re* Operations: Ques. (Mr. Osler) 452 (i).

——— Number of Immigrants deported, Payments to Govt. by Co., Form of Deposit Cheque, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 2452 (ii).

——— Payments to, Names of Directors, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 1647 (i).

——— Personal Explanation (Mr. A Lavergne) *re* Vote and Par. in 'La Presse', 2622 (ii).

——— Personal Explanation (Mr. Sifton) 2457 (ii).

——— Preston, W. T. R., Refusal to answer Questions: M. (Mr. Monk) to summon before Bar of Hse., 4451; Amt (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4472; Agreed to (Y. 95; N. 47) 4533 (iii).

——— on Amt. (Mr Foster): Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) Ref. to Rep. of Committee, 2106; Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 2106, 2108 (ii).

——— Ref. to in Debate on 'Arctic' (Mr. Fielding) 3645 (ii).

——— Signatures missing: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2081 (ii).

See 'Preston'; &c.

North Bay Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6736 (iv).

Northern Commercial Telegraph Co., Limited B. No. 139 (Mr. Gorman) 1°*, 1743 (i); 2°*, 2066 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4397 (iii).

North Head Breakwater, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 576 (i).

North Head, Grand Manan Breakwater, Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 1105 (i).

North Lake Post Office, Removal to Black Point, and Return, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2274 (ii).

North Saskatchewan River Survey: in Com. of Sup., 6995 (iv).

Northumberland Straits and Lower St. Lawrence Ice-breaker: in Com. of Sup., 7558 (iv).

See 'Marine,' &c.

Norwegian Shipping Competition: Par. in Sydney 'Record' (Mr Black) 4084 (iii).

North-west Commercial Travellers' Association B. No. 212 (Mr. Bole) 1°*, 5992 (iii); 2°*, 6707; in Com., and 3°*, 7270 (iv).

Northwest Lands, Allotments of, Denial of Statement made by Mr Bole: Ques. of Privilege (Mr Bergeron) 4249 (iii).

Northwest Land Patents: M. for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 2927 (ii).

N. W. Mounted Police, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 360 (i).

N. W. Mounted Police, in Sask. and Alberta: Rep. of Council Read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. of Sup., 4975 (iii).

N. W. Mounted Police, Force, Yukon: in Com. of Sup., 4967 (iii).

N. W. T., Govtl. Schools: in Com of Sup., 5880 (iii).

N.S. Lt. Governorship, Apptmnt. of Mr. Fraser: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 837 (i).

Oak Point, P.E.I. Mail Service, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 1102 (i).

Oaths of Office B. No. 1 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1°*, 'pro forma', 4 (i).

Ocean and River Service: in Com, of Sup., 3350, 3803, 3934, 4089, 4760, 4816 (iii).

——— Govt. Steamers: in Com. of Sup., 3200 (ii).

Official Cars, for Govt. Number, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 984 (i).

See 'Private'.

Officials of House of Commons, Salaries, &c.: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7054 (iv).

Ogden, Wm. Edward, Relief B. No. 210 (Mr. Derbyshire) 1°*, 5992; 2° m., 6075 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6706 (iv).

O'Gorman, John, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 1099 (i).

Oil Supplies *re* Lighthouses: in Com. of Sup., 4140 (ii).

See 'N.B. Petroleum.'

Oka Reserve, Claims of Indians: in Com. of Sup., 728 (i).

Ontario Lumber Co.'s Lighthouse on French River, Contract *re* Erection: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 1867 (i).

See 'Marine, French River,' &c.

Ontario Northern and Timagami Ry. Co. B. No. 132 (Mr. McCool) 1°*, 1743 (i); 2°*, 2066; in Com., and 3°*, 3435 (ii).

Opening of Parliament: Mess. from His Ex. (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).

Orangemen and Leader of Opposition, Newspaper Criticisms: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4716 (iii).

Orangemen and h. m. for Carleton, N.B.: Personal Explanation (Mr. Taylor) 4801 (iii).

Orillia Postmastership, Apptmnt. to: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 329 (i).

Osoyoos Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6757 (iv).

Ottawa Astronomical Observatory, Electric Wiring, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 764

Ottawa, Brockville and St. Lawrence Ry. Co. B. No. 151 (Mr. Derbyshire) 1°*, 2451; 2°*, 2721; in Com., and 3°*, 3435 (iii).

Ottawa Buildings, Electric Power, Elevators, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6764 (iv).

——— Repairs, Furnishings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6759 (iv).

Ottawa Buildings, Leased to Govt., Rentals, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 187 (i).

Ottawa Buildings, Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7013 (iv).

——— Supreme Court Library: in Com. of Sup., 7034 (iv).

Ottawa Carbide Co., Amounts paid to Dec. 31, 1905: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1099 (i).

——— Purchases from: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 986 (i).

Ottawa Field Battery No. 2, Caretaker's Name, Qualifications, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2725 (ii).

Ottawa Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7037 (iv).

Ottawa Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 6175 (iv).

Ottawa Parlt. Buildings, Fittings: in Com. of Sup., 7038 (iv).

——— Refacing Stone: in Com of Sup., 7038 (iv).

Ottawa Post Office Building, Condition, Irregularities, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1580 (i).

Ottawa Post Office Employees, Wages paid: Ques. (Mr. Stewart) 6245 (iv).

Ottawa Post Office, Fittings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7038 (iv).

——— Total Expenditure *re* Repairs: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 452 (i).

Ottawa Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 6709 (iv).
See 'Public Works, Ottawa.'

Ottawa River, Buoys in Channel: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 1371 (i).

Ottawa River Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 6767 (iv).

Owen Sound, Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6990 (iv).

——— Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 6736, 7013 (iv).

Owen Sound and Meaford Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 6160 (iv).

Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co.'s B. No. 173 (Mr. Stewart) 1°*, 3952 (ii); 2°*, 5402; in Com., 6056 (iii); 3° m., 6323; on Order for 3°, 6678; 3°*, 6706 (iv).

Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co. and White Fish Island, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 833 (i).

Pacific Bank of Canada B. No. 50 (Mr. Belcourt) 1° m., 656; 2°*, 928 (i); in Com., 3242; 3°*, 3243 (ii).

Pacific Cable, Deficit, Payments *re*: in Com. of Sup., 7577 (iv).

——— Statement read (Mr. Fielding) 7692 (iv).

Pacific Coast, Aids to Navigation, Pets., Reps., Cor. *re* Necessity of: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1741 (i).

——— Loss of Steamships, &c., Reps. *re* Findings, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1741 (i).
See 'B.C.'

Pacific and Eastern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 205 (Mr. Belcourt) 1°*, 5556; 2°*, 6075 (iii).

Pacific Marine Underwriters, Limited B. No. 54 (Mr. Macpherson) 1°*, 656; 2°*, 928 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3739 (ii).

Pacific Northern and Omineca Ry. Co.'s B. No. 80 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) 1°*, 999; 2°*, 1298 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2066 (ii).

Pairs on Division *re* Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 'Arctic' Debate: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 3799 (ii).

Palmer's Point Lighthouse, Claims for Damages: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 6087 (iii).

Palmerston Postmaster, Apptmnt. by Reform Executive: Par. in 'News': Read (Mr. Barr) 2326 (ii).

——— Apptmnt. of: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 2454 (ii).

Paquet, Jos., Reinstatement as Pilot: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3970 (ii).

Parke, Mr. Philip, Sale of Land to, Location, Conditions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1865 (i).

Parliament Buildings, Addition and Alterations, Library, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6712 (iv).
See 'Public Works, Ottawa.'

Parliament, Delay in Opening: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8 (i).

Parliament: *See* 'Opening.'

Parry Sound Mail Service, Amount paid to Contractor: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 422 (i).

Parry Sound Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6990 (iv).

Partridge Island, Water System, Payments to Pub. Works Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 4896 (iii).

Pasquah's Indian Band, Surrender of Land, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5503 (iii).

Patent Bills: *See* 'Anderson Puffed Rice, &c.'; 'Cyclone Woven Wire,' 'Duryea, C.B.' 'Edmunds, Henry,' 'Gray, F. M.,' 'Houk, Henry Luther,' 'Toledo Glass Co.,' 'Underwood,' 'Wurts, H.'

Patent Medicines, Legislation *re* Sale of: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 183 (i).
See 'Medicines.'

Patent Record: in Com. of Sup., 2676 (ii), 7379 (iv).

Patrol Boats *re* Customs: in Com. of Sup., 4896 (iii).

Patrol Boat for Hudson Bay: in Com. of Sup., 4867 (iii).

Pay and Allowance, Militia: in Com. of Sup., 7177 (iv).
See 'Militia.'

Payette, Philias, Compensation *re* Damages to Health on N. T. Ry. Construction: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 5321 (iii).

Peck, L. C., Dismissal as Postmaster from Hopewell Hill, N. B., Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 1375 (i).

Peel County Mail Contracts, Location, Expiration of, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Blain) 773 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 1749 (i).

Peer, John Albert, Relief B. No. 169 (Mr. Campbell) 1°*, 3403; 2°*, 3739 (ii); in Com., 4950, 5447; 3° m., 5460 (iii).

Peigan and Blood Indian Agencies, Cattle purchased, Number, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 4702 (iii).

Pelée Islands Steam Subventions: in Com. of Sup., 7557 (iv).

Penitentiaries B. No. 176 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) Res. prop., 3907 (ii); in Com. on Res., 4077; 1°*, of B., 4084; 2°, and in Com., 5387, 5402; 3°*, 5406 (iii); Sen. Amts., 6818 (iv).

Penitentiaries, Contract *re* Flour Supplies: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 341 (i).

——— Advertisements *re*: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 450 (i).

——— List of Names: M. for Copy* (Mr. Taylor) 774 (i).

See 'Flour', &c.

Pensions to Members of Parliament: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 4570 (iii).

Pensions to Militiamen: in Com. of Sup., 7575 (iv).

Pensions Bill for Privy Councillors: Remarks on M. to take in Mondays (Mr. U. Wilson) 4568 (iii).

Pensions to Privy Councillors: *See* 'Privy Councillors.'

Peribonka River Dykes: in Com. of Sup., 6975 (iv).

Personal Explanation, *re* Montreal Meeting *re* Lord's Day Bill (Mr. Macdonald) 7637 (iv).

Personal Explanation *re* Statement with ref. to Senator J. H. Ross and Homestead Regulation (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) 3235 (ii).

See 'Privilege.'

Petawawa Military Ground, Purchase of, O.C., Surveys, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Worthington) 344 (i).

Peterborough Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 6738 (iv).

Peterborough Lift Lock, Reps., Documents, &c. *re* Defects: M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 1871 (i).

See 'Canals, Trent.'

Petitcodiac and Moncton Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7555 (iv).

Petitions, Presenting of, Expiration of Time: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 828 (i).

Petit Rocher Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 7043 (iv).

Pickerel Fishing on Lake Huron, Date of Close Season: Ques. (Mr. Gunn) 2034 (ii).

Pictou Cattle Disease: Remarks (Mr. Macdonald) in Com. of Sup., 7440 (iv).

Pictou Landing Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 5073

Pictou Station Accommodation I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5075 (iii).

Pictou Voters' List, Affidavits *re* Names fraudulently put on: Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) in Com. of Sup., 3946-7 (ii).

Pierreville, Yamaska, Wharf, Cost, Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1746 (i).

Pilotage Act Amt. B. No. 219 (Mr. Brodeur) 1° m., 6537 (iv).

Pilotage Commission, N. Sydney, Investigation *re*: Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Boyce) 6803 (iv).

Pilotage Commissioners, Remuneration or Salaries: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 768 (i).

Pilotage Fund, Defalcation of D. McLean, Sec. Treas., Investigation, &c., Telegrams, Cor., &c.: Read (Mr. Boyce) 5435 (iii).

Pinette Harbour Dredging, P.E.I., Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 332 (i).

Piping, Butt and Lap Welded, Duty, Quantity imported from U.S., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 175 (i).

Pisquid Road Mail Service, Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. A .McLean) 1565 (i).

Pitt River, C.P.R. Bridge: in Com. of Sup., 7053 (iv).

Placer Mining, Yukon Ter. B. No. 153 (Mr. Oliver) 1° m., 2452; 2°*, 3412; in Com., 3412 (ii); 4802, 3°*, 4805 (iii); Sen. Amts., 6828

See 'Yukon.'

Plasterers' Labourers at Winnipeg, Non-payment by Contractors: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 1372 (i).

Pointe à la Frigate, Gaspé Co., Breakwater, Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1151 (i).

Pointe aux Trembles Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6975 (iv).

Point Edward Dredging Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 6990, 7048 (iv).

Point Prim Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6931 (iv).

Pontiac County, Geological Formation, Reps. *re* Ques. (Mr. Piché) 1673 (i).

Porcupine Mountain Reserve, ref. (Mr. Ames) to in debate on B. 47, 3548 (ii).

Port Arthur and Fort William, Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6772 (iv).

——— Dredging, Advertising for Tenders: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3503 (ii).

——— Expenditure in 1902-3-4-5: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3243 (ii).

——— Tenders *re* Dredging: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1856 (i).

Port Arthur Dredging, Contract with Great Lakes Dredging Co.: in Com. of Sup., (Mr. Bennett) 3804 (ii).

Port Arthur Harbour, Payment *re* Tugs: Remarks (Mr. Northrup) in Com. of Sup., 4094 (iii).

Port Bruce Harbour, Amounts voted, expended and Payments to, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ingram) 205 (i).

——— Incomplete Ret.: Remarks (Mr. Ingram) 3505 (ii).

Port Burwell Harbour, Amounts voted, expended and Payments made to, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ingram) 206 (i).

——— Tenders *re* Advertisements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 982 (i).

Port Burwell Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6990 (iv).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 5185, 5343 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Ingram) 4250 (iii).

Port Colborne Breakwater, Amount expended, &c., Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 447 (i).

Port Colborne, Breakwater and Elevators: Papers laid on Table (Mr. Hyman) 1841 (i).

——— Deepening Channel: in Com. of Sup., 5357 (iii).

——— Elevator, Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 579 (i).

——— Elevators, Welland Canal: in Com. of Sup., 5165 (iii).

——— Entrance, Welland Canal: in Com. of Sup., 5165 (iii).

——— Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6772 (iv).

Port Credit Harbour Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 7014 (iv).

Port Hood Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6789 (iv).

Port Simpson and Queen Charlotte Islands Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7555 (iv).

Port Stanley Harbour Improvements, Advertisements *re* Tenders: Ques. (Mr. Macdonnell) 984 (i).

Port Stanley Harbour, Amounts voted, expended and Payments to, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ingram) 205 (i).

——— Payment of Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 172 (i).

Port Stanley, Port Burwell, &c., Customs Receipts since 1896, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 171 (i).

Port Stanley Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6991 (iv).

POST OFFICE :

Algoma Post Office, Pet. *re* : Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 556 (i).

Amaranth Township, Pet. *re* Establishment of Post office: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 990 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

'Appeal to Reason', Removal of Prohibitive Ban: Ques. (Mr. Barr) 1867 (i), 5615 (iii).

Arcola and Regina Mail Service, Pet. *re* Improvement: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5006 (iii).

Atlantic Mail Service, Contracts with Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Stockton) 189, 214 (i).

——— Contract *re*, Report, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 198 (i).

See 'Trade and Commerce,' &c., 'Mail,' &c.

Bell's Rapids Post Office, Establishment of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 201 (i).

Birnie Postal Facilities, Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5006 (iii).

Blooming Point Post Office, P.E.I., Pet. *re* Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. A. McLean) 332 (i).

Brantford Postal Revenue, Value, Postal Notes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 339 (i).

Brantford Post Office, Total Amount of Wages, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 340 (i).

Cannington Postmaster, Amount of Salary for 1903-4-5: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 453 (i).

——— Charges against, Investigation *re* : Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 190, 421 (i).

——— Dismissal of Mr. H. D. Talbot: M. for Cor. (Mr. S. Hughes) 2459; Ques. of Order (Mr. Zimmerman) : Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 2460; Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker), Irrelevancy of debate *re* quoting articles: Ruling, 2467 (ii).

———Incomplete Answer to Question: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 225 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 540 (i).

Chatham, Free Mail Delivery : Remarks in Com. of Sup. (Mr. Clements) 551 (i).

Coffin, David T., Postmaster at Hillsboro Head, Charges *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 3065 (ii).

——— M. (Mr. A. Martin) for Cor.*, 3997 (ii).

Coldwater and Lawson Mail Service, Amount paid *re* Contract: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 330 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 529 (i).

Copper Cliff Postal Facilities: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 7693 (iv).

Elgin County Mail Contracts, Location, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ingram) 3997 (ii).

French Village Post Office, P.E.I., Change of Location: M. for Pets.* (Mr. A. McLean) 345 (i).

Galliher, L. L., Dismissal from Wilton Post office, Apptmnt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 835 (i).

Gooderham Post Office, Charges against Postmistress, &c.: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 1583 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
International Postal Congress, Canadian Representative at, Instructions *re*: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 2728 (ii).
Iona Postmaster, Dismissal of Mr. Jos. McCabe, Cor. &c.: M. for copies * (Mr. A. Martin) 345 (i).
Kettlebey Postmaster, Place of Residence of J. M. Walton : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3405 (ii).
'Ladies Home Journal', Reduction of Postage Rates, U.S. Publications, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 5620 (iii).
See 'Magazines.'
Leamington Postmaster, and Outside Business : Remarks (Mr. Clements) in Com. of Sup., 533 (i).
Leamington Post Office, Ownership of: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 588 (i).
Letter Carriers, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 527 (i).
——— Uniforms, Names of Contractors, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 1747 (i).
Little Current Postmaster, B. H. Turner, Dismissal, Charges *re* : Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 2727 (ii).
London Ry. Mail Service, Apptmnt. of Supt. &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 3405 (ii).
McRae, Mr. E., Loss of Letter to Bank of New Brunswick, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 6930 (iv).
Magazines, Canadian-American, Advance *re* Postal Rates : Ques. (Mr. Cockshutt) 2270 (ii).
See 'Ladies,' 'Postage,' 'Postal Rates.'
Mail Contracts and Services: in Com. of Sup., 525 (i).
Mail Shipments from American Ports, Canadian Ports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 198
Mail Transportation across Atlantic, Contracts *re*, &c.: M. for Copies * (Mr. R. L. Borden) 204 (i).
See 'Atlantic.'
Midland and Vasey Mail Service, Tender *re* Contract : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 1376 (i).
Mission Road and North Sequin Mail Service, Amount paid to Contractor : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 422 (i).
Montmagny Postmaster, Apptmnt. of, Complaints *re* other Occupation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 3404 (ii).
Montreal Post Office Employees, Absence, Payments for over-time, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 340 (i).
Mount Vernon, P.E.I., Mail Service, Pet. *re* : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1567 (i).
North Lake Post Office, Removal to Black Point, and Return, &c.: M. for Cor. * (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2274 (ii).
Oak Point, P.E.I. Mail Service, Tenders *re* : Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 1102 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*
Orillia Postmastership, Apptmnt. to: Ques. (Mr. Bennett)329 (i).
Ottawa Post Office Employees, Wages paid : Ques. (Mr. Stewart) 6245 (iv).
Palmerston Postmaster, Apptmnt. of : Ques. (Mr. Barr) 2454 (ii).
——— Par. in 'News' : Read (Mr. Barr) 2326 (ii).
Parry Sound Mail Service, Amount paid to Contractor : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 422 (i).
Peck, L. C., Dismissal as Postmaster from Hopewell Hill, N.B., Investigation *re* : Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 1375 (i).
Peel County Mail Contracts, Location, Expiration of, &c. : M. for Ret.* (Mr. Blain) 773 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 1749 (i).
Pisquid Road Mail Service, Pet. *re* : Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1565 (i).
Postage of 'Home Journal,' Letter from Mrs. Webster : Read (Mr. Taylor) 5530 (iii).
Papers, American: *See* 'Appeal to Reason.'
Postal Employees, Delegation *re* Grievances, Legislation &c.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 3795
Postal Rates on Magazines : Remarks (Mr. Cockshutt) *re* Answer to former Question, 2823 (ii).
See 'Magazines.'
Postal Service Act, Legislation *re* : Remarks (Mr. Monk) 3582 (ii).
Postmasters, Duties of, Policy of Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 329 (i).
——— Pet. *re* Duties and Remuneration : Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 1374 (i).
——— Salaries, Delegation *re* : Remarks (Mr. Stockton) in Com. of Sup. 7445 (iv).
——— Salaries : Policy of Govt. *re* : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 537 (i).
Postmaster General's Rep. : Presented (Mr. Aylesworth) 211 (i).
Post Office, Deptl. Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 401 (i), 7445 (iv).
——— Outside Service, Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 525 (i).
Post Office Boxes, Regulations *re* Rentals : Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 423 (i).
Post Office Clerkships, Additional Apptmnts. Rep. *re* : M. (Mr. Barker) for Copy, 771 (i).
Post Offices, Erection of, Govt. Policy: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 6750 (iv).
Post Office Savings Banks, N.B. and N.S., Number transferred : Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1101 (i).
Post Offices, System *re* Opening on Sundays : Remarks (Mr Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 554 (i).
Prince Albert Mail Service, Contract from Station to Post Office : Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche 1745 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

P.E.I., Charlottetown to Belfast Mail Service: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) in Com. of Sup., 548 (i).

P.E.I. Ry., Contract *re* Mail Service : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2267 (ii).

P.E.I. and G.B. Mail Service, Number of Trips : Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 426 (i).

Ry. Mail Clerks appointed from N. York : Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 330 (i).

Rock Hill Postmaster, Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 836 (i).

Rural Mail Delivery, Free, Information *re* U.S. System : Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 216 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 712, 1572 (i).

St. Aubert and St. Pamphile Mail Service, Expiration of Contract : Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2266 (ii).

St. Hypolite Mail Service, Pets. *re* Improvement : Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 2267 (ii).

St. Mary's Post Office Site, Purchase of, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 4703 (iii).

Sault Ste. Marie Post Office, Decision *re* Opening on Sundays : Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 555 (i).

Smith, Mrs Sarah, Dismissal from Mount Buchanan Post Office, P.E.I., and Apptmnt. of Mr. Bishop : M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2038 (ii).

Terrebonne and Ste. Therese Post Offices, Revenue *re* : Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 2721 (ii).

Thessalon Postmaster, Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 2273 (ii).

——— Rentals from P.O. Boxes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 2727 (ii).

Thessalon Post Office, Irregularities *re* : Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 557 (i).

Thorndale Post Office, Removal of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 989 (i).

——— M. for Copies* (Mr. Elson) 998 (i).

Toronto Post Office : in Com. of Sup., 7039 (iv).

——— Fire, Destruction of Mails : Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 2238 (ii).

——— Pneumatic Tube System : Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 7040 (iv).

Victoria Harbour Postmaster, Complaint *re* Duties : Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 543 (i).

Walsh, Patrick, Dismissal from East Romans Post Office, Pet. *re* : Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 769 (i).

——— M for Copies* (Mr. Lancaster) 1206 (i).

Wicksteed Post Office, Pet. *re* Mail Service : Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 556 (i).

Williams, J. J., Dismissal from Port Hawkesbury Post Office : Ques. (Mr. McLennan) 2926 (ii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Wilton Post Office, Dismissal of L. L. Galliher and Apptmnts.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 835 (i).

Winnipeg-Selkirk Mail Service, Tenders *re* Contract : Ques (Mr. W. J. Roche) 3405 (ii).

Woodstock, N.B., Apptmnt. of Mr. L. C. Smith as Postmaster : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 1378, 1564 (i).

Yukon Post Office Services : in Com. of Sup., 558 (i).

Poultry Stations, Total Expenditure and Revenue : Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 587 (i).

See 'Agriculture', &c.

Powell, Capt., Apptmnt. to Permanent Force : Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4798 (iii).

Pratt, Capt. John, Charges *re* Irregularities : Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 4783 (iii).

Preferential Tariff and Canadian Farmers, ref. to Mr. Fisher's Speech in deb. on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 37 (i).

——— ref. to in deb. on Address (Mr. Fisher) 77 (i).

Preferential Trade with G.B., False Declarations *re*, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2548 (ii).

Prendergrast, H. W., Basis of Payments to *re* Dredging at Matchedash Bay: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2454 (ii).

Press Criticims *re* Members : *See* 'Cinq-Mars', *See* 'Privilege', &c.

Preston, Mary Emeline, Relief B. No. 169 (Mr. Campbell) 1°*, 3403; 2°*, 3739 (ii); in Com., 4950; 3°*, 4950 (iii).

Preston, Griffiths, Messrs., Cor. with High Commissioner and Dom. Govt.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1748 (i).

Preston, Mr. W. T. R., Removal from Office of Immigration Agent: Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 6868; Neg. (Y. 39; N. 89) 6928 (iv).

Debate:

(Mr. Monk) 6868; (Mr. Oliver) 6886; (Mr. Macdonell) 6895; (Mr. Guthrie) 6904; (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6905; (Mr. Verville) 6913; (Mr. Bristol) 6913; (Mr. A. Johnston) 6914; (Mr. Bergeron) 6920; (Mr. Campbell) 6923; (Mr. Lalor) 6925; (Mr. S. Hughes) 6926 (iv).

Preston, W. T. R., Immigration Agent in G.B., Visit to Canada: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 172 (i).

——— Rental of House in London: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 3906 (ii).

Preston, W. T. R.: *See* 'North Atlantic Trading Co.', 'Public Accts Com.'

Prince Albert and North Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 221 (Mr. Crawford) 1°*, 6677; 2°*, 6707; in Com., and 3°*, 7270 (iv).

Prince Albert Mail Service, Contract from Station to Post Office: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1745 (i).

Prince Albert Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6754 (iv).

Prince Arthur of Connaught, Reception in Senate: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 1749 (i).

——— Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 314 (i).

——— Welcome to on Arrival in Canada: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. to adjn., 742 (i).

Prince County, P.E.I., Expenditure *re* Public Works: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2266 (ii).

P.E.I. and Mainland Winter Navigation, Cor. *re* New Steamer and Mr. Duguid's Rep. *re* Recommendation, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 1870 (i).

——— Rep. *re* 'Montcalm': Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) 971 (i).

——— Ice-breakers for Northumberland Straits: in Com. of Sup. (Mr. A. Martin) 3934 (ii), 4760 (iii).

——— Ice-breakers: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 4817 (iii).

——— Total Yearly Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 835 (i).

See 'Marine', &c.

P.E.I., Coal Borings, Rep. of Mr. Ellis, Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 5983 (iii).

——— Dredging, Apptmnt. of Supt.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 329 (i).

P.E.I. and G. B. Mail Service, Number of Trips: Ques. (Mr. A. Maclean) 426 (i).

P.E.I., Fisheries, Cor. *re* Control by Govt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lefurgey) 997 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lefurgey) 3076 (ii).

P.E.I., New Dredge, Completion of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 332 (i).

——— Provincial Subsidies, Cor. *re* Basis of Agreement: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 774 (i).

——— Representation in Parlt.: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) on M. to take in Mondays, 4571 (iii).

——— Steamship Service: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 445 (i).

——— Tunnel, Estimate of Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 188 (i).

P.E.I. Ry., Branch Lines to Stanley Bridge, Surveys, Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 996 (i).

——— Cape Traverse Surveys: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 5174 (iii).

——— Cardigan and Montague Branch, Completion of Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 1866 (i).

——— Charlottetown to Belfast Mail Service: Remarks (Mr. A. Martin) in Com. of Sup., 548 (i).

P. E. I. Ry., Charlottetown Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5149 (iii).

——— Contract *re* Mail Service: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2267 (ii).

——— Damages to Expropriated Lands: M. for Ret.* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1206; Remarks *re* Ret. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2825 (ii).

——— Employees Wages, published in Aud. Gen.'s Rep.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2549 (ii).

——— Facilities, Pets. *re* Extension: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 444 (i).

——— Freight Rates, 1905, Tariff in Force in April, 1906, Stmnt. of Through Freight Rates, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lefurgey) 2950 (ii).

——— Hillsborough Bridge Contractor, J. Haney, Claims for Damages: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1563 (i).

——— Hodgson Property, Acquiring of, Cor., &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lefurgey) 1380 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 5079 (iii).

——— Land Purchase, Inadequate Compensation, Charges *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1864 (i).

——— News Agency, Contract *re* Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2266 (ii).

——— Newspaper Selling Privileges, Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 6247 (iv).

——— Shops, Rebuilding, Free Site at Summerside: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2728 (ii).

——— Stanley Bridge, Branch Lines, P.E.I. Ry. Survey, Authority *re* Deficient Ret. (Mr. A. Martin) 3317 (ii).

——— Summerside Branch, Rep. *re* Earnings: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1563 (i).

——— Wages paid Employees, Stmnts. *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lefurgey) 2951 (ii).

——— inquiry for ret. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5533 (iii).

See 'P.E.I. Ry. Employees'.

Printers from G.B., Cor. between Imp. Govt. and Can. Govt. *re* False Representations: M. for Copies* (Mr. Verville) 998 (i).

Printers Complaint *re* Winnipeg Printer's Board of Trade, Cor. with Imp. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 572 (i).

Printing Bureau Employees, Names of those receiving less than $12 per week: Ques. (Mr. Stewart) 7060 (iv).

Printing Com.: List presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 169 (i).

——— 3rd Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. Parmelee) 5081 (iii).

——— 5th Rep., M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. to Internal Economy Com., 7054 (iv).

Private Bills, Expiration of Time: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 2811 (ii).

Private Bills, Irregularity of Procedure: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 2325 (ii).
——— M. (Mr. Calvert) to place on Order Paper, 6317 (iv).
——— M. to extend Time (Mr. Dyment) 1575 (i).
——— M. to extend Time (Mr. Grant) 828 (i).
——— M. (Mr. Macpherson) to extend Time, 2820 (ii).
——— M. (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) to extend Time, 5082 (iii).
Private and Official Cars, Ret. ordered by Mr. Tolton: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 839 (i).
See 'Official.'
Privilege, Ques. of, Criticism in 'La Presse' by Mr. Cinq-Mars (Mr. Foster) 4030 (iii).
See 'Cinq-Mars.'
Privilege, Ques. of, Par. in Toronto 'Daily Star' (Mr. Lennox) 1750 (i).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Macpherson) Par. in Toronto 'News' *re* Interruption in House during debates, 3068 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Aylesworth) Par. in Toronto 'World' *re* Municipal Ownership 7367 (iv).
——— (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Hon. R. Préfontaine, 6608 (iv).
Privilege Ques. of.: Statement *re* Senator Cox's Indemnity as Senator, 3152 (ii).
See 'Personal Explanation.'
Privy Councillors Annuities B. No. 18 (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1° m., 316; on Order for 2°, 887, 1711 (i), 2511; 2° m., 2512, 2975 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) 4568 (iii).
——— Repeal B. No. 142 (Mr. U. Wilson) 1°*, 1743 (i).
——— Repeal B. No. 220 (Mr. Fielding) 1° m., 6541; 2° m., 7569; in Com., 7619; 3° m., 7649 (iv).
See 'Pensions,' 'Senate and House of Commons Bills.'
Privy Councillors, Payment of Annuities to, Names: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 2035 (ii).
Privy Councillors Pensions Bill: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4536 (iii).
Privy Council Office, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 358 (i).
Prorogation: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 7600 (iv).
——— Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec., 7695, 7698 (iv).
——— Speech from Throne, 7701 (i).
Provincial Autonomy, Interference in Elections by Dept. of Interior, ref. to in deb. on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 44 (i).
Provincial Elections in N.W., ref. to in deb. on Address (Mr. Foster) 68 (i).
Provincial Representations in Parlt.: Protest *re* Shelving: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) on M. to take in Mondays, 4571 (iii).
Provincial Subsidies, Cor. between Govt. *re* Readjustment, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Parmelee) 211 (i).
——— Conference *re* Readjustment: Ques. (Mr. Parmelee) 195 (i).
Public Accounts Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to add Name, 417 (i).
——— Meetings, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6801 (iv).
——— M. to sit concurrently with Sittings of House: M. (Mr. Belcourt) 5529 (iii).
——— Rep., Ref. back to Com.: Remarks (Mr. Northrup) *re* Motion, 3904 (ii).
——— 2nd Rep.: M. (Mr. Belcourt) to conc., 4247 (iii).
——— 10-15 Reps. of Com.: M. (Mr. Wm. Roche) to print, 7458 (iv)
——— Rep.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 126 (i).
——— Witnesses Burking Evidence: Remarks (Mr. Ingram) in Com. of Sup., 4110 (iii).
See 'Preston,' &c.
PUBLIC WORKS:
Actonvale Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6728 (iv).
Amherstburg Channel Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 6985 (iv).
Amherst Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6772 (iv).
Annapolis Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6773 (iv).
Antigonish Public Building, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 6727 (iv).
Armouries, Erection of, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 6758 (iv).
Arbitrations, &c., *re* Building Contracts: in Com. of Sup., 6765 (iv).
Arnes, Lake Winnipeg, Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6994 (iv).
Aylmer Post Office Site, Pets., &c., *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ingram) 205 (i).
Baddeck Wharf, N.S., Location, Payments *re* Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 2457 (ii).
Battle River Bridge at Battleford: in Com. of Sup., 7020 (iv).
Bayfield Harbour, Total Expenditure up to 1896 and since: Ques. (Mr. Gunn) 578 (i).
Beaverton Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6985 (iv).
Belle River, Ont., Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6985 (iv).
Belleville Armoury, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6733 (iv).
Bell River, P.E.I., Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6956 (iv).
Bic Harbour Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6943 (iv).
Blanche River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6985 (iv).
——— Wharf Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 6977 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

'Boynton,' Tug, of Sault Ste. Marie Tug Co., Payments to: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 4093 (iii).

Brandon Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 6743 (iv).

Brantford Public Building, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6734 (iv).

Bronte Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6986 (iv).

——— Lighthouse: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 4788 (iii).

Buildings, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 6755 (iv).

——— Man.: in Com. of Sup., 6743 (iv).

——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 6727 (iv).

——— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 6733, 7013, 7037 (iv).

——— Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 6728, 7036 (iv).

Calgary Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6752 (iv).

Campbellton Wharf Extension: in Com. of Sup., 6935 (iv).

Canning Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6787 (iv).

Canton Fabre, Lake Temiskaming Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6943 (iv).

Cape Tormentine Harbour Works: in Com. of Sup., 6935 (iv).

Chance Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6940 (iv).

Chateauguay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6943 (iv).

Chateau-Richer Breakwater, Reconstruction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3969 (ii).

——— Wharf Dues, Amount collected: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 4708 (iii).

Chaudière Falls Water Power, Leases, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Taylor) 3997 (ii).

Chicoutimi Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6728 (iv).

Chicoutimi Pulp Co., Contract *re* Piers and Booms: M. for Copies* (Mr. Perley) 1379 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. Perley) 993 (i).

See 'St. Maurice.'

Chicoutimi-Saguenay Dredging, Cor. &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Girard) 3997 (ii).

Chockfish River Outlet Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6241 (iv).

Clinton Post Office, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gunn) 1567 (i).

Cobourg Piers, Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 6986 (iv).

Collingwood Dry Dock, Cor. *re* Bonus: M. for Copies* (Mr. Bennett) 774 (i).

——— Inquiry for Rets. (Mr. Bennett) 1367 (i).

——— Valuation *re* Bounty paid: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 574 (i).

Collingwood Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6986 (iv).

Columbia River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6995 (iv).

Crapaud Harbour Channel Dredging: Ques. (Mr. A. McLean) 329 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Cumberland, B. C. Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6755 (iv).

Dalhousie Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6941 (iv).

Daly & Hanman's Dredges, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 572, 761 (i).

Descente des Femmes Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Sup., 7020 (iv).

D'Escousse Wharf, Expenditure *re* Construction, 1903-5: Ques. (Mr. W. Wright) 990 (i).

Dipper Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6941 (iv).

D'Israeli Wharf, Completion, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 2268 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1377 (i).

——— in Com. of Sup., 6943 (iv).

——— Expenditure *re*, Authority for, &c.: (remarks) in debate on Public Works Expenditure, 3425 (ii).

Dom. Buildings, Rent, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6759, 7013 (iv).

See 'Ottawa.'

Dorset Wharf, Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Sam. Hughes) 419 (i).

Dredges under Charge of Mr. Cowie: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4154 (iii).

Dredges under Charges of Mr. Lafleur: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4154 (iii).

——— St. Lawrence Ship Channel: in Com. of Sup., 7560 (iv).

——— Ont. and Quebec: in Com. of Sup., 6995 (iv).

Dredging Plant, New, B. C.: in Com. of Sup., 6996 (iv).

Dredging in Ont., Amounts paid, Work performed, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Bennett) 773 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 417 (i), 2721 (ii).

——— Que. and Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 7014 (iv).

Echo Bay Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 7049 (iv).

——— Contract Price *re* Construction, Specifications, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 2032 (ii).

Edmonton and Athabaska Landing, Telegraph Extension: in Com. of Sup., 7012 (iv).

Edmonton, Immigration Building: in Com. of Sup., 6753, 7042 (iv).

——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6753 (iv).

Fairford River Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6994 (iv).

Fernie Public Building: in Com of Sup., 6757 (iv).

'Fielding', Dredge, Estimated and Total Cost of: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4700 (iii).

Fox River Breakwater, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1151 (i).

French River Lighthouse for Ontario Lumber Co., Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr Bennett) 1867 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
French River Water Power, Pending Applications, &c.: Ques (Mr. Bennett) 5003 (iii).
Gelinas, Mr., Sec. of Pub. Works Dept., Travelling Expenses: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 398 (i).
Georgeville Wharf, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 6777 (iv).
Georgian Bay Canal Surveys, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 335 (i).
Georgian Bay Laboratory: in Com. of Sup., 3707 (ii).
Glace Bay, Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6774 (iv).
——— Specifications, Plans, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 428 (i).
Glace Bay Public Building: in Com of Sup., 6727 (iv).
Gobeil, Mr., Dep. Min. of Public Works, Additional Pay as Arbitrator: Remark in Com. of Sup., 371 (i).
Goderich Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6989 (iv).
Grande Rivière du Beaupré, Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6793 (iv).
Grand River, Dunnville, Amount spent for Dredging: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 579 (i).
Grand Vallee Wharf, Total Cost, Income, &c. Ques. (Mr. Monk) 341 (i).
——— Date of Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1370 (i).
——— Par. in 'Le Canada': Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Monk) 3796 (ii).
——— Revenue &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1150 (i).
Great Lakes Dredging Co., Payments for Tugs in Thunder Bay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 3583 (ii).
Grosse Isle Quarantine Inspector, Expenditure *re* Yacht 'Montmorency', Cottage &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2269 (ii).
Grosse Isle, Que., Marconi Telegraph System: in Com. of Sup., 7011 (iv).
Guelph Armoury, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6734 (iv).
Habitant River, Canning Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6787 (iv).
Hamilton Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 6735 (iv).
Harbours and Rivers, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 6995, 7052 (iv).
——— Man.: in Com. of Sup., 6994, 7036 (iv).
——— N.B.: in Com. of Sup., 6935, 7043 (iv).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 6772, 7042 (iv).
——— Ont.: in Com. of Sup., 6772, 6985, 6989, 7048 (iv).
——— P.E.I.: in Com. of Sup., 6931 (iv).
——— Que.: in Com. of Sup., 2894 (ii), 6771, 6943, 7043 (iv).
——— Sask.: in Com. of Sup., 7052 (iv).
PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Higgin's Shore, P.E.I., Pet. *re* Wharf: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 571 (i).
Humboldt Telegraph Station: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 7012 (iv).
Huntsville, Baysville and Bracebridge Wharfs, Name of Engineers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wm. Wright) 1868 (i), 2453 (ii).
Inverness (Broad Cove) Mines Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6788 (iv).
Inverness Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6727 (iv).
Isle Bizard and Ste. Genevieve, Bridge: Remarks (Mr. Hyman) in Com. of Sup., 6962 (iv).
Kingston, R. M. C. Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 6735 (iv).
Ladysmith Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 6757 (iv).
Lake Megantic Piers: in Com. of Sup., 6974 (iv).
Lake St. Peter's Piers: in Com. of Sup., 7560 (iv).
Lake of Two Mountains, Hydrographic Surveys, Completion of Maps, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Piché) 330 (i).
Laprairie Ice Pier, Contract to Messrs. Amiot & Lemay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 763 (i).
Last Mountain Lake Outlet, Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7052 (iv).
Leonardville, Deer Island Wharf, Location, Estimated Cost: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 3251 (ii).
Levis Dry Dock, Resolution *re* Enlargement: Ques. (Mr. Carrier) 4705 (iii).
L'Ile aux Grues Channel, Deepening, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 200 (i).
London, Armoury, Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 2037 (ii).
——— Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 6735 (iv).
——— Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 6736 (iv).
——— Post Office Improvements, Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 2037 (ii).
Macleod Court House, Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 2035 (ii).
Macpherson, Overseer at Georgeville Wharf, Dismissal, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6777 (iv).
Magog Post Office, Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 341 (i).
Magog Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6729 (iv).
'Maisonneuve,' Str., Cost of Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 1566 (i).
Marconi Telegraph System: in Com. of Sup., 6771, 7561 (iv).
Medicine Hat Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 6753 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Midland Dredging, Number of Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 1868 (i).
Midland Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6990 (iv).
Miminegash Breakwater Repairs, Pet. *re* Extension: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 201 (i).
——Vouchers *re* Expenditure: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lefurgey) 2273 (ii).
Montmagny Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6731 (iv).
'Montmorency' Yacht, Cost of Maintenance, Service, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2269 (ii).
Montreal Barracks, Delay in Purchase of of Site: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 334 (i).
Montreal Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7036 (iv).
Montreal Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 6732 (iv).
Montreal Post Office Improvements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 335 (i).
Moosejaw Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6753 (iv).
Neepawa Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 6743 (iv).
New Harbour Breakwater, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7043 (iv).
New Westminster Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6757 (iv).
Nicolet Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 6732 (iv).
North Bay Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 6736 (iv).
North Head Breakwater, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 576, 1105 (i).
North Saskatchewan River Survey: in Com. of Sup., 6995 (iv).
Osoyoos Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6757 (iv).
Ottawa Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup. 6709 (iv).
—— Astronomical Observatory: in Com. of Sup., 6709 (iv).
—— contract *re* electric lighting: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1868 (i).
—— Addition and Alterations, Library, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6712 (iv).
—— Additions: in Com. of Sup., 6713 (iv).
—— Electric Lighting, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1567 (i).
—— Electric Power, Elevators, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6764 (iv).
—— Fittings: in Com. of Sup., 7038 (iv).
——Heating, and Coal, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6764 (iv).
—— Leased to Govt., Rentals, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 187 (i).
—— Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7037 (iv).
—— Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 6724 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Ottawa Public Buildings, Post Office Building, Condition, Irregularities, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1580 (i).
—— Post Office Fittings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7038 (iv).
—— Post Office, Total Expenditure *re* Repairs: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 452 (i).
—— Refacing Stone: in Com. of Sup., 7038 (iv).
—— Rents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7013 (iv).
—— Repairs, Furnishings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6759 (iv).
—— Royal Mint Building: in Com. of Sup., 6711 (iv).
—— Steel Shelving: in Com. of Sup., 6736 (iv).
—— Supreme Court Library: in Com. of Sup., 7034 (iv).
—— Water Service: in Com. of Sup., 6765 (iv).
—— Western Block Addition, Amount expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 194 (i).
—— Woods Building, Occupied by Militia Dept., Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 186 (i).
—— Woods Co., Amounts paid by Govt. for Rentals: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 422 (i)
Ottawa, Tower of West Block, Collapse, Evidence *re* Inquiry: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5364 (iii).
—— Further information, Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1579 (i), 5529 (iii).
—— Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3712 (ii).
—— Letter from Mr. L. F. Taylor: Read (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 7025 (iv).
—— Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1154 (i).
—— Investigation *re* Collapse, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6714 (iv).
—— Inspection by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. for Sup., 1268, 1302 (i).
—— Ques. of Order (Mr. Conmee) *re* Dredging Contracts: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 1305 (i).
—— Rep. laid on Table (Mr. Hyman) 4029 (iii).
—— Tower, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6714 (iv).
Ottawa, Victoria Museum Building: in Com. of Sup., 6713 (iv).
—— Change of Plans: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 1152 (i).
—— Name of Contractors, Quality of Stone, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 1152 (i).
—— Specifications *re* Material, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Perley) 1741 (i).
—— Specifications *re* Stone, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 2031 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Ottawa River Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 6767 (iv).
Owen Sound, Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6990 (iv).
——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6736, 7013 (iv).
Parry Sound Wharf, in Com. of Sup., 6990 (iv).
Partridge Island, Water System, Payments to Pub. Works Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 4896 (iii).
Peribonka River Dykes: in Com. of Sup., 6975 (iv).
Peterborough Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 6738 (iv).
Petit Rocher Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 7043 (iv).
Pierreville, Yamaska, Wharf, Cost, Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 1746 (i).
Pinette Harbour Dredging, P. E. I., Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 332 (i).
Pitt River, C. P. R. Bridge: in Com of Sup., 7053 (iv).
Point Edward Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6990 7048 (iv).
Pointe à la Frigate, Gaspé Co., Breakwater, Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1151 (i).
Point Prim Island Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6931 iv).
Pointe aux Trembles Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6975 (iv).
Port Arthur and Fort William Dredging, Advertising for Tenders: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3503 (ii).
——— Contract with Great Lakes Dredging Co.: in Com. of Sup., (Mr. Bennett) 3804 (ii).
——— Expenditure in 1902-3-4-5: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 3243 (ii).
——— Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6772 (iv).
——— Tenders *re* Dredging: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1856 (i).
Port Bruce Harbour, Amounts voted, expended and Payments to, &c,: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ingram) 205 (i).
Port Burwell Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6990 (iv).
Port Burwell Harbour Improvements, Tenders *re*, Advertisements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 982 (i).
——— Amounts voted, expended and payments made to, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ingram) 206 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Wm. Jackson) 5185, 5343 (iii).
Port Colborne Breakwater, Amount expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 447 (i).
——— Breakwater and Elevators: Papers laid on table (Mr. Hyman) 1341 (i).
——— Deepening Channel: in Com. of Sup., 5357 (iii).
PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Port Colborne Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6772 (iv).
Port Credit Harbour, Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 7014 (iv).
Port Hood Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6789 (iv).
Port Stanley Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6991 (iv).
——— Advertisements *re* Tenders: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 984 (i).
——— Amounts voted, expended and Payments to, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Ingram) 205 (i).
——— Customs Receipts since 1896, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 171 (i).
——— Payment of Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 172 (i).
Post Offices, Erection of, Govt. Policy: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 6750 (iv).
Prendergast, H. W., Basis of Payments to *re* Dredging at Matchedash Bay: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2454 (ii).
Prince Albert Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6754 (iv).
Prince County, P. E. I., Expenditure *re* Public Works: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2266 (ii).
P. E. I., Dredging, Apptmnt. of Supt.: Ques. (Mr. A. McLean) 329 (i).
——— New Dredge, Completion of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 332 (i).
——— Tunnel, Estimate of Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 188 (i).
Public Buildings, Govtl. Policy *re* Erection: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6729 (iv).
Public Works, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Hyman) 968 (i).
——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 371 (i), 7021 (iv).
——— Dep. Min.: *See* 'Gobeil, Mr.'
——— Employees, Payments to for Extra Work, Cor. with Aud. Gen.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 769 (i).
——— Engineering Staff, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 6767 (iv).
——— Expenditure by Provinces: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 3248 (ii).
——— Expenditure, Unauthorized Payments, Charges *re*: Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 3428, Neg. (Y. 48; N. 100) 3500 (ii).
——— Miscellaneous Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 6765 (iv).
——— Surveys and Inspections: in Com. of Sup., 7020 (iv).
——— Temporary Clerical Assistance: in Com. of Sup., 6767 (iv).
Pugwash Wharf, Expenditure *re* Repairs, Inspector's Qualification, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 1862 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Quaco Harbour, Extension of Pier: in Com. of Sup., 6941 (iv).
Quebec Citadel and Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 6732 (iv).
Quebec Cliffs, Reps. *re* Dangerous Condition: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 3155 (ii).
Quebec Deep Water Wharfs, Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 583 (i).
Quebec Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6771, 7036 (iv).
——— Contract of Dussault & Lemieux: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1377 (i).
Ray's Creek Wharf, Location of: (Mr. Ames) 2926 (ii).
Regina Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 6754 (iv).
Reid Wrecking Co., Emplymt. and Payments to: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 4089 (ii).
Richibucto Breakwater, Tenders *re* Contract: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 2031 (ii).
Rivière Jesus Wharf, Amount expended, Completion: Ques. (Mr. Léonard) 453 (i).
Rivière Ouelle, Pier Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 6977 (iv).
Rivière St. Louis Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6977 (iv).
Rondeau Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6991 (iv).
——— Tenders, &c. *re* Advertisements for: Ques. (Mr. Macdonnell) 983 (i).
Rustico Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6931 (iv).
St. Alexis Pier, Amount expended, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 3905 (ii).
St. Andrews Locks, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1375 (i).
St. Anicet Wharf, Repairs, Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Walsh) 1566 (i).
St. Anicet and St. Barbe Waterway, Rep. of Engineer *re* Opening: Ques. (Mr. Walsh) 7371 (iv).
Ste. Anne de Chicoutimi Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6980 (iv).
Ste. Anne's Rapids, Man., Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7036 (iv).
St. Boniface Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6743 (iv).
St. Hyacinthe Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 6733 (iv).
St. John, N.B., Drill Hall, Erection of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 427 (i).
——— Harbour Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6942
St. John River Tributaries: in Com. of Sup., 6942 (iv).
St. John's, Que., Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7036 (iv).
——— Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 6733 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
St. Joseph Harbour, Amount voted and expended: Ques. (Mr. Gunn) 579 (i).
St. Mary's Post Office Site, Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 7051 (iv).
St. Mary's Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6739 (iv).
St. Mary's River Dredging, Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 426, 450 (i).
St. Maurice District, Slides and Booms: in Com. of Sup., 6996 (iv).
St. Maurice Slides and Booms, Total Expenditure, Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 1100 (i).
See 'Chicoutimi.'
Saguenay River Piers, Chicoutimi: in Com. of Sup., 7016 (iv).
Saguenay River Piers and Booms, Cost for Operation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 1379 (i).
Saskatchewan and Alberta Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 6752 (iv).
Saskatoon Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6754 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie Govt. Dock, Coal stored by Private Companies: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3502 (ii).
——— Construction and Repairs: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 424 (i).
Scotch Cove Breakwater, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 7042 (iv).
Seaforth Public Building, Erection of: Ques. (Mr. Gunn) 578 (i).
——— Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gunn) 1567 (i).
'Seguin' Str., Payments *re* Construction Work: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 4096 (iii).
Selkirk Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6743, 6752 (iv).
Seymour Narrows, Survey, Rep. of Royal Commission on Transportation: Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 5321 (iii).
Shelburne Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6727 (iv).
Shellmouth Bridge, Man., Contract *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2270 (ii).
Sherbrooke Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 6733 (iv).
Silverwater, Manitoulin Island, Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6991 (iv).
Simcoe Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6740 (iv).
Slides and Booms: in Com. of Sup., 6996 (iv).
Sorel Wharf Accident, Cor. with Officials &c.: M. for Copies * (Mr. Blain) 2951 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6981 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Kemp) in Com. of Sup., 7044 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Stony Creek Armoury, Damage by Fire, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) 327 (i).
Summerside Breakwater, Stipulation in Tender *re* Wages : Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1375 (i).
Summerside Harbour Breakwater : in Com. of Sup., 6932 (iv).
Tate Dry Dock, Name of Lessee, Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1374 (i).
Taylor, Mr. L. Fennings, Letter *re* Investigation into Collapse of Laurier Tower : Read (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 7025 (iv).
Telegraph Systems : in Com. of Sup., 7011 (iv).
——— Extension, Cape Breton Island: in Com. of Sup., 7011 (iv).
——— Mar. Provs.: in Com. of Sup., 7020 (iv).
——— P.E.I. and Mainland : in Com. of Sup., 6769 (iv).
——— Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7020 (iv)
Terrebonne Wharf, Amount expended, Completion &c.: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 454 (i).
Thames River Gunboats, Disposal of : Remarks (Mr. Kemp) 2550 (ii).
Thames River Dredging, Necessity of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 175 (i).
Thames River Floods, Relief for, Cor., Plans, Surveys, &c.: M. (Mr. Clements) for Copies, 774 (i).
Thames River Survey, Improvements of Channel, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 175 (i).
Thames River Wharfs: in Com. of Sup., 6991 (iv).
Three Rivers, Harbour Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6980 (iv).
——— Drill Hall : in Com. of Sup., 6733 (iv).
Toronto Barracks, Erection of, Purchase of Site, at Humber River : Ques. (Mr. Macdonnell) 5506 (iii).
Toronto Customs House, Alterations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6741 (iv).
Toronto, Dom. Buildings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6742 (iv).
Toronto Harbour Dredging : Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) in Com. of Sup., 7014 (iv).
Toronto Harbour (eastern entrance) Dredging, Contract *re* : Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 4800 (iii).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6994 (iv).
——— Payments *re*, Cor. &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Macdonell) 997 (i).
Toronto Harbour Breakwater Extension, Payments *re*, Cor. &c.: M. for Copies * (Mr. Macdonell) 997 (i).
Toronto Military Buildings : in Com. of Sup., 6742 (iv).
Toronto Observatory, Removal from Toronto: Remarks (Mr. Kemp) in Com. of Sup., 3683 (ii).
Toronto Post Office, Coustruction of, Purchase of Site : Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 5505 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*
Transportation Facilities : in Com. of Sup., 6772 (iv).
——— Montreal Harbour : in Com. of Sup., 7036 (iv).
Transportation Commission, Payments, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7021 (iv).
Trent River, Control of Water Power by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 199 (i).
Vancouver Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 6758 (iv).
Victoria Harbour, Removal of Rocks : in Com. of Sup., 6995 (iv).
Washedemoak River, N.B., Deepening of : Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 584 (i).
Water Power in Prov. of Quebec, Sale of : Inquiry *re* : Remarks (Mr. Monk) 4991 (iii).
Waterways Commission, Transportation Facilities : in Com. of Sup., 6769 (iv).
Westville Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 6727 (iv).
Wharfs, Docks, &c., Incomplete Ret.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 211 (i)
Wilson's Beach Breakwater, N.B., Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 576, 761 (i).
Wingham Public Building, Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr Gunn) 1567 (i).
Winnipeg, Immigration Building : in Com. of Sup., 6743, 7042 (iv).
——— Military Stores Building : in Com. of Sup., 6743 (iv).
——— Postal Station, C.P.R.: in Com. of Sup., 6751 (iv).
——— Post Office : in Com. of Sup., 6744 (iv).
Wood Island Breakwater, P.E.I., Repairs to : Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 332 (i).
Wood Islands, Extension of Jetty : in Com. of Sup., 6933 (iv).
Woodstock, N.B., Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 6728 (iv).
Yukon Telegraph Lines : in Com. of Sup., 7021 (iv).
Yukon Telegraph Lines, Ashcroft-Dawson : in Com. of Sup., 6771 (iv).
Yukon Telegraph System, Total Cost, Earnings, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 1865 (i).
Puebla Tramway, Light and Power Co's. B. No. 128 (Mr. Calvert) 1°*, 1743 (i) ; 2°*, 2066 ; in Com., and 3°*, 2666 (ii).
Pugwash Wharf ; Expenditure *re* Repairs, Inspector's Qualifications, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 1862 (i).
Quaco Harbour Extension of Pier: in Com. of Sup., 6941 (iv).
'Quadra' Str., Repairs, &c., Inquiry for Reps., &c. (Mr. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 4852 (iii).
'Quadra' and Govt. Steamers, B.C., Memos. *re* Expenditure &c. : Read (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. of Sup. 4915 (iii).

Qu'Appelle; Long Lake and Saskatchewan Railroad and Steamboat Co.'s B. No. 86 (Mr. Carvell) 1°*, 1252; 2°*, 1570 (i); in Com., 2667, 2703 ; 3°*, 2709 (ii).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. Co., Contracts with Govt., Loan Indebtedness, Cor. respecting: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 203 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 317 (i).

——— Answer to Question inaccurate : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 346 (i).

Qu'Appelle & Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. and SS. Co., and Man. and Southeastern Co.'s Land Grants, Selection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 769 (i).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Ry. Co.'s Land Grant, Disposal, &c., O.C., Change of, &c., Security held by Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 169 (i).

——— Notice to Co. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 425 (i).

——— Ret. laid on Table: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 2321 (ii).

——— Information *re* O. C. of Aug., 1902: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3215 (ii).

——— Explanation (Mr. Oliver) *re* Cor., 3504 (ii).

Quarantine, Animals Health Act : in Com. of Sup., 2682 (ii), 7440 (iv).

See 'Agriculture.'

Quebec Bridge, Co.'s Books, Inspection of: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 445 (i).

——— Financial Statement, Directors, Bonds, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Monk) 428 (i).

——— Govt. Representative on Board of Directors, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 338 (i).

——— Obstruction to Navigation in St. Lawrence, on M. to adjn., Cor., &c.: Read (Mr. Armstrong) 216 (i).

——— Payment of Subsidies, Bonds, &c.: Ques.: (Mr. Monk) 338, 445 (i).

Quebec Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 6728 (iv).

Quebec Canals, Remarking Boundaries, Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5079 (iii).

Quebec Citadel and Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 6732 (iv).

Quebec Central Ry. (St. Francis to St. George) Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 6157 (iv).

Quebec Cliffs, Dangerous Condition of, Works *re* Protection to City : Ques. (Mr. A. Lavergne) 3066 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 3155 (ii).

Quebec Cullers' Office, Apptmnt. of Supervisor: Ques. (Mr. Morin) 3245 (ii).

Quebec Deep Water Wharfs, Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 583 (i).

Quebec and Gaspé Basin Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7553 (iv).

Quebec Harbour Commissioners B. No. 174 (Mr. Brodeur) Res. prop., 3503 ; in Com, on Res., 3926, 1°* of B., 3933, 2°*, 3933; in Com., 3933 (ii) 4807; 3°*, 4816 (iii).

Quebec Harbour Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6771, 7036 (iv).

——— Contract of Dussault & Lemieux: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1377 (i).

Quebec Immigration Hospital for Trachoma Treatment, Amount expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 334 (i).

Quebec and Lake Huron Ry. C.'s B. No. 103 (Mr. Lachance) 1°*, 1465; 2°*, 1710; in Com., and 3°*, 3434 (ii).

Quebec-Midland Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 23 (Mr. Bureau) 1°*, 349; 2°*, 524; in Com., 1297; 3°*, 1297 (i).

Quebec, Montreal and Southern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 72 (Mr. Demers) 1°*, 890; 2°*, 1298 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3434 (ii).

Quebec Pilots, Examination and Reinstatement of Jos. Paquet: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3970 (ii).

Quebec, Saguenay and Gulf of St. Lawrence Ry. Co.'s B. No. 141 (Mr. Girard) 1°* 1743; 2°*, 1858 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3435 (ii).

Quebec and Seven Islands Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 6156 (iv).

Queen's College, Kingston, B. No. 160 (Mr. Harty) 1°*, 3065; 2°*, 3243; in Com. and 3°*, 3953 (ii).

Questions answered by Marine Deptl. Officers: Remarks (Mr. Northrup) in Com. of Sup., 2918 (ii).

Questions answered by Ministers, not heard by members: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 318 (i).

Questions put by members and discourteous replies by ministers: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 537 (i).

Quinquennial Census for Man., Sask. and Alberta: in Com. of Sup., 7435 (iv).

Railway Act (expediting proceedings) Amt. B. No. 6 (Mr. Lancaster) 1° m., 17; 2° m., 456; 3°*, 782 (i).

Railway Act (crossings) Amt. B. No. 8 (Mr. Lancaster) 1° m., 18 ; on Order for 2°, 349, 483 ; 2° m., 844 ; ref. to Sel. Com., 859 (i).

Railway Act (express and telephones) Amt. B. No. 9 (Mr. Maclean) 1° m., 18; on Order for 2°, 349, 443; 2° m., 782, 1710 (i), 2069 (ii).

Railway Act (liability) Amt. B. No. 17 (Mr. Lennox) 1° m., 250, 2° m., 884 (i).

Railway Act (General) Amt. B. No. 62 (Mr. Emmerson) 1° m., 744; 2°, and in Com., 1584 (i), 2566 (ii), 7065; 3° m., 7105; 3°*, 7116; Sen. Amts. 7570, 7639 (iv).

Ry. Act (1903) Amt. B. No. 152 (Mr. Conmee) 1° m., 2451 (ii).

Ry. Act Amt. Bill : Remarks *re* Discussion (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 3101 (ii).

Ry. Act Amt. Bills: M. (Mr. Emmerson) for Special Com., 890 (i).

——— Ref. to Special Com. : Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 4539 iii).

Ry. Act, Amts. by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 568 (i).

Railway Subsidies Authorization B. No. 214 (Mr. Emmerson) Res. prop., 6119; in Com., on Res., 6129, 6167; 1°*, of B., 6182; 2° m., and in Com., 6829; 3°*, 6845 (iv).

RAILWAYS :

Calgary and Edmonton Ry., Payments *re* Mining Rights: in Com. of Sup., 5862 (iii).

Canada Eastern Ry., Purchase of: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 5033 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Lands, Authority *re* Selection: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 3739 (ii).

Can. Northern Ry. Co., Man. and Southeastern Ry. Co. and Qu'Appelle, &c. Co., Cor. *re* Transference of Land Grant, &c.: M. for Copies * (Mr. Ames) 208 (i).

Duval, Mr. J. E., Resignation from Ry. Commission, &c.: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 2728 (ii).

Gov. Gen.'s Cars, Purchase of : in Com. of Sup., 7511 (iv).

G.T.P. Ry.: *See* 'National Transcontinental.'

Great Northern Railway, Application *re* Subsidies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 2078 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Boyce) 2700 (ii).

Land Grants, Selection by Ry. Cos., Govt. Policy: Notice of Motion (Mr. Lancaster) 889 (i).

——— on M. for Sup. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 890 (i).

Lands, Policy of Govt. *re* Selection by Ry. Cos.: Ques. (Mr. Alcorn) 570 (i).

See 'Interior', &c.

Miscellaneous (litigation): in Com. of Sup., 5179 iii).

National Transcontinental Ry., Proposed Route from Winnipeg to Quebec and Moncton : Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 418 (i).

National Transcontinental Ry.: *See* 'Grand Trunk Pacific Ry.'

P. E. I. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 5079 (iii).

——— Branch Lines to Stanley Bridge, Surveys, Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. Martin) 996 (i).

——— deficient ret. (Mr. A. Martin) 3317 (ii).

——— Cape Traverse Survey: Remarks (Mr. Lefurgey) in Com. of Sup., 5174 (iii).

——— Cardigan and Montague Branch, Completion of Construction, &c.: Ques. Mr. A. Martin) 1866 (i).

——— Charlottetown Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5149 (iii).

——— Charlottetown Ry. Station, Tenders *re* Construction : Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2271 (ii).

——— Damages to Expropriated Lands: Remarks *re* Ret. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2825 (ii).

——— Employees Wages, published in Aud. Gen.'s Rep.: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2549 (ii).

——— Freight Rates, 1905, Tariff in Force in April 1906, Stmnt. of Through Freight Rates, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lefurgey) 2950 (ii).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

P.E.I. Ry., Hillsborough Bridge Contractor, J. Haney, Claims for Damages: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1563 (i).

——— Hodgson Property, Acquiring of, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lefurgey) 1380 (i).

——— Land Purchase, Inadequate Compensation, Charges *re*: Ques. (Mr. A. McLean) 1864 (i).

——— Montague and Cardigan Branch, P.E.I. Ry., Damages for Lands Expropriated, Cor., Reps., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1206 (i).

——— Mugford, J. C., Claim for Damages *re* Fire on P.E.I. Ry.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 585 (i).

——— Murray River Branch, P. E. I. Ry., Claims for expropriated Lands, Settlement of : Remarks (Mr. A. A. McLean) 5993 (iii).

——— News Agency, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2266 (ii), 6247 (iv).

——— Shops, Rebuilding, Free Site at Summerside: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 2728 (ii).

——— Summerside Branch, Rep. *re* Earnings: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1563 (i).

——— Wages paid Employees, Stmnts. *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lefurgey) 2951 (ii).

——— inquiry for ret. (Mr. Lefurgey) 5533 (iii).

Payette, Philias, Compensation *re* Damages to Health on N.T. Ry. Construction: Ques. (Mr. Léonard) 5321 (iii).

Railway Accidents in Canada, 1904-5, Passengers and Employees Injured, Investigation: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 446 (i).

Railway Accidents Inspector, Appmnt. of : Ques. (Mr. Pringle) 6087 (iii).

Railways and Canals, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Emmerson) 125 (i).

——— Ret. from : Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 840 (i).

Railways and Canals, Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 5014 (iii).

Railways, Collection of Revenue: in Com. of Sup., 5343 (iii).

Railway Commission, Maintenance: in Com. of Sup., 7513 (iv).

Railway Committees, meeting concurrently with sittings of Hse.: M. (Mr. Campbell) 5362 (iii).

——— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to add Names, 4246, 4450 (iii).

Ry. Companies, &c., and Jurisdiction of Ry. Act: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 3969 (ii).

——— Consulting Engineer's Salary: in Com. of Sup., 416 (i).

Railways in Dom., Control of by Dom. Govt.: Ques. of Privilege (Mr. Emmerson) *re* Par. in Toronto 'Globe', 3153 (ii).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

Railway Mail Clerks appointed from N. York: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 330 (i).

Railways, Provincial, Dom. Subsidies to: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Macdonell) 3277 (ii).

——— Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2727 (ii).

Railway Statistics, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Emmerson) 2080 (ii).

Railway Subsidies, Amounts earned under 3 per cent Clause: Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) 7062 (iv).

Ry. Subsidies (lands) voted by Parlt., in Man., Sask. and Alberta, Number of Acres, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 209 (i).

Subsidies to Rys.: *See* 'Ry. Subsidies.'

Surveys, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5174 (iii).

Transcontinental Ry. Commissioners, Expropriation of Land in Prov. of Quebec: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 446 (i).

——— Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 213 (i).

——— Report: M. to print (Mr. R. L. Borden) 268 (i).

Transcontinental Ry.: *See* 'G.T. Pacific.'

Woods Co., Amounts paid to for Supplies by Transcontinental Ry. Commission Construction: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 449 (i).

Ramsay, Asenath Relief B. No. 190 (Mr. Ross) 1°*, 5081; 2°*, 5227; in Com., and 3°*, 6034 (iii).

Rainmaking in the Yukon, Expenditure *re*, Supervision by Dom. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 1208 (i).

——— Failure of Mr. Hatfield: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7187 (iv).

——— Inquiry for O.C. (Mr. Foster) 839, 1008 (i), 2080 (ii).

——— Payments to Mr. Hatfield: M. (Mr. Foster) to adjn., 560 (i).

See 'Hatfield'.

Ray & Bronson Mining Concessions in Yukon, Date of Grant, Condition, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1744 (i).

See 'Yukon'.

Ray's' Creek Wharf, Location of: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 2926 (ii).

Receiver General's Office: in Com. of Sup., 7451 (iv).

Red River Commission: in Com. of Sup., 7053 (iv).

Regina Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 6754 (iv).

Registry Offices, Salaries in N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 5978 (iii).

Reid & Co., Contracts *re* Tugs for Marine Service: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 3588 (ii).

——— Emplymt. and Payments to: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 4089 (iii).

'Rembrant' Coal Barge, Investigation *re* Loss: Ques. (Mr. Laurence) 1859 (i).

Renfrew, N., Electoral District, Issue of Writ: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 6165 (iv).

——— Notification (Mr. Taylor) 6125 (iv).

Representation of Provinces in Dom. Parlt., Pet. *re* Amt. to B.N.A. Act: M. (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 1106 (i).

Returns from Interior Dept., Supplementary Documents, &c. laid on Table with Explanations (Mr. Oliver) 3151 (ii).

Returns incomplete: Remarks (Mr. Hyman) 212 (i).

Returns: Inquiry for (Mr. Armstrong) 1008 (i).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1367 (i).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 456, 1202 (i), 2160 (ii).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Lefurgey) 2327, 3076 (ii).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. J. D. Reid) 2811 (ii), 4035 (iii).

Returns ordered, Delay in bringing Down: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. for Sup., 713 (i).

Returns for 1904 and 1905, Delay in bringing down: List read (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1253 (i).

Returns, Delay in Presenting: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 13 (i).

Returns, Delay in Producing: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1940 (i).

Returns, Preparation of by Parlt., Access to Deptl. Files by Members: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2927 (ii).

——— Preparation of by Sec. of State: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 838 (i).

——— Inefficient System *re* Preparation: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 13 (i).

Returns of Previous Session, Memo from Sec. of State *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 162 (i).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 12 (i).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 213 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 162 (i).

Returns, Statement *re* Work of Preparation &c.: List read (Mr. Oliver) 2811 (ii).

Revillon Brothers, Limited B. No. 76 (Mr. McCool) 1°*, 999; 2°*, 1298 (i); in Com., 3672; ref. back to Ry. Com., 3674 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5400 (iii); Sen. Amts., 6706 (iv).

Revised Statutes: *See* 'Statutes'.

Richelieu and Ontario Nav. Co.'s B. 65 (Mr. Bureau) 1°*, 829; 2°*, 974 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3739 (ii).

Richibucto Breakwater, Tenders *re* Contract: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 2031 (ii).

Rideau Canal, Reservation, Notice to Tenants *re* Warehouses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 4703 (iii).

——— Swing Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 5174 (iii).

——— Water Power, Applications *re* Leases, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3742 (ii).

Riding Mountain Timber Reserve, Change in Boundary: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 765 (i).

Riding Mountain Timber Reserve, Ref. to in Com. on B. 47: (Mr. W. J. Roche) 3336 (ii).
——— Reps. *re*: M. for Copy * (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1740 (i).
Riding Mountain Timber Reserve, Policy *re* Squatters: Ref. to in Com. on Forest B. 47 (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2847 (ii).
——— Prohibition of Settlers by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 996 (i).
Rifle Ranges in Mar. Provs., Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 5753 iii).
Rifle Ranges, Ordnance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7161 (iv).
See 'Militia', &c.
Rigaud Seigniory, Payments to Owners: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 993 (i).
Rio de Janeiro Tramway, Light and Power Co., Limited B. No. 94 (Mr. Calvert) 1°*, 1252; 2°*, 1570 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2665 (ii).
Rivière Jésus Wharf, Amount expended, Completion: Ques. (Mr Leonard) 453 (i)
Rivière Ouelle, Pier Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 6977 (iv).
Rivière St. Louis Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6977 (iv).
Roads Allowance, Sas. and Alberta, B. No. 202 (Mr. Oliver) 1° m., 5363; 2° m., and in Com., 5560; 3°*, 5563 (iii).
Roberts, Mr Orlando, Marine Engineer, Certificate &c: Remarks (Mr. Foster) on Conc., 7585 (iv).
Robertson, Andrew C., Fishery Inspector, Apptmnt. and Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 4155 (iii).
Roberval and James Bay Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 6156 (iv).
Robinson Treaty, Annuities for Indians: in Com. of Sup., 722 (i).
Rock Hill Postmaster, Name, &c: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 836 (i).
Rocky Mountains Park Act Amt. B. No. 164 (Mr. Oliver) 1° m., 3234 (ii); 2° m., and in Com., 4734, 4759; 3°*, 4805 (iii).
Rolling Stock, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7501 (iv).
See 'I.C.R.', &c.
Rondeau Harbour, Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6991 (iv).
——— Tenders, &c. *re*, Advertisements for: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 983 (i).
Ross Rifle, Commission *re* Examination &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3408 (ii).
——— Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup, 7162, 7174 (iv).
——— Contracts with Govt., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Worthington) 1380 (i).
——— Improvements: Remarks (Mr. S Hughes) 3411 (ii).
Ross Rifle Co, Incorporation, Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1372 (i).
Ross Rifle, Inspectorship, Apptmnt. of Imp. Officer: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 423 (i).
——— Number manufactured, distributed and Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3246 (ii).
See 'Militia,' &c.
Rothesay Freight Shed, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7501 (iv).
Royal Assent: *See* 'Bills'.
Royal Bank of Canada B No. 131 (Mr. Maclean), 1*, 1743; 2°*, 1857 (i); on Order for Com., 4389; in Com., 6022; 3°*, 6034 (iii).
Royal Mint Building, Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 6711 (iv).
Rules and Procedure of the Hse., Revision of: M. for Special Com. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 252 (i).
Rules of the House: *See* 'House of Commons'.
Rural Mail Delivery, Free, Information *re* U.S. System: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 216 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 712, 1752, (i).
Russian Jews, Massacre of: Prop. Res. (Mr. Macdonell) 226 (i).
Rustico Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6931 (iv).
Ste. Agathe des Monts Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 6171 (iv).
St. Alexis Pier, Amount expended, Tenders &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 3905 (ii).
St. Andrew's Locks, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1375 (i).
St. Anicet and St. Barbe Waterway, Rep. of Engineer *re* Opening: Ques. (Mr. Walsh) 7371 (iv).
St. Anicet Wharf, Repairs, Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Walsh) 1566 (i).
St. Anne de Chicoutimi Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6980 (iv).
Ste. Anne's Rapids, Man., Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 7036 (iv).
St. Aubert and St. Pamphile Mail Service, Expiration of Contract: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2266 (ii).
St. Boniface Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6743 (iv).
St. Catharines Bay and Tadousac Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7554 (iv).
St. Clair and Erie Ship Canal Co.'s B. No. 46 (Mr. Tisdale) 1°*, 558; 2°*, 782; in Com., and 3°*, 1297 (i).
St. George, Mr. E. C. S., Sale of Land to, Conditions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1866 (i).
St. Hyacinthe Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 6733 (iv).
St. Hypolite Mail Service, Pets. *re* Improvement: Ques. (Mr. Léonard) 2267 (ii).
St. John and Cumberland Basin Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7555 (iv).
St. John and Digby Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7545, 7580 (iv).

St. John, N.B., Drill Hall, Erection of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 427 (i).
——— Grain Elevator, Cost, Capacity: Ques. Mr. Stockton) 2272 (ii).
St. John Harbour Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6942 (iv).
St. John Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 7694 (iv).
St. John River, N.B., Tributaries: in Com. of Sup., 6942 (iv).
St. Johns, Que., Barracks, Medical Supplies, 1904-5: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 4156 (iii).
——— Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 7036 (iv).
——— Military School, Medical officer, Name and Qualifications: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 4704 (iii).
——— Numeri[illegible]rce: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 4155 (iii).
St. Johns, Que., Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6733 (iv).
St. Joseph Harbour, Amount voted and expended: Ques. (Mr. Gunn) 579 (i).
St. Lawrence Lighthouses between Lachine and Bay of Quinté, Total Cost of Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 1150 (i).
——— Remarks *re* Question (Mr. Taylor) 1571 (i).
——— Answer (Mr. Brodeur) 1571 (i).
St. Lawrence Power Co., Amounts paid *re* Electric Lighting: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 5345 (iii).
See 'Canals, Cornwall'.
St. Lawrence Route Accidents, Number of Seagoing Vessels, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 974, 1096 (i).
——— Number of Accidents, Vessels wrecked, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 585; Remarks *re* Question, 586 (i).
——— Number of Vessels of 1,000 Tons, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 768 (i).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Depth of Water at Quebec and Montreal, Paragraph in Quebec Chronicle: Ques.: (Mr. Gervais) 4797 (iii).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 2894 (ii).
——— Lighting Buoys, Acetylene Gas, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2897 (iii).
See 'Marine,' &c.
St. Mary's River Bridge Co.'s B. No. 172 (Mr. Stewart) 1°*, 3952 (ii); 2°*, 5402; 3°*, 6075 (iii).
St. Mary's Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6739 (iv).
——— Post Office Site, Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 7051 (iv).
St. Mary's Post Office Site, Purchase of, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 4703 (iii).
St. Mary's River Dredging, Amounts paid 1905, Complaints *re* Approaches; Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 426, 450 (i).
St. Maurice District, Slides and Booms: in Com. of Sup., 6996 (iv).
——— Total Expenditure, Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 1100 (i).
St. Philippe Station, Accommodation *re* Cars, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lapointe) 993 (i).
St. Rose and Orangedale Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 6164 (iv).
St. Thomas Collector of Customs, Removal of Mr. Darroch: M. for Cor. * (Mr. Ingram) 205 (i).
St. Vincent de Paul Penitentiary Employees, Increase of Salaries, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Léonard) 2268 (ii).
——— Guards, Salaries, Pet. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Léonard) 454 (i).
Sabbath Observance: *See* 'Lord's Day.'
Saddlery and Harness for Militia, Contracts and Advertisements, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 577 (i).
Saguenay River Piers, Chicoutimi: in Com. of Sup., 7016 (iv).
Saguenay River Piers and Booms, Cost for Operation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 1379 (i).
See 'Chicoutimi.'
Salvation Army Immigrants, Number, Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 185 (i).
Salvation Army Immigrants and S. America: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 6801 (iv).
Sand-Heads Lightship, B.C., Repts. and Cor.: Read (Mr. Brodeur) 4912 (iii).
San Francisco Disaster, Com. from British Ambassador at Washington: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 2083 (ii).
——— Contribution by Dom. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Bole) 1748 (i).
——— Disposal of Relief Fund: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 5530 (iii).
——— Govt. Aid, applied to Canadians: Remarks (Mr. Osler) 2891 (ii).
——— Mess. from His Ex., Suppl. Estimates: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 1749 (i).
——— Proposed Aid (remarks) in Com. on Supply B. 178 (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4353 (iii).
Sarcee Indian Reserves, Negotiations *re* Surrender: Remarks (Mr. M. S. McCarthy) in Com. of Sup., 959 (i).
Saskatchewan and Alberta Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 6752 (iv).
Saskatchewan Protested Elections, Law *re* Trial of: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 3741 (ii).
Saskatchewan Public Lands, Transference to Private Corporations: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 324 (i).
Saskatchewan Valley Land Co., Date of Contract, Conditions *re* Settlement, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2027 (ii).
——— Deficiencies in Ret.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3076 (ii).

Saskn. Valley Land Co., Omissions in Ret., O.Cs., Cor., &c., Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2623 (ii).
——— Purchase from Can. Northern Ry. Co., Date of Transfer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1745 (i).
——— Purchase of Homestead Lands, Selection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 420 (i).
——— Sale to A. D. Davidson, Papers *re*: Ques. (Mr. Alcorn) 1569; Proposals, Acceptance, &c.: M. (Mr. Alcorn) for Copies*, 1570
——— Valuations of Lands sold: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lake) 428 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 425, 1854, (i), 2234 (ii).
Saskatoon Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6754 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie Canal, Construction: in Com. of Sup., 5165, 5357 (iii).
——— shelter for lockmen: in Com. of Sup., 7506 (iv).
——— Govt. Dock, Coal stored by Private Companies: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3502 (ii).
——— Dock, Warehouse, &c., Construction and Repairs: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 424 (i).
——— Post Office, Decision *re* Opening on Sundays: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup. 555 (i).
——— Riot, Suppression of by Militia, Cor. Telegrams *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Boyce) 2274 (ii).
——— legal proceedings *re* calling out militia: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 2271 (ii).
——— Value of Farm and Garden Products entered for Duty, &c., 1905: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 2078 (ii).
Sauvalle, Marc, Employment by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3245 (ii).
——— in Com. of Sup., 5983 (iii).
Savage Harbour, P.E.I., Payments to certain Persons, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 3066 (ii).
Schomberg and Aurora Ry. Co.'s B. No. 102 (Mr. Campbell) 1°*, 1465; 2°*, 1710 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2666 (ii).
Schools, Day and Industrial for Indians, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 1087 (i).
——— Mar. Provs.: in Com. of Sup., 718 (i).
——— Ont. and Que.: in Com. of Sup., 717 (i)
See 'Indians.'
School Lands disposed of by Govt. in Man., Sask., and Alberta, Six months, 1905, Average Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 192 (i).
School Lands Exchange Authorization B. No. 163 (Mr. Oliver) 1° m., 3223; 2°*, 3910; in Com., 3910 (ii), 5191; 3°*, 5195 (iii).
——— sold by Govt. in Man. and N. W. T., 1905, Amounts paid to Provs., Quantity yet unsold, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 191 (i).
Schools of Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 3399 (ii).
Scientific Institutions: in Com. of Sup., 3683 (ii).
Scotch Cove, Breakwater, N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 7042 (iv).
Scugog River Dams and Locks, Maintenance by Federal Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1859 (i).
Seaforth Public Building, Erection of: Ques. (Mr. Gunn) 578 (i).
——— Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gunn) 1567 (i).
'Seagull' Str., Purchase of: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 972 (i).
Secretary of State, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
Seeds, &c., for Indians, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 735 (i).
——— N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 734 (i).
See 'Indians,' &c.
'Seguin' Str., Payments *re* Construction Work: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 4096 (iii).
Selkirk, John McR., Salary paid *re* Pelee Island Cable: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 587 (i).
Selkirk Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6743, 6752 (iv).
Senate and House of Commons Act (corrupt practices) Amt. B. No. 10 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1° m., 19; 2° m. and ref. to Sel. Com., 351 (i); in Com., 7648; 3°*, 7649; Sen. Amts., 7695
——— (indemnity) Amt. B. No. 97 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1° m., 1252; 2° m., 1777; in Com., 1793 (i), 7117; 3°*, 7143; Sen. Amts., 7570 (iv).
Senate and House of Commons: *See* 'Indemnity B. 18.'
Senate Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 7573 (iv).
Senate and House of Commons, Number of Employees: M. for Ret. (Mr. Sproule) 1869 (i).
——— Mess. to Senate: M.* (Mr. Sproule) 2273 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 1672 (i).
Senate Gratuities: in Com. of Sup., 7579 (iv).
Senate Reform: Prop. Res. (Mr. G. H. McIntyre) 2276 (ii).
Senate Vacancies from N.B.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 992 (i).
Sessional Clerks, H. of C.: in Com. of Sup., 7572 (iv).
Sessions, Length of: *See* 'Fiscal Year Bill.'
Seven Islands Indian Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 5987 (iii).
Severn River, Obstructions *re* Ry. Construction: Ques. (Mr. Grant) 581 (i).
Seymour Narrows, Survey, Rep. of Royal Commission on Transportation: Ques. (Mr. Sloan) 5321 (iii).
Shangaling in B.C., Par. in B.C. Papers: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4994 (iii).
Sharbot Lake and Bathurst Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 6143 (iv).

Shediac and Coast Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 6160 (iv).
Shelburne Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6727 (iv).
Shellmouth Bridge, Man., Contract *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2270 (ii).
Sherbrooke Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 6733 (iv).
Sherbrooke Military Camp, Purchase or Lease of Lands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Tobin) 328 (i).
Shipping List, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Brodeur) 4995 (iii).
Ships Safety Act (accidents) Amt. B. No. 48 (Mr. Sinclair) 1° m., 559; 2°, and in Com., 1148; 3° m., 1205 (i); in Com., 4024 (ii), 6862; 3°*, 6868 (iv).
——— M. (Mr. Fielding) to place on Govt. Orders, 6856 (iv).
Shipwrecked Seamen, Care of: in Com. of Sup., 3687 (ii).
Shortis Case: Personal Explanation (Mr. Bergeron) 5531 (iii).
Side Ladders, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7501 (iv).
Silver Coins, Redemption of old Coins &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 333 (i).
See 'Finance.'
Silverwater, Manitoulin Island, Wharf : in Com. of Sup., 6991 (iv).
Simcoe Public Building : in Com. of Sup., 6740 (iv).
Sioux Indians, Man.: in Com. of Sup., 960 (i).
Skeffington, Detective on I.C.R., Dismissal, Charges, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 183 (i).
——— Remarks in Com. of Sup., 7493 (iv).
Slides and Booms: in Com. of Sup., 6996 (iv).
See 'Public Works,' &c.
Smart, Col., Resignation of : Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 5363 (iii).
Smelting: *See* 'Steel.'
Smith, Mrs. Sarah, Dismissal from Mount Buchanan Post Office, P.E.I., and Apptmnt. of Mr. Bishop: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 2038 (ii).
Sorel Wharf Accident, Cor. with Officials, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Blain) 2951 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6981 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Kemp) in Com. of Sup., 7044 (iv).
Soulanges Canal, Construction: in Com. of Sup., 5357 (iii).
——— Lighting: in Com. of Sup., 7511 (iv).
Souris Fish Drier, Construction, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1373 (i).
S. A. War Contingent, Cost of Outfitting, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 1564 (i).
South African Volunteers, Disabled, &c., Recognition as Pensioners : Prop. Res. (Mr. Broder) 429, Neg. (Y. 59, N. 97) 434 (i).
South African Volunteers pensioned by Imp. Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 1098 (i).
Southeast Quarter Section 28, Township 7, W. Meridian, Sale of: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 584 (i).
Southern Central Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 140 (Mr. McCraney) 1°*, 1743 (i); on Order for 2°, 2264; 2°*, 2720 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 6034 (iii).
South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 19 (Mr. Guthrie) 1°*, 349; 2°*, 524; in Com., and 3°*, 1140 (i).
South Shore and Quebec Southern Ry. Co.'s B. No. 118 (Mr. Devlin) 1°*, 1667; 2°*, 1792 (i).
Speaker's Apartments, H. of Co., Stmnt. of Goods supplied from 1886 to 1906: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Belcourt) 2950 (ii).
——— M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. Lancaster) 2274 (ii).
——— Inquiry (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 7358 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lancaster) 5533 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Taylor) 4035, 5185 (iii).
Speech from the Throne: Read (Mr. Speaker) 4 (i).
Speers and Davidson, A. D., Sale of Land, Reps. Maps, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Barker) 1571 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Barker) 1855 (i).
——— Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2700, 2890
See 'Qu'Appelle,' &c.
Spencer, Muriel Violet, Relief B. No. 208 (Mr. Stewart) 1°*, 5751; in Com., and 3°*, 6075 (iii).
Spur Lines and Sidings, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 7502 (iv).
Stafford, Mr. J. A., Offer to Purchase Islands in Georgian Bay.: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 5007 (iii).
Standard Trusts Co.'s B. No. 147 (Mr. Bole) 1°*, 2321; 2° m., 2720 (ii); in Com., 4942; 3° m., 5002 (iii).
Standing Orders Com., Rep.: Presented (Mr. Macpherson) 2820 (ii).
Statistical Year-book: in Com. of Sup., 2682 (ii), 7382 (iv).
Statutes, Consolidation and Revision of: in Com. of Sup., 7527, 7537 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6678 (iv).
Steamboat Inspection Act Amt. B. No. 16 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy) 1° m., 250; 2° and ref. to Sel. Com., 1148 (i).
Steamboat Inspection, Inspectors' Salaries : in Com. of Sup., 3688 (ii).
Steamers, Dom., Amounts paid for Supplies by Tender, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 981 (i).
See 'Marine.'
Steamer, New, being constructed in England, Plans, Specifications, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. A. A. McLean) 1871 (i).

Steamer for Northwest Indian Coast Agency: in Com. of Sup., 1094-5 (i).

Steamship Subsidies, Statement *re* Operations, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 568 (i).
See 'Trade and Commerce.'

Steel Shelving, Ottawa Deptl. Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 6736 (iv).
See 'Public Works, Ottawa.'

Steel and Iron Ores, Electrical Smelting Process: in Com. of Sup., 5934 (iii).
See 'Iron,' &c.

Stellarton, Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5074 (iii).

Sterling Life Assurance Co.'s incorp. B. No. 105 (Mr. Lennox) 1°*, 1465; 2°*, 1710 (i); in Com., 5499; 3°*, 5500 (iii).

Stone, E. B., Lease of Land in Bow River District: Ques. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 3740 (ii).

Stony Creek Armoury, Damage by Fire, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Smith, Wentworth) 327 (i).

Strathcona Electoral District: Certificate of Election (Mr. Speaker) 1840 (i).

Sub-marine and Fog Signals: in Com. of Sup., 4954 (iii).

Subsidies to Rys.: *See* Ry. Subsidies.'

Summerside Breakwater, Stipulation in Tender *re* Wages: Ques. (Mr. Lefurgey) 1375 (i).

Summerside Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6932 (iv).

Sunday Observance: *See* 'Lord's Day B. 12,' &c.

Supply B. No. 56 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Ways and Means, 658; 1°*, of B., 711; 2° m. and in Com., 712; 3°*, 712 (i).

——— B. No. 178 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Ways and Means, 4352; 1°*, 4353; 2°*, and in Com., and 3°*, 4354 (iii).

——— B. No. 225 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Ways and Means, 7636; 1°*, 2°*, and in Com., 7636; 3°*, 7649 (iv).

Supply: M. for Com. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 125, 304 (i).

SUPPLY:

COMMITTEE:

Administration of Justice: *See* 'Justice'.

Arts, Agriculture and Statistics:
Archives, 2669 (ii), 7372 (iv).
Census and Statistics, 7379 (iv).
Charlottetown Exhibition, Grant, 7440 (iv).
Dairying Interests, 7412 (iv).
Exhibitions, 304 (i).
Experimental Farms, 7386 (iv).
Branch Stations, 8411 (iv).
Imperial Institute, Can. Exhibit, 315 (i).
Patent Record, 2676 (ii), 7379 (iv).
Printing, &c., of Bulletins, 7411 (iv).
Quinquennial Census, Man. &c., 7435 (iv).
Year Book, 2682 (ii), 7382 (iv).

Charges of Management:
General Vote, 7451 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

COMMITTEE—*Con.*

Civil Government:
Agriculture, 369 (i).
Auditor General's Office, 7573 (iv).
Board of Civil Service Examiners, 416 (i).
Contingencies:
Agriculture, 369 (i).
Finance, 366 (i).
Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office, 357, 416 (i), 7579 (iv).
High Commissioner's Office, 402 (i).
Indian Affairs, 365 (i).
Inland Revenue, 367 (i).
Interior, 404 (i).
Justice, 359 (i), 7529 (iv).
Marine and Fisheries, 370 (i).
Post Office, 401 (i).
Privy Council Office, 358 (i).
Trade and Commerce, 402 (i).
Customs, 360 (i), 7514 (iv).
Depts. Generally, 416 (i).
Finance, 366 (i), 7452 (iv).
Gen. Consulting Engineer, 416 (i).
Geological Survey, 405 (i), 5978 (iii).
Gov. Gen.'s Sec.'s Office, 357, 416 (i).
High Commissioner's Office, 402 (i).
Indian Affairs 365 (i), 5985 (iii).
Inland Revenue, 367 (i), 7513 (iv).
Interior, 362, 404 (i), 5509, 5975 (iii).
Justice, 359 (i), 7538 (iv).
Labour, 7444 (iv).
Marine and Fisheries, 370 (i), 4896 (iii), 7558 (iv).
Militia and Defence, 359 (i), 7182 (iv).
North-west Mounted Police, 360 (iv).
Post Office, 401 (i), 7445 (iv).
Privy Council Office, 358 (i).
Public Works, 371 (i), 7021 (iv).
Railways and Canals, 5014 (iii).
Secretary of State, 7573 (iv).
Trade and Commerce, 402 (i).

Culling Timber, 7542 (iv).

Customs:
Miscellaneous, 515 (i), 7515 (iv).
Salaries, Contingent Expenses, &c., 491 (i).
Salaries, Travelling Inspectors, Expenses, &c., 510 (i).
Yukon, 515 (i).

Dominion Lands:
Contingencies, &c., 5939 (iii).
Mines Branch, Salaries, &c., 5941 (iii).
Supt's Salary, 5934 (iii).
Salaries, Outside Service, 5614, 5936 (iii).
Surveys, &c., 5881 (iii).
Timber Protection, 5939 (iii).

Dominion Police, 490 (i).

Excise:
Adulteration of Food, 2617 (ii).
General Vote, 7513 (iv).
Methylated Spirits, 1561 (i).
Salaries, &c., 1548 (i).
Stamps for Tobacco, 1558 (i).
Weights and Measures:
Metric System, 2611 (ii).
Rent, Fuel, Travelling Expenses, &c., 2607 (ii).
Salaries *re* Light Inspection, 2601, 2608, (ii), 7513 (iv).
Travelling Expenses, &c., 2611 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Fisheries:
Can. Fishery Exhibit, 3706 (ii).
Dog-Fish, Reduction Work *re*, 3707, 3709 (ii).
Educational Fish Curing Establishments, 3707 (ii).
Fish-breeding Establishments, 3700, 3709 (ii).
Fish Bounty, 3706 (ii).
Georgian Bay Laboratory, 3707 (ii).
Lake Winnipeg, Protection Steamer, 7563 (iv).
Protection Service, 3703. 3709 (ii).
Salaries to Overseers. &c., 3692, 3707 (ii).
U. S. Vessels, Fishing Licenses, &c., 3709 (ii).
Geological Survey:
Boring in West, &c., 5982-3 (iii).
Dickinson, A., Map of Yukon, 5980 (iii).
Klondike Gold Gravels, 5980, 5985 (iii).
Nicolas, F., Indexing, 5980 (iii).
Power Launch, B.C., 5979 (iii).
Sauvalle, Marc, Translations, 5983 (iii).
Victoria Memorial Museum, Specimens, 5983 (iii).
Govt. of Northwest Territories:
Maintenance of Lunatics, 5880 (iii).
Registrars, 5528 (iii).
Govt. of Yukon Territory:
General Vote, 5906 (iii).
Maintenance of Roads, &c., 5934 (iii).
Immigration:
Agents' Salaries, Can., G.B., and Foreign Countries, 1342, 1635 (i), 5862, 5967 (iii).
Contingencies, &c., 5509 (iii).
Indians:
British Columbia:
Day Schools, 1087 (i).
Industrial Schools, 1087 (i)
Medical Attendance, 1079 (i).
Offices, &c., 1094 (i).
Relief, 1078 (i).
Salaries, 1078 (i).
Seed, 1079 (i).
Steamboat for N.W. Coast Agency, 1094 (i).
Generally:
Salary, J. A. Macrae, 1228 (i).
Manitoba and N. W. T.:
Annuities, 734 (i).
General Expenses, 960 (i).
Implements, 735 (i).
Live Stock, 735 (i).
Provisions, 932 (i), 5990 (iii)
Schools, 947 (i), 5990 (iii).
Seeds, 735 (i).
Sioux, 960 (i).
Surveys, 947 (i).
Triennial Clothing, 943 (i).
New Brunswick:
Medical Attendance, 734 (i).
Salaries, 734 (i).
Nova Scotia :
Medical Attendance, 734 (i).
Relief and Seed Grain, 734 (i).
Ontario and Quebec :
Indian Treaty No. 9, Expenses *re*, 733 (i).
Legal Expenses, 726 (i).
Medical Attendance, 717 (i).
Robinson Treaty Annuities, 722 (i).
Salaries of Chiefs, &c., Agent Oka, 721 (i).
SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Indians—*Con.*
Ont., &c.—*Con.*
Schools, 1817 (i), 5985 (iii).
Seven Islands, 5987 (iii).
Surveys, 723 (i).
Yukon :
Medical Attendance, 1206 (i).
To provide Education, 1228 (i).
Inspection of Staples :
Salaries, 7541 (iv).
Justice :
Exchequer Court, 488 (i).
Miscellaneous, 486 (i).
Supreme Court, 488 (i).
Yukon :
Atlin, Judges' Living Allowance, 488 (i).
Judges' Allowances, 489 (i), 7518 (iv).
Legislation :
House of Commons :
Committees, &c., 7572 (iv).
Publishing Debates, 7573 (iv).
Senate :
General Vote, 7573 (iv).
Gratuity to W. L. Lambkin, 7579 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service :
Agencies, Rents and Contingencies, 3591 (ii).
Aids to Navigation, 4788, 4912, 4951 (iii), 7584 (iv).
Compensation *re* Gas Buoy Explosions, 4868 (iii).
Maintenance and Repairs, &c., 3617, 3803 (ii), 4117, 4867 (iii).
Marconi Telegraph System, 7561 (iv).
N.W.M.P., Patrol Boat, 4867, 4896 (iii).
Partridge Island, Water Works, 4896 (iii).
Salaries and Allowances to Keepers, 3583 (ii).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions :
Annapolis and Hull, 7555 (iv).
Can. and Australia, 7556 (iv)
Can. and G.B., 7543 (iv).
Can. and Mexico, 7554 (iv).
Can. and Nfld., 7557 (iv).
Can. and South Africa, 7553 (iv).
Digby and St. John, 7545, 7580 (iv).
Gaspé Basin and Quebec, 7553 (iv).
Magdalen Islands and Mainland, 7553 (iv).
Montreal to Havana, &c., 7556 (iv).
Newcastle, &c., and Miramichi, &c., 7556 (iv).
Pelee Island and Mainland, 7557 (iv).
Petitcodiac River and Cumberland, 7555 (iv).
Port Essington, B.C., and Queen Charlotte Islands, 7555 (iv).
Quebec and Isle of Orleans, 7557 (iv).
St. John and Cumberland Basin, 7555 (iv).
St. John, Hfx., and W. I., and South America, 7551 (iv).
Sydney and Bay St. Lawrence, 7554 (iv).
Tadousac, and St. Catherine's Bay (winter), 7554 (iv).
Victoria and San Francisco, 7553 (iv).
Marine Hospitals :
Care of Sick Seamen, &c, 3686 (ii).
Shipwrecked and Distressed Seamen, 3687 (ii).
Militia :
Annual Drill, 5012 (iii), 7178 (iv).
Camp Grounds, 7183 (iv).
Clothing, &c., 7181 (iv).
Deptl. Library, 7182 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Militia—*Con.*
Ordnance, &c., 7161 (iv).
Pay and Allowance, 7177 (iv).
Reserve Ammunition, 7177 (iv).
Royal Military College, 7182 (iv).
Sussex, &c., Buildings, 7183 (iv).
Miscellaneous :
Academy of Arts, 7576 (iv).
Assay Office, Vancouver, 5944 (iii).
Astronomical Work of Interior Dept., 5858 (iii).
Baker, I. G., & Co., Reimbursements, 516 (i), 7515 (iv).
Banff Park, 5942 (iii).
British Medical Asso'n., Grant, 7577 (iv).
Calgary and Edmonton Ry., Mining Rights, 5861 (iii).
Canadian Mining Institute, 5949, 5977 (iii).
Caves in B.C., 5858 (iii).
Champlain, Monument at St. John, N.B., 7578 (iv).
Comparative Legislation Asso'n. Grant, 7529 (iv).
Duchess of Bedford, Arctic Expedition, 7579 (iv).
Insurance Commission, 305 (i), 7581 (iv).
Japan, Famine Fund, 315 (i).
Labour Dept., 7444 (iv).
Legal Expenses, 5944 (iii), 7528 (iv).
Litigated Matters, Ont. and Que., 7577 (iv).
London. Eng., Can. Law Library, 7528 (iv).
Maps, Lithographing, &c., 5946, 5977 (iii).
Naturalization Act, 7576 (iv).
Pacific Cable Operation, 7577 (iv).
Prince Arthur of Connaught, Visit of, 314 (i).
Professional Advice to Aud. Gen., 7577 (iv).
Registry Offices, Alberta and Sask., 5978 (iii).
Revised Statutes, Commission, 7527, 7537 (iv).
Scientific Literature, Catalogue, 7576 (iv).
Tariff Commission, 7455 (iv).
Yoho Park Reserve, Roads, &c., 5944 (iii).
Mounted Police :
General Vote, 4967 (iii).
Ocean and River Service :
Govt Steamers, Maintenance, &c., and Ice Breakers, including Steamer 'Arctic', 3200, 3350, 3803, 3934 (ii), 4089, 4760, 4816 (iii).
Ice-breaker for Lower St. Lawrence, &c., 7558-9 (iv).
Masters' and Mates' Examination, 3399 (ii).
Schools of Navigation, 3399 (ii).
Wreck Investigations, 4867 (iii).
Wrecking Plant, 4867 (iii).
Penitentiaries :
General Vote, 7526 (iv).
Kingston, 7529 (iv).
Pensions :
Fenian Raid, 7575 (iv).
Rebellion of 1885, 7575 (iv).
Post Office :
Mail Service, 529 (i).
Miscellaneous, 550 (i).
Salaries and Allowances, &c., 525 (i).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Capital :
Buildings :
Archives, 6711 (iv).
Astronomical Observatory, 6709 (iv).
Eastern Building, 6713 (iv).
New Block, 6724 (iv).
Parlt. Buildings, Additions, &c., 6712 (iv).
Royal Mint, 6711 (iv).
Supreme Court Library, 7034 (iv).
Victoria Memorial Museum, 6713 (iv).
Western Deptl. Block, Addition, 6714 (iv).
Harbours and Rivers:
Manitoba:
St. Andrew's Rapids, 7036 (iv).
Ontario:
Port Arthur, &c., Harbour Improvements, 6772 (iv).
Quebec:
Dredge 'Galveston,' 2921 (ii).
Quebec Harbour Improvements, 6771, 7036 (iv).
River St. Lawrence Ship Channel, 2894 (ii).
Transportation Facilities:
Georgian Bay to Montreal, Surveys, &c., 6772 (iv).
St. Mary's Current, 7036 (iv).
Port Colborne, 6772 (iv).
Public Works—Collection of Revenue:
Land and Cable Lines, Lower St. Lawrence, 6769 (iv).
Telegraph Lines, P.E.I., 6769 (iv).
Yukon, 6771 (iv).
Public Works—Income:
Buildings:
British Columbia:
Cumberland, Public Building, 6755 (iv).
Fernie, Public Building, 6757 (iv).
Ladysmith, Public Building, 6757 (iv).
New Westminster, 6757 (iv).
Osoyoos, Public Building, 6757 (iv).
Vancouver, Public Building, 6758 (iv).
Generally:
Armouries, Construction, 6758 (iv).
Manitoba:
Brandon, Drill Hall, 6743 (iv).
Neepawa, Public Building, 6743 (iv).
St. Boniface, Public Building, 6743 (iv).
Selkirk, Public Building, 6743 (iv).
Winnipeg, District Military Stores, 6743 (iv).
——— New Immigration Building, 6743 (iv).
——— Military Buildings, 6743 (iv).
——— New Post Office, 6744 (iv).
——— Old Immigration Building, 7042 (iv).
——— Postal Station, 6751 (iv).
Mar. Provs.:
Generally, 6728 (iv).
New Brunswick:
Woodstock Armoury, 6728 (iv).
Nova Scotia:
Antigonish, Public Building, 6727 (iv).
Glace Bay, Public Building, 6727 (iv).
Inverness, Public Building, 6727 (iv).
Shelburne, Public Building, 6727 (iv).
Westville, Public Building, 6727 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
Ontario:
Belleville, Armoury, 6733 (iv).
——— Public Building, 6733 (iv).
Brantford, Public Building, 6734 (iv).
Guelph, Armoury, 6734 (iv).
——— Public Building, 6734 (iv).
Hamilton, Drill Hall, 6735 (iv).
Kingston, Military Buildings, 6735 (iv).
London, Military Buildings, 6735 (iv).
——— Post Office, 6736 (iv).
North Bay, Public Building, 6736 (iv).
Ottawa, Deptl. Buildings:
——— Fittings, 7038 (iv).
——— Military Buildings, 7037 (iv).
——— Nepean Stone Facing, 7038 (iv).
——— Post Office, 7038 (iv).
——— Steel Shelving, 6736 (iv).
Owen Sound, Public Building, 6736, 7013 (iv).
Peterborough, Armoury, 6738 (iv).
St. Mary's Public Building, 6739 (iv).
Simcoe, Public Building, 6740 (iv).
Toronto Custom House, 6741 (iv).
——— Dom. Buildings, 6742 (iv).
——— Drill Hall, 6742 (iv).
——— Military Buildings, 6742 (iv).
——— Post Office, 6742, 7039 (iv).
Quebec:
Actonvale, Public Building, 6728 (iv).
Chicoutimi, Public Building, 6728 (iv).
Magog, Public Building, 6729 (iv).
Montmagny, Public Building, 6731 (iv).
Montreal, Barracks, 6732 (iv).
——— Military Buildings, 6732 (iv).
——— Post Office, 6732 (iv).
Nicolet, Public Building, 6732 (iv).
Quebec, Military Buildings, 6732 (iv).
St. Hyacinthe Drill Hall, 6733 (iv).
St. John's, Military Buildings, 7036 (iv).
St. John's, Public Building, 6733 (iv).
Sherbrooke, Drill Hall, 6733 (iv).
Three Rivers, Drill Hall, 6733 (iv).
Rents, Repairs, &c.:
Dom. Public Buildings, Rents, 6759, 7013 (iv).
Ottawa, Dom. Buildings, 6759 (iv).
——— Electric Power, 6764 (iv).
——— Fuel, 6764 (iv).
——— Post Office, 6763 (iv).
Saskatchewan and Alberta:
Calgary, Public Building, 6752 (iv).
Edmonton, Immigration Building, 6753 (iv).
——— Jail, 7042 (iv).
——— Public Building, 6753 (iv).
Medicine Hat, Public Building, 6753 (iv).
Moosejaw, Public Building, 6753 (iv).
Prince Albert, Public Building, 6754 (iv).
Regina, Post Office, &c., 6754 (iv).
Saskatoon, Public Building, 6754 (iv).
Dredging:
B.C., New Dredging Plant, 6996 (iv).
Ont. and Que., New Dredging Plant, 6995 (iv).
——— Dredging, 7014 (iv).
Harbours and Rivers:
British Columbia:
Columbia River, Improvements, 6995
Pitt River, Bridge Works, 7053 (iv).
Victoria Harbour, Dredging, &c., 6995 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Manitoba:
Arnes, Wharf, 6994 (iv).
Fairford River, 6994 (iv).
Maritime Provs.:
General Vote, 6956 (iv).
New Brunswick:
Campbellton, Wharf, 6935 (iv).
Cape Tormentine, Harbour, 6935 (iv).
Chance Harbour, Breakwater, 6940 (iv).
Chockfish, River Improvements, 6941 (iv).
Dalhousie Harbour, 6941 (iv).
Dipper Harbour, 6941 (iv).
General Vote, 7043 (iv).
Quaco Harbour, 6941 (iv).
River St. John, Tributaries, 6942 (iv).
——— Tidal Wharf, 6942 (iv).
St. John, Harbour, 6942 (iv).
Nova Scotia:
General Vote, 6772, 7042 (iv).
Glace Bay, Harbour, 6774 (iv).
Habitant River, Canning Wharf, 6787 (iv).
Inverness Mines, Harbour, 6788 (iv).
Port Hood, Harbour, 6789 (iv).
Ontario:
Amherstburg Channel, 6985 (iv).
Belle River, Dredging, &c., 6985 (iv).
Beaverton, Harbour, 6985 (iv).
Blanche River Improvements, 6985 (iv).
Bronte Harbour, 6986 (iv).
Cobourg, Pier, 6986 (iv).
Collingwood, Harbour, 6986 (iv).
Echo Bay, Wharf, 7049 (iv).
Goderich, Harbour, 6989 (iv).
Harbours, &c., Generally, 6989, 7014 (iv).
Midland, Harbour, 6990 (iv).
Owen Sound, Harbour, 6990 (iv).
Parry Sound, Wharf, 6990 (iv).
Point Edward, Dredging, 6990, 7048 (iv).
Port Burwell, Harbour, 6990 (iv).
Port Stanley, Harbour, 6991 (iv).
River Thames, Wharfs, 6991 (iv).
Rondeau Harbour, Improvements, 6991 (iv).
Silverwater, Wharf, 6991 (iv).
Toronto Harbour, Eastern Entrance, 6994 (iv).
Prince Edward Island:
Point Prim Island, Wharf, 6931 (iv).
Summerside Harbour, 6932 (iv).
Wood Islands, 6933 (iv).
Quebec:
Bic Harbour, 6943 (iv).
Canton Fabre, Lake Temiscamingue, 6943 (iv).
Chateauguay, Wharf, 6943 (iv).
D'Israeli, Wharf, 6943, 6956 (iv).
Grande Rivière de Beaupré, 6973 (iv).
Harbours and Rivers, &c., 6974 (iv).
Lake Megantic, Piers, 6974, 7043 (iv).
Montmorency Falls, Crib-work, 6975 (iv).
Pointe aux Trembles, Wharf, 6975 (iv).
River Blanche, Wharf, 6977 (iv).
River Ouelle, Pier, 6977 (iv).
River Peribonka, &c., Training Dykes, 6975 (iv).
River St. Louis, Improvements, 6977 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Harbours and Rivers—*Con.*
Quebec—*Con.*
Ste. Anne de Chicoutimi, Wharf, 6980 (iv).
Three Rivers, Harbour, 6980 (iv).
Saskatchewan and Alberta :
Last Mountain Lake Outlet, 7052 (iv).
North Sask. River, Survey, 6995 (iv).
Marine Dept.:
Ship Channel, New Dredge, 7560 (iv).
Operation of 'Galveston', 7561 (iv).
Permanent Piers, 7560 (iv).
Miscellaneous :
Arbitrations and Awards, 6765 (iv).
Art Gallery, Ottawa, 6767 (iv).
Deep Waterways, Commission, 6769 (iv).
Engineering Branch, Salaries, &c., 6767 (iv).
Generally, 7053 (iv).
Surveys, &c., 6767, 7020 (iv).
Head Waters of Ottawa, 6767 (iv).
Telegraph Lines, Yukon, 7021 (iv).
Temporary Assistance, &c., 6767 (iv).
Transportation Commission, 7021 (iv).
Roads and Bridges :
River Bridge, 7020 (iv).
Colonization Roads, &c., in Man., &c., 6997 (iv).
Slides and Booms :
River Saguenay, 7016 (iv).
Telegraph Lines:
Mar. Provinces:
Cape Breton Island, 7011, 7020 (iv).
North-west Territories:
Edmonton-Athabaska Landing, 7012 (iv).
Quebec :
Descente des Femmes, 7020 (iv).
Grosse Isle, Marconi, 7011 iv).
Quarantine:
Grosse Isle, Steamer, 2697 (ii).
Health of Animals, 2682 (ii), 7440 (iv).
Railways and Canals:
Canals:
Beauharnois:
St. Stanislas Weir, 7512 (iv).
Cornwall :
Repairs, 5358 (iii).
Galops :
To complete Channel, 5158 (iii).
To stop Leak, 5080 (iii).
Generally, 5343 (iii).
Grenville :
Dams across Slides, 5079 (iii).
Lachine :
Electrical Installation, 7511 (iv).
Repairing Leaks, 5358 (iii).
Slope Walls, 5079 (iii).
Staff, 7483 (iv).
North Channel :
Galops and Adams Island Channel, 5158, 5357 (iii).
Quebec Canals, Surveys, &c., 5079 (iii).
Rideau :
Swing Bridges, 5174 (iii).
Sault Ste. Marie :
Construction, 5165, 5357 (iii).
Shelter for Lockmen, 7506 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Railways and Canals—*Con.*
Canals—*Con.*
Soulanges :
Construction, 5357 (iii).
Workshops, 7511 (iv).
Trent :
Construction, 5166 (iii).
Holland River, 5167 (iii).
Improvements, 5172 (iii).
Staff, 7499 (iv).
To pay W. Mitchell, 7500 (iii).
To purchase Tug, 5360 (iii).
Welland :
Electric Light Power Plant, 5161, 5357 (iii).
Port Colborne, Entrance, 5165 (iii).
——— Elevator, 5165 (iii).
Summit Level, 5358 (iii).
To pay D. W. Parr, 7500 (iv).
Williamsburg :
Gate Lifter, 5358 (iv).
Miscellaneous :
Cost of Litigation, 5179 (iii).
Gov. Gen.'s Cars, Purchase, 7511 (iv).
Railway Commission, 7513 (iv).
Surveys and Inspections, Railways, 5174 (iii).
Railways :
Intercolonial Railway :
Additional Sidings, &c., 7502 (iv).
Air Brakes, 5074 (iii).
Campbellton, Improvements, 5070 (iii).
Coal Handling Plant, 5357 (iii).
Double Tracking, 5356 (iii).
Drummondville, Accommodation, 5070 (iii).
Floyd, Mr., Allowance, 7484 (iv).
Freight Cars, Side Ladders, 7501 (iv).
General Vote, 5343 (iii).
Halifax, Accommodation, 5071 (iii), 7483 (iv).
Increased Accommodation, &c., 5079 (iii), 7503 (iv).
Indiantown and Blackville, Improvements, 7503 (iv).
Levis Accommodation, 5355 (iii).
Mitchell, Diversion of Line, 5070 (iii).
Moncton, Shops, &c., 7501 (iv).
Newcastle, Improvements, 5070 (iii).
Pictou, Accommodation, 5075 (iii).
Pictou Landing, 5073 (iii).
River du Loup, Engine House, &c., 5070 (iii).
Rolling Stock, 5076 (iii), 7501 (iv).
Rothesay, Improvements, 7501 (iv).
St. Moïse, Station, 7483 (iv).
Side Ladders on Box-Cars, 7501 (iv).
Stellarton, Accommodation, 5074 (iii).
Strengthening Bridges, 5016 (iii), 7502 (iv).
Sydney Mines Extension, 5075 (iii).
Truro, Accommodation, 5073 (iii).
Water Service, 7481 (iv).
National Transcontinental Ry.:
Surveys and Construction, 5115 (iii).
Prince Edward Island Ry.:
Charlottetown, Increased Accommodation, 5149 (iii).
General Vote, 5079 (iii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
COMMITTEE—*Con.*
Scientific Institutions :
Astronomical Observatory, 5876 (iii).
Hydrographic Surveys, 3685 (ii).
Magnetic Observatory, 3683 (ii).
Meteorogical Service, 3684 (ii).
To pay W. A. Found, 3685 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection :
Inspection of Dom. Steamers, Fog Alarms, &c., 3691 (ii).
Steamboat Inspection, 3688 (ii).
Supt. of Insurance :
Salary, 7578 (iv).
Trade and Commerce :
Chinese Immigration Act, 7539 (iv).
Commercial Agencies, 7539, 7556 (iv).
CONCURRENCE :
Fisheries Protection Steamer, Lake Winnipeg, 7598 (iv).
Ocean and River Service, Unforseen expenses, 7585 (iv).
Supreme and Exchequer Courts Act Amt., B. No. 67 (Mr. Fitzpatrick) 1°*, 890; 2°, m., 1259; in Com., 1261; ref. back to Sel. Com., 1584 (i); on Order for Com., 2161, 3506; 3°*, 3523 (ii).
——— Bill (Mr. Lennox) withdrn., 4568 (iii).
Supreme Court Ad Hoc Judges, Apptmnt, of : Remarks (Mr. Bergeron), 3068 (ii).
Supreme Court, Administration of: in Com. of Sup., 488 (i).
Supreme Court Building Library ; in Com. of Sup., 7034 (iv).
Supreme Court of Canada, Vacancy, Apptmnt. *re* Quebec Case: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 3910 (ii).
——— Apptmnt of Ad Hoc Judges: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1103 (i).
See 'Justice.'
Supreme Court of Judicature, New Brunswick B. No. 224 (Mr. Aylesworth) 1° m., 6790; 2°, and in Com., 7183; 3° m., 7188 (iv).
Supreme Court, Postponement of Quebec Cases: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 3075 (ii).
Supreme Court, References by Gov. Gen. in Council: Ques. (Mr. Bristol) 1678 (i).
Surveys of Dom. Lands: in Com. of Sup., 5977 (iii).
See 'Dom. Lands.'
Surveys for Indians in Man. and N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 723 (i).
——— Ont. and Que.: in Com. of Sup., 723 (i).
Sussex Camp Ground: in Com. of Sup., 7183 (iv).
Sussex Rifle Range, Contract Price, Caretaker's Wages, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 577 (i).
Sussex Station, N.B., I.C.R.: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 5074 (iii).
Sutherland Combination Sight and Ross Rifles, Purchase of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 4703 (iii).
Sutherland, Geo. M., Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 2265 (ii).
Sutherland, Geo. N. and John Lamont, Employment by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 3245 (ii).
——— Remarks *re* Question (Mr. Boyce) 2701 (ii).
Swamp Lands, Man., Cor. with Dom. Govt., O. C., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Staples) 345 (i).
——— System of Classification : Ques. (Mr. Staples) 446 (i).
Swan Lake Indian Reserve, Settlement *re* Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 1246.
Sydney and Bay St. Lawrence, Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7554 (iv).
Sydney Mines, Extension I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5075 (iii).
Sydney, North, Harbour B. No. 74 (Mr. Brodeur) 1° m., 969 (i); 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 2189 (ii).
Sydney Pilotage Commission and Pilots Retiring Fund, Amounts paid to Cor., &c., M. for Copies* (Mr. Boyce) 997 (i).
Sydney Riots, Payments to Militia: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1104 (i).
Tariff Commission, Announcement *re* Legislation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9 (i).
——— Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 7455 (iv).
——— Printing of Evidence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 201 ; Evidence laid on Table (Mr. Paterson) 201 (i).
Tariff Revision, Changes of Policy, &c.: ref. to in deb. on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 37 (i).
Taschereau, Sir Henri, Resignation from Supreme Court: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 2243 (ii).
Tate Dry Dock, Name of Lessee, Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1374 (i).
Taylor, Mr. L. Fennings ; Letter *re* Investigation into Collapse of Laurier Tower: Read (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 7025 (iv).
See 'Tower,' &c.
Telegraph System: in Com. of Sup., 7011 (iv).
Telegraph Extension, Cape Breton Island: in Com of Sup., 7011 (iv).
——— Mar. Provs.: in Com. of Sup., 7020 (iv).
——— P.E.I. and Mainland: in Com. of Sup., 6769 (iv).
——— Que.: in Com. of Sup., 7020 (iv).
Telegraph, Telephone Lines and Express Cos. Notice of Motion (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1855 (i).
Telephone Committee, Continuance of: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 126 (i).
——— Amount paid *re* Committee: Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 214, 322 (i).
———Conclusions, Recommendations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 979 (i).
Telephone Legislation, Letter from 'The Canadian Independent Tel. Association' : Read (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 347 (i).

Telephone Lines in Man., Memorial *re* Expropriation by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 3250 (ii).

Telephone System (Man.) B. No. 167 (Mr. W. J. Roche) 1° m., 3315 (ii).

——— *See* 'Manitoba', &c.

Telephones, &c.: *See* 'Ry. Act B. 62', 'Bell Telephone B.'

Temagami, Cobalt and Temiscamingue Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 217 (Mr. McCool) 1°*, 6543; 2°*, 6707; in Com., and 3°*, 7270 (iv).

Temiskaming and Northern Ont. Ry. Subsidy: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 3° of Ry. Subsidies B. 6841 (iv).

Temperance Colonization Co.'s Contract *re* Settlers: Ref. to in deb. on North Atlantic Trading Co.'s Contract (Mr. D. Ross), 1960-1 (i).

Temple Mutual Life Association incorp. B. No. 38 (Mr. Bole) 1°*, 444; 2°*, 928 (i).

Terrebonne and Ste, Therese Post Offices, Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Leonard) 2721 (ii).

Terrebonne Wharf, Amount expended, Completion, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Léonard) 454 (i).

Thames River Dredging, Necessity of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 175 (i).

——— Survey, Improvements of Channel, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 175 (i).

Thames River Floods, Relief for, Cor., Plans, Surveys, &c.: (Mr. Clements) for Copies, 774 (i).

Thames River Gunboats, Disposal of: Remarks (Mr. Kemp) 2550 (ii).

Thames River Wharfs: in Com. of Sup.., 6991 (iv).

Theatrical Advertising Matter, Application *re* Remocal of Duty: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 5507 (iii).

Thermograph Records on Ocean Steamers: M. for Copies* (Mr. E. D. Smith) 427 (i).

Thessalon Postmaster, Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 2273 (ii).

Thessalon Postmaster, Rentals from P.O. Boxes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 2727 (ii(.

Thessalon Post Office, Irregularities *re*: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 557 (i).

Thirteenth Scottish Dragoons, Resignation of Col., Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 7178 (iv).

Thorndale Post Office, Removal or, Memorials, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Elson) 998 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. Elson) 989 (i).

Thorold and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s B. No. 126 (Mr. Calvert) 1°*, 1743; 2°*, 1857 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3187 (ii).

Three Rivers, Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 6733 (ix).

——— Harbour, Deep Water Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6980 (iv).

Three Rivers, St. Hyacinthe and Sherbrooke Drill Sheds, Cost of Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Worthington) 3251 (ii).

Ticket-of-Leave Prisoners, liberated, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bergeron) 4154 (iii).

Ties delivered at Rogersville, by Messrs. Buckley, Galland and Mahoney, Inspection of: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 2723 (ii).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 2950 (ii).

See 'I. C. R.', &c.

Timber Berths Nos. 1158, 1175, &c., Leasing Cor., &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 773 (i).

Timber Berth Leases, Original Tenders not produced: Remarks (Mr. Ames) in Com. on B. 47, 3579 (ii).

Timber or Hay Lands granted for Homestead Entries in Man., Description, Names of Applicants, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lake) 427.

Timber Lands sold or leased by Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 345 (i).

Timber Leases in Man. and N.W.T., Applications for, Between 1880 and 1896: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 5502, 5753 (iii).

——— Ret., Incomplete: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 212 (i).

See 'Interior.'

Tobacco Culture in Two Mountains, Requests for Seeds, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ethier) 584 (i).

Tobacco, Raw Leaf, Increase of Duty, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 176 (i).

Tobacco Stamps: in Com. of Sup., 1558 (i).

Toledo Glass Co.'s Patent Relief B. No. 110 (Mr. Stewart) 1°*, 1575; 2°*, 1792 (i); in Com., 3674, 3715; ref. back to Sel. Com., 3952 (ii).

Toronto Barracks, Erection of, Purchase of Site at Humber River: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 5506 (iii).

Toronto City Bill No. 137 (Mr. Macdonell) 1°*, 1743 (i); 2°*, 2066 (ii).

Toronto Customs House, Alterations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6741 (i).

Toronto Dom. Buildings, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6742 (iv).

Toronto and Hamilton, Niagara and Western Ry. Co.'s B. No. 134 (Mr. Guthrie) 1°*, 1743 (i); 2°*, 2066 (ii); in Com., 4389; 3° m., 4397 (iii).

Toronto Harbour, Breakwater Extension, Payments *re*, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Macdonell) 997 (i).

——— Dredging, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 4800 (iii).

——— remarks (Mr. Macdonell) in Com. of Sup., 7014 (iv).

——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6994 (iv).

——— Payments *re*, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Macdonell) 997 (i).

Toronto Military Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 6742 (iv).
Toronto Observatory, Removal to Ottawa : Remarks (Mr. Kemp) 127 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Kemp) in Com. of Sup., 3683 (ii).
See 'Astronomical.'
Toronto Old Fort, Application *re* Transfer : Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1370 (i).
Toronto Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 7039 (iv).
——— Construction of Purchase of Site: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 5505 (iii).
——— Fire, Destruction of Mails : Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 2238 (ii).
——— Pneumatic Tube System: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 7040 (iv).
Toronto Street Ry., Litigation, Retainer of Hon. A. B. Aylesworth : Ques. (Mr. Ltnnox) 3252 (ii).
Toronto Union Station Co.'s incorp. B. No. 138 (Mr. Macdonell) 1°*, 1743 (i); 2°*, 2720 (ii); in Com., 4397 ; 3°*, 4397 (iii).
Tower of West Block, Collapse of, Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1154 (i).
——— Collapse of, Inspection by Govt. : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. for Sup., 1268, 1302 (i); Ques. of Order (Mr. Conmee) *re* Dredging Contracts: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 1305 (i).
——— Further Information : Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1580 (i), 3712 (ii).
——— Evidence *re* Inquiry: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5364 (iii).
——— Further Cor.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5529 (iii).
See 'West Block.'
Tower, Western Deptl. Block, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6714 (iv).
——— Letter from Mr. L. F. Taylor: Read (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 7025 (iv).
See 'Public Works, Ottawa,' &c.

TRADE AND COMMERCE :
Acadia SS. Subsidy, Govt. Aid to: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3250 (ii).
Allan SS. Co., Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7543 (iv).
Annapolis and G. B. Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7555 (iv).
Canada-Australian Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7556 (iv).
Canada and Mexico Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7554 (iv).
——— Contracts *re* : M. for Copies* (Mr. A. A. McLean, 2038 (ii).
Canada and Newfoundland Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 7557 (iv).
Canada and S. Africa, Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7553 (iv).

TRADE AND COMMERCE—*Con.*
Chinese Immigration Act, Remuneration to Officials: in Com. of Sup., 7539 (iv).
Commercial Agencies: in Com. of Sup., 7556 (iv).
——— Treaties, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7539 (iv).
Consular Agents and Trade Commissioners, Apptmt. by Imp. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Kemp) 2084 (ii).
Grain Inspection, *re* Man. Grain Act, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 7541 (iv).
G.B. and Canada Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7543 (iv).
Japanese Deportation from B.C., Par. in Vancouver Paper: Read (Mr. Sproule) 3152 (ii).
Magdalen Islands Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 7553 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions: in Com. of Sup., 7543 (iv).
Montreal and Mexico Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7556 (iv).
Newcastle, Neguac and Escuminac, Miramichi River Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7556 (iv).
Newfoundland and W. Indies, Steps *re* Confederation: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 333 (i).
Northumberland Straits and Lower St. Lawrence Ice-breaker: in Com. of Sup., 7558 (iv).
Pelee Islands Steam Subventions: in Com. of Sup., 7557 (iv).
Petitcodiac and Moncton Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 7555 (iv).
Port Simpson and Queen Charlotte Islands Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7555 (iv).
Quebec and Gaspé Basin Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 7553 (iv).
St. Catherine's Bay and Tadousac Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7554 (iv).
St. John and Cumberland Basin Mail Subsidy : in Com. of Sup., 7555 (iv).
St. John and Digby Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7545, 7580 (iv).
Steamship Subsidies, Statement *re* Operations, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 568 (i).
Sydney and Bay St. Lawrence, Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7554 (iv).
Trade and Commerce, Chinese Immigration Act.: in Com. of Sup., 7539 (iv).
——— Deptl. Salaries, in Com. of Sup., 403 (i).
——— Reports, Expenditure *re* Compiling, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Kemp) 581 (i).
——— Rep.: Presented (Mr. Paterson) 125 (i). 4032 (iii).
Trade and Nav. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Paterson) 125 (i).
Trans-Atlantic Steamship Subsidies, Contracts with Govt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. E. D. Smith) 1741 (i).

TRADE AND COMMERCE—*Con.*
Victoria and San Francisco Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7553 (iv).
Wheat Inspection at Winnipeg, Grading, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5004 (iii).
Trade and Nav. Rep., Presented (Mr. Paterson) 125 (i).
Trans-Atlantic Steamship Subsidies, Contracts with Govt.: for Copies* (Mr. E. D. Smith) 1741 (i).
Transcontinental Ry. Commissioners, Expropriation of Land in Prov. of Quebec: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 446 (i).
Transcontinental Ry. Commission: Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 213 (i).
——— M. to Print (Mr. R. L. Borden) 268 (i).
Transcontinental: *See* 'G. T. Pacific.'
Trans-Niagara Bridge Co.'s B. No. 161 (Mr. Calvert) 1°*, 3065; 2°*, 3243 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 6034 (iii); Sen. Amts., 7270, 7370 (iv).
Transportation Commission, Apptmnt. of Commissioners, Copies of Evidence, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Bennett) 203 (i).
——— Payments, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 7021 (iv).
——— Rep. of Evidence, &c.: Prop. Res. (Mr. Bennett) 2038, 3279 (ii).
——— notice of prop. res. (Mr. Bennett) 1679 (i).
——— delay in bringing down: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) 770 (i).
——— remarks (Mr. Bennett) 1106 (i).
Transportation Commission: Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 212 (i).
——— Printing and Distribution: Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 427 (i).
——— Printing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1004 (i).
Transportation Facilities: in Com. of Sup., 6772 (iv).
——— Montreal Harbour: in Com. of Sup., 7036 (iv).
See 'Marine,' &c., 'Waterways,' &c.
Transportation for Passengers and Freight, Increase in Rates, I.C.R., St. Jean Port Joli, Lévis: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 583 (i).
Travelling Expenses *re* Indians, B.C.: in Com. of Sup., 1094 (i).
Treaty, No. 8, Indian Band: Remarks (Mr. Fowler) in Com. of Sup., 1251 (i).
——— No. 9, Indian Payments, Agents, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5988 (iii).
Tree Culture and Timber Preservation: in Com. of Sup., 5939 (iii).
Trent Canal, Arrangements *re* Control of Tributary Waters: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 834 (i).
——— Balsam Lake Route: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 5343 (iii).
——— Construction: in Com. of Sup., 5166 (iii).
Trent Canal, Eastern Section, Depth of: Ques. (Mr. McCool) 836 (i).
——— Expenditure *re* Construction: M. for Ret.* (Mr. S. Hughes) 1379 (i).
——— inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Hughes) 1581 (i).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5172 (iii).
——— Investigation *re* Route, Damage to Lift Ques. (Mr. Porter) 199 (i).
——— Kirkfield Lift Lock, Cor., &c.: M. (Mr. S. Hughes) for Copy, 3253 (ii).
——— Official Inquiry *re* Faulty Construction, Remuneration, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 189 (i).
——— Precautions taken *re* Levels, Break, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 588 (i).
——— Staff: in Com. of Sup., 7499 (iv).
——— Supt., Instructions to Mr. Pearson, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1560 (i).
——— Surveys from Rice Lake, Damages *re* Break in Lock: Ques. (Mr. Ward) 449 (i).
——— Tugs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5360 (iii).
——— Water Power, Lease or Sale of: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 1379 (i).
——— Waterways from Balsam Lake, &c., Cost of Opening: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 588 (i).
Trent River, Control of Water Power by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 199 (i).
Trent Valley Harbour Improvements: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 7014 (iv).
Triennial Clothing for Indians, Man:. in Com. of Sup., 943 (i).
Trust Funds Investment and Securities, Provincial Subsidies, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1577 (i).
Turner's Head Fog Alarm, N.B., Cost of, Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stockton) 2269 (ii).
Twelve-Mile Power Co.'s Limited incorp. B. No. 183 (Mr. Thompson) 1°*, 4451; 2°*, 5227; 3°*, 6075 (iii); Sen. Amts., 7271 (iv).
Tyerman, Dr., Medical Officer for Twatt's Band of Indians: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 1245 (i).
Underwood Typewriter Co.'s Patent (No. 69140) Relief B. 123 (Mr. Campbell) 1°*, 1667; 2°*, 1792 (i).
Ungava Bay, Claims of Newfoundland, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Gervais) 7459 (iv).
Uniforms for 80th Regiment, Nicolet: Ques.. (Mr. L. Lavergne) 7693 (iv).
United Empire Bank of Canada incorp. B. 52 (Mr. Belcourt) 1°*, 656; 2°*, 928 (i).
United Empire Life Insurance Co.'s incorp. B. No. 90 (Mr. Pardee) 1°*, 1252; 2°*, 1570 (i) in Com., and 3°*, 6706; Sen. Amts., 7271, 7370 (iv).
U. S. Citizens and Naturalization *re* N. W. Ters. Settlers: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 343 (i).
Usury: *See* 'Money Lenders.'
Vacancies: *See* 'Electoral Districts,' &c.

Vancouver Experimental Farms, Statement by Min. of Inland Revenue: Ques. (Mr. Herron) 575 (i).

Vancouver, Fraser Valley and Southern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 87 (Mr. Macpherson) 1°*, 1252; 2°*, 1570 (i); in Com., 2709; M. to ref. back to Sel. Com., 2712; in Com., 3187; 3°*, 2187 (ii).

Vancouver and Lulu Island Ry. Co.'s B. 29 (Mr. Macpherson) 1°*, 350; 2°*, 525; in Com., 1141; ref. back to Sel. Com., 1295 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2066 (ii).

Vancouver and Northern Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 119 (Mr. Macpherson) 1°*, 1667; 2°*, 1792 (i).

Vancouver Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 6758 (iv).

Vancouver, Westminster and Yukon Ry. Co.'s B. No. 41 (Mr. Macpherson) 1°*, 485; 2°*, 781; in Com. and 3°*, 1569 (i).

Vaughan, Wm. Napoleon, Relief B. No. 180 (Mr. Stewart) 1°*, 4451; 2°*, 4951; in Com., 6035; 3°*, 6035 (iii).

Ventilation of Chamber: Remarks (Mr. Bristol) 7359 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. Taylor) 5616 (iii).

See 'Acoustics,' &c.

Ventilation of SS. carrying perishable goods, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. D. Smith) 569 (i).

Veterans of Fenian Raids, Claims for Compensation: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 613, 619; Neg. (Y. 40; N. 90) 646 (i).

Victoria Day: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Adjournment, 3672 (ii).

Victoria Harbour Postmaster, Complaint *re* Duties: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 543 (i).

Victoria Harbour, Removal of Rocks: in Com. of Sup., 6995 (iv).

Victoria Museum Building, Ottawa: in Com. of Sup., 6713 (iv).

——— Name of Contractors, Quality of Stone, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 1152 (i).

——— Specifications *re* Material, Cor. &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Perley) 1741 (i).

——— Specifications *re* Stone, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fowler) 2031 (ii).

See 'Geological Survey.'

Victoria and San Francisco Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 7553 (iv).

Votes and Proceedings, Correction *re* Adjnd. Deb. on Land Grants, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 972 (i).

Voyageurs of the Nile, Medals, Recognition for Services, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Hughes) 420, 448 (i).

——— Remarks *re* Answer to Question, (Mr. S. Hughes) 485 (i).

Wagner, Philip, Charges against: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Foster) 344 (i).

Wagner, Philip, Charges *re* Interference in Elections: Amt. (Mr. Fowler) to Com. of Sup., 5570; Neg. (Y. 41; N. 88) 5612 (iii).

——— Emplymt. by Govt., Previous Imprisonment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 194 (i).

——— Irregularities: Notice of M. (Mr. Foster) 5185 (iii).

Walsh, J. A.: *See* 'Land Grants, Sale,' &c.

Walsh, Patrick, Dismissal from East Roman Valleyk Post Office, Pets., Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Lancaster) 1206 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 769 (i).

Washedemoak River, N.B., Deepening of: Ques. (Mr. Wilmot) 584 (i).

Water Powers in Canada, Leases or Alienations, &c.: M. (Mr. Monk) for Statement, 594 (i).

——— Sale of: Inquiry *re*: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 4991 (iii).

Waterways Commission, Rep. *re* Niagara Water Power Co., Treaties, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 567 (i).

——— Rep., Printing &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1366 (i).

——— Transportation Facilities: in Com. of Sup., 6769 (iv).

See Transportation.'

Ways and Means: M. for Com. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 125 (i).

——— M. for Com. (Mr. Fielding) 3819 (ii).

See Budget.'

Weeks, Mr. W. A., Apptmnt. by Govt. *re* P.E.I. Ry., Claims: Ques. (Mr. A. A. McLean) 586 (i).

Weeks, Mr. W. A., Emplymt. by Govt. *re* Dispute with P.E.I. Ry., O.C. *re*: M. for Copy* (Mr. A. Martin) 997 (i).

Weights and Measures Act (milk cans) Amt. B. No. 14 (Mr. Campbell) 1° m., 169; 2° m., 874; ref. to Agr. Committee, 883 (i); in Com., 2068; 3° m., 2971 (ii).

Weights and Measures Inspections: in Com. of Sup., 2601 (ii).

Weir Licenses, Charlotte Co., N.B., Number granted, 1906: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 1565 (i).

Welland Canal, Bridge and Locks, Amount spent in Repairs: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 580 (i).

——— Electric Power and Plant: in Com. of Sup., 5161 (iii).

——— Gratuity to D. W. Parr: in Com. of Sup., 7500 (iv).

——— Port Colborne Deepening: in Com. of Sup., 5357 (iii).

See Canals,' &c.

Wellington and Union Bay, Ry. Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 6143 (iv).

West Cape Branch, P. E. I. Ry., Surveys, &c.: Ques, (Mr. Lefurgey) 582 (i).

Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s Subsidy: in Com. on Res., 6159 (iv).

Western Assurance Co.'s B. No. 199 (Mr. L. G. McCarthy), M. to present Pet., 4991 ; 1°*, 2°*, 5181 ; in Com., 5501 ; 3°*, 5502 (iii).

Western Block Addition, Amount expended, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 194 (i).

——— Collapse of Tower : Rep. laid on Table (Mr. Hyman) 4029 (iii).
See 'Tower.'

Western Loan and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. No. 35 (Mr. Adamson) 1°*, 443; 2°*, 569 (i); in Com., 3236 ; 3°*, 3434 (ii).

West Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s B. No. 26 (Mr. Pardee), 1°*, 350 ; 2°*, 525 ; in Com., 1140 ; 3°*, 1141 (i).

Westville Public Building ; in Com. of Sup., 6727 (iv).

Whale Fisheries in Hudson Bay: *See* 'Fisheries B. 223.'

Wharfs, Docks, &c., Incomplete Ret.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 211 (i).

Wheat Inspection at Winnipeg, Grading, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 5004 (iii).

Whitefish Indian Reserve, Sale of, Name of Purchaser : Ques. (Mr. Bennett) 2454, 2724 (ii).

——— Timber Sales, Number of Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 3405 (ii).

White Fish Island, Classification of Exported Fish : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1854 (i).

——— M. for Copies* (Mr. Boyce) 996 (i).

White Fish Island, Expropriation by Pacific and Atlantic Ry. Co.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 190, 833 (i).

White Fish Island, Sale of Timber on Indian Reserves, Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. on B. 194, 5429 (iii).

White Horse and Alsek Ry. b. No. 31 (Mr. Macpherson) 1°*, 350 ; 2°*, 525 ; in Com., and 3*, 1297 (i).

Wicksteed Post Office, Pet. *re* Mail Service : Remarks (Mr. Sam. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 556 (i).

Wight, Frederick Wm., Relief B. No. 193 (Mr. Parmelee) 1°*, 5081 ; 2°*, 5227; in Com., and 3°*, 6034 (iii).

Wiley, Daniel, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 985 (i).

Williamsburg Canal, Gate Lifter : in Com. of Sup., 5358 (iii).

——— Staff, and Repairs, Total Expenditure : Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 982 (i).

Williams Head Quarantine Station, B.C., Permanent and Temporary Employees : Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 5506 (iii).

Williams, J. J., Dismissal from Port Hawkesbury Post Office: Ques. (Mr. McLennan) 2926.

Wilson, Thos. L., Payments to for Gas Buoys : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 767 (i).
See 'Marine,' &c.

Wilson, Mr. Alex., Apptmnt. as special Immigration Agent : Ques. (Mr. Barr) 1864 (i).

Wilson's Beach Breakwater, N.B., Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 576 (i).

——— Amounts paid to J. M. Johnson : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 761 (i).

Wilton Post Office, Dismissal of L. L. Galliher and Apptmnts.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 835 (i).

Windmill Lighthouse, Installation of Acetylene Gas, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 981 (i).

Windsor, Chatham and London Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. No. 146 (Mr. Clarke) 1°*, 2321 ; 2°*, 2721 (ii) ; in Com., and 3°*, 5227 (iii).

Windsor, Essex and Lake Shore Rapid Ry. Co.'s B. No. 150 (Mr. Clarke) 1°*, 2321; 2°*, 2721 (ii); in Com., 5223; in Com. and 3°*, 5400 (iii).

Wingham Public Building, Expenditure *re* : Ques. (Mr. Gunn) 1567 (i).

Winnipeg 'Free Press', Amount paid by Govt. 1904-5 : Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 3969 (ii).

——— Amounts paid for all Purposes : Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 5752 (iii).

Winnipeg Immigration Building : in Com. of Sup., 6743, 7042 (iv).

Winnipeg Loan and Trust Co.'s incorp. B. No. 129 (Mr. Lefurgey) 1°*, 1743 (i) ; 2°*, 2066 (ii) ; in Com., 6053 ; 3°*, 6055 (iii).

Winnipeg Militia Dept., Amounts paid for Coal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 2080 (ii).

Winnipeg Military Stores Building: in Com. of Sup., 6743 (iv).

Winnipeg, Postal Station, C.P.R.: in Com. of Sup., 6751 (iv).

——— Post Office : in Com. of Sup., 6744 (iv).

Winnipeg Printers' Complaints, Rep. of Dep. Minister of Labour: M. for Copy* (Mr. Verville) 1380 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. Verville) 1378 (i).

Winnipeg-Selkirk Mail Service, Tenders *re* Contract : Ques. (Mr. W. J. Roche) 3405 (ii).

Winnipeg Street Car Strike, Settlement of, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bergeron) 1259 (i).

Winter Communication with P.E.I. and Mainland, Construction of Steamer, &c.: Ques. (Mr. A. McLean) 336 (i).

——— Ice-breaker 'Montcalm,' in Northumberland Straits: Remarks (Mr. J. J. Hughes) 1256 (i).

——— Contract *re* Steamer: Ques. (Mr. Hughes, P.E.I.) 323 (i).
See 'P.E.I.'

Wire Fencing on Boundary Lines, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 1677 (i).

Wire Fencing, Inspection of Imports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Clements) 176 (i).

Wolvin Fleet, Withdrawing from Montreal Port: Remarks (Mr. Bennett) in Com. of Sup., 2649 (ii).

Women's Art Association of Canada incorp. B. No. 59 (Mr. Grant) 1°*, 744 ; 2°*, 974 (i).
Woods Building, Occupied by Militia Dept., Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ingram) 186 (i).
Woods Co., Amounts paid by Govt. for Rentals; Ques. (Mr. Monk) 422 (i).
——— Amounts paid for Supplies *re* Georgian Bay Surveys : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 423 (i).
——— Amounts paid to for Salaries by Transcontinental Ry. Commission : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 449 (i).
——— Amounts paid for Supplies, 1905 : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1369 (i).
——— Payments *re*, from all Depts.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 979 (i).
——— Payments by Govt. for Rentals from 1896 : Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 4701 (iii).
——— Total Amounts paid for Supplies from 1897-1905 : Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 1858 (i).
Wood Island Breakwater, P. E. I., Repairs to: Ques. (Mr. A. Martin) 332 (i).
Wood Island, Extension of Jetty : in Com. of Sup., 6933 (iv).
Woodstock, N. B., Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 6728 (iv).
Woodstock, N. B., Apptmnt. of Mr. L. C. Smith as Postmaster : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 1564 (i).
——— Leave of Absence of L. C. Smith : Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 1378 (i).
Woodstock, N.B., Collector of Customs, Charges *re* Ques. (Mr. Ganong) 3251 (ii).
Worthington Pump purchased by Govt. Charges *re* : Remarks (Mr. J. D. Smith) in Com. of Sup., 4108 (iii).
See 'Arctic.'
Wrecks on Pacific Coast, Loss of Life, Causes, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. Smith) 428 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. Smith) 338 (i).
See 'Pacific Coast.'
Wrecking Plant, Davie & Sons : in Com. of Sup., 4867 (iii).
Wrecks in St. Lawrence, 1905, Causes, Losses, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. Smith) 428 (i).
——— Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 170 (i).
See 'St. Lawrence Route,' &c.
Wurts, Henry, Jr., Patent Relief B. No. 106 (Mr. Belcourt) 1°*, 1465 ; 2°, 1710 (i) ; in Com. 2205 ; 3°*, 2205 (ii).
Year Book : in Com. of Sup. 2682 (ii), 7382 (iv).
Yoho Park Roads, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5944 (iii).
Yukon, Agents, Indians, Indian Reserve Land disposed of, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 2949 (ii).
——— Chargts *re* Wood Contract : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 6801 (iv).
——— Citizens' Meeting, Res. *re* Hydraulic Concessions, and Elective Council : Read (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6546 (iv).
Yukon, Concessions of Bronson and Ray, Cancellation of : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1856 (i).
——— Charges *re* : on M. for Sup. (Mr. Foster) 1511 (i).
See 'Ray,' &c.
Yukon Council, Govt. Policy *re* Election of, Res. from Citizens of Yukon : Read (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 2886 (ii).
——— Supervision by Dom. Govt. *re* Expenditures : Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 1208 (i).
Yukon Gold Gravels, Estimated Value: in Com. of Sup., 5981, 5985 (iii).
——— Value of 1897-1905 : Ques. (Mr. Blain) 2031 (ii).
Yukon Gold Royalty, Amount collected from 1897 to 1902 : Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 5004 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. of Sup., 5927 (iii).
Yukon Gold Royalties : Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7638 (iv).
——— Hatfield : *See* 'Rainmaking.'
Yukon Indians, Medical Attendance and Relief: in Com. of Sup., 1206 (i).
——— Schools : in Com. of Sup., 1228 (i).
——— Schools, Officials, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2271 (ii).
Yukon Judges, Living Allowances: in Com. of Sup., 489 (i), 7618 (iv).
——— Local Council, Maintenance of Roads, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5934 (iii).
Yukon Map, Preparation of : in Com. of Sup., 5980 (iii).
Yukon Post Office Services : in Com. of Sup., 558 (i).
Yukon, Ray and Bronson Mining Concession, Date of Grant, Conditions, &c., Expenditure : Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1744 (i).
See 'Bronson,' &c.
Yukon Representative Institutions : M. (Mr. Thompson) to Com. of Sup., 5103 (iii).
Yukon Ter., Charges by Mr. Graham Campbell *re* Judiciary, Letter to Gov. Gen.: Read (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 5915 (iii).
——— Govtl. Expenditure, Living Allowances, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5906 (iii).
Yukon, Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Sup., 7021 (iv).
——— Ashcroft-Dawson : in Com. of Sup., 6771 (iv).
——— System, Total Cost, Earnings, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 1865 (i).
Yukon, Wood Contracts *re* : Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7639 (iv).